**Peer Review Guide for Peer Reviewers and Submitting Authors**

The University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries are establishing a facilitated peer review process to support the peer review of alternative scholarly works, specifically in relation to the tenure and promotion process.[[1]](#footnote-1) Such a process is critically needed across many fields to support scholarly efforts in multimedia publication, data curation, publicly engaged scholarship, collaborative works, and other forms of alternative scholarly products that do not fit within established disciplinary traditions.

The process will support and uphold the sacredness of peer review as a process for fair evaluation that respects diversities[[2]](#footnote-2) and has been established with the needs of individual authors and institutional units in mind in terms of measurement, communicability, and reporting. This process mirrors traditional peer review (following models of peer review for publications and tenure and promotion and grant awards) as closely as possible with all materials peer-reviewed in accordance with already established standards of excellence.

**Peer Review Process**

The steps/stages for the facilitated peer review process are:

* Author(s) submits completed *Application* to Committee
* Committee reviews *Application* for completeness; communicating with author(s), as needed, to obtain complete information
* Committee informs author(s) after the *Application* has been accepted as complete
* Committee confirms selection of at least two peer reviewers, with no less than 50% from the list provided by the author(s)
* Committee chair creates projected timeline for review process
* Committee chair contacts potential peer reviewers, supporting any discussion/questions
* Committee chair contacts author(s) with the status of the review process and to share the projected timeline, and to support any discussion/questions
* Committee chair maintains schedule for the process
* Peer reviewers conduct peer review
* Peer reviewers submit completed reviews to the Committee chair, consulting the Committee as needed
* *Possible discussion and clarification at this stage*
* Committee chair reviews peer reviewer submissions for completeness, consulting the Committee as needed
* *Possible discussion and clarification at this stage*
* Committee may select a third peer reviewer if needed, handled on a case-by-case basis
* Committee chair in consultation with the Committee drafts a summary letter synthesizing the narrative reviews from the peer reviewers
* Committee chair prepares compilation of the draft summary letter, reviews, application, and any other documentation and provides this compiled packet to the Committee
* Committee reviews, makes any changes, conducts final work, if necessary, and grants final approval of the summary review letter with full review packet
* Committee chair submits letter and review packet to author(s)
* Committee chair sends letters acknowledging the peer reviewers for their service
* Committee contacts author(s) and peer reviewers to request feedback to assess and improve the facilitated peer review process

**Roles and Responsibilities for the Peer Review Process**

**Author(s)**

The facilitated peer review process begins with the author(s) completing the *Application for Facilitated Peer Review Support for Alternative Scholarly Works.*

Authors provide contextual and background information as well as documentation to support the review of their alternative scholarly works. By completing the *Application,* authors provide succinct information and context for alternative scholarly works.

**Facilitated Peer Review Committee**

The Facilitated Peer Review Committee is comprised of UF faculty and staff. The Committee’s role is to facilitate the process of peer review. The Committee is akin to members of a journal editorial board, or a publisher’s on-staff editors in providing the framework for peer review, or the program officers for a granting agency that supports and facilitates the experts who are conducting peer review. The Committee establishes the necessary policies, procedures, and documentation; locates the appropriate experts to conduct peer review; and supports the process of peer review as performed by experts. Peer review is conducted by experts in the field.

Additional roles expected of the Committee include:

* Full Committee
  + Reviews templates and processes no less than annually; makes appropriate updates and changes
* Committee Chair
  + Schedules meetings, takes minutes, and distributes and maintains documentation regarding the process

**Peer Reviewers**

Peer reviewers are crucial contributors to the facilitated peer review process. By reviewing materials and providing thorough, informed, and expert written reviews, peer reviewers ensure that scholarly works endorsed through the peer review process represent substantive impact or contribution to the field and that those works can be recognized and credited properly. This provides the necessary supports for individual authors, institutions and institutional units, and more broadly, scholarly communications in terms of inquiry, excellence, and innovation. Peer reviewers also provide feedback to aid authors in improving and extending their work for maximum impact for the field.

**Identification of and Attribution for Authors, Committee, and Peer Reviewers**

Given that in many forms of alternative scholarship, as with online scholarly works, authors are identified, this process differs from the traditional peer review process in this one area where institutional facilitators, author(s), and reviewers are not anonymous. The facilitated peer review process will follow the process used for tenure and promotion letters wherein the identities of institutional facilitators, author, and reviewers are disclosed and authors may retain rights to review all feedback.

Because this process needs to support individual authors, as well as the needs of departments, colleges, and institutions, reviews from the facilitated peer review process will be shared with the author(s). With both author(s) and reviewers identified, peer reviewers are able to actively contribute to scholarly communication and discourse through their participation in the process.

**Peer Review Form for Alternative Scholarly Works**

The *Peer Review Form for Alternative Scholarly Works* contains contextual notes to support the feedback requested from peer reviews.

Alternative scholarly works can be unusually difficult to alter. The common options of “accept,” “accept with revisions,” and “reject” may not be appropriate. Peer reviewers for the facilitated peer review process are asked to evaluate the Work in terms of the equivalency provided on the application. The equivalencies are those listed as an existing peer-reviewed category in the traditional T&P process at the University of Florida (e.g.; journal article, book chapter, edited collection, book, etc.).[[3]](#footnote-3) Peer reviewers review the Work and select one of the following options:

* Equivalency is appropriate as recommended by the author(s).
* Equivalency is not appropriate as recommended by the author(s). However, the Work is a significant scholarly contribution, and the reviewer recommends the equivalency as another category listed in the T&P process.
* Equivalency is not appropriate as recommended by the author(s). The Work is not at a level that would merit an equivalency.

The *Peer Review Form for Alternative Scholarly Works* provides additional information to aid reviewers which may also be informative for authors submitting Work for review.

**Additional Information**

Additional information on the peer review process, roles, and responsibilities is given in the *Application for Facilitated Peer Review Support for Alternative Scholarly Works* and the *Peer Review Form for Alternative Scholarly Works.* All materials are located on the Committee Website: <http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/committees/fprc/>

1. The University of Florida Promotion and Tenure (P&T or T&P) guidelines and information are online: http://www.aa.ufl.edu/tenure [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See Michéle Lamont, *How Professors Think* (Harvard University Press: 2009), for a discussion of peer review as a standardized and ritualized process wherein peer review becomes and is sacred. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The University of Florida Promotion and Tenure (P&T or T&P) guidelines and information are online: <http://www.aa.ufl.edu/tenure> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)