

When it comes to publications, the University of Georgia gives priority to the publications that are presented in the world's leading international scientific databases – Scopus and Web of Science. There are several reasons for that:

When scientific journal appears in the leading scientific databases it already suggests the high quality of the journal.

Given the huge number of scientific journals in the world, there is a necessity of certain ready tools enabling us to filter out and assess the level of scientific staff productivity. This is what international scientific databases are needed for. Scopus database, for example, covers more than 37 000 scientific journals, while in the Web of Science core collection there are up to 21 000 journals. Unless these databases simplified the job, one by one assessing credibility of tens of thousands of journals would require enormous resources from universities and some disciplines might even fail to manage it by their internal resources. According to the classification of the databases, there are hundreds of scientific sub-fields – some of the journals of the sub-field may be so specific that hardly any specialist can be found at university, or even in the whole country, able to assess the quality of the journal.

Leading scientific databases deliver necessary metadata for each particular journal and publication they cover, which, in part, facilitates the evaluation of the quality of scientific activities.

When assessing the scientific value of a publication the following methods are applied: average journal impact factor and citation half-life. These methods become reliable and subject to comparison only within the framework of certain scientific bases. For example, we can compare citation half-life of two articles of the same field in the Scopus database, however, it is inappropriate to compare citation half-life of the article from one field of Scopus database to that of the other article from another field.

The number of citations recorded in any leading database is also reliable in the sense that it provides the number of those citations that appear merely in works and journals, that are part of the database.

Thus, adding a publication to the database gives us not only certain indicator of quality but credible tool as well, enabling us to compare publications.

Scientists worldwide are more likely to read works of the journals, that are included in the leading databases and are in the list of top journals in respective field.

Bringing works to the specialist of the field ensures not only quality of the work, but its influence and practical effectiveness too. High-quality scientific work may be lost, unless it is reviewed by the professional community.

For this reason, by giving priority to international scientific databases, we manage to set the quality standard and promote the effectiveness of scientific activity. Due to the factors mentioned above, university ranking system basically rests on the assessment of publications recorder in the international database.

Scientific works that are beyond the international databases – apart from hardly being subject to quality evaluation and being likely to remain beyond the scientific process, they constitute neither international ranking nor the reputation of the university.

International reputation of a university, in turn, is directly related to the further academic progress. University ranking is shaped by the academic level of students and scientists willing to work with it.

Hence, for the University of Georgia, the main criteria, enabling us to assess staff activity with regard to the scientific publications lies in the number of their publications, scientific journals and citations in Scopus and Web of Science databases.

We have an additional tool of evaluation – Google Scholar works and citations. Google Scholar indicators often correlate with the leading database indicators and have particular impact over some of the ranking systems. Publications added to the Google Scholar database are more likely to be looked for and shared by colleagues. However, unlike to Scopus Web of Science databases, Google Scholar does not provide feedback on the quality of scientific journals or other scientific sources (e.g. conference works). Virtually any online source, meeting certain technical, non-scientific criteria, may have an access to the Google Scholar database.

In particular cases, there can be some publications, that do not constitute any of the above-mentioned databases – for example: monographs of certain relevance, expert documents or manuals. However, university is not liable to fully record and evaluate all the publications left beyond the major databases.