

## Resolution For Faculty Assembly Regarding the Use of Formal Preferred Journals Lists

(revised and approved Faculty Assembly 10/06/2021)

Whereas, faculty retention, conferral of tenure and/or promotion and the academic freedom they confer are cornerstones of the modern university including the University of Pittsburgh;

Whereas, fair and just treatment of all faculty with regard to the manner in which tenure, promotion and/or retention are awarded and faculty evaluations are performed are University-wide concerns;

Whereas, individual units of the University determine criteria for tenure, promotion and/or retention of their faculty according to their stated missions in teaching, education, service and research, equitable application of these criteria is essential in performance evaluations and in recommendations for tenure, promotion and/or retention;

Whereas, adoption of a “formal preferred journal list” as a metric for faculty scholarly activity may not cover all the areas of inquiry by faculty, which could force faculty to shape their research to fit the list rather than pursue areas of interest to them;

Whereas, a “formal preferred journal list” necessarily prioritizes certain lines of research and thought that may stifle innovation, creativity, and academic pursuits, particularly with new or unconventional ideas;

Whereas, such a “formal preferred journal list” may concentrate research within disciplines rather than across disciplines and this may inadvertently diminish efforts to promote cross disciplinary work that may produce publications suited to journals not on the list;

Whereas, a faculty member may work on an area not represented in the journals on the formal preferred list, which could adversely affect annual performance evaluation, retention, and promotion;

Whereas, a “formal preferred journal list”, even if formulated with faculty consent and participation in its creation initially, could be changed over time by administrators such that the list could be misused in annual performance evaluation, retention, and promotion; and

Whereas, using such a “formal preferred journal list” may unintentionally perpetuate academic structures that reward dissemination of knowledge in a particular format or on particular topics and disadvantage certain groups or unpopular ideas; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That all relevant scholarly and creative contributions be included in all assessments of faculty productivity in performance evaluations and in recommendations for promotion, tenure and/or retention; and

*Resolved*, That a “formal preferred list of journals” is unacceptable to the faculty and should not be used as it violates academic freedom and stifles inquiry and collaboration.