**Application for Facilitated Peer Review Support for Alternative Scholarly Works**

*Important Notes:*

The facilitated peer review process utilizes traditional peer review with expert reviewers. 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 author and reviewer participants in the process identified, peer reviewers are actively contributing to scholarly communication and discourse through their participation in this process. We intend for this process to be for substantively complete works.

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 this 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.).[[1]](#footnote-1) 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 as an aid to reviewers. This information may also be informative for completing the following application.

**1. Core Information**

**Title/Name of Work:**

**Name of author(s) requesting facilitated peer review, and contribution to the Work:**

**Contact email address(es) for author(s), or alternate contact information:**

**Please provide information on how to access the Work.**

* **URL for the Work:**
* **If not online, mode/means of access:**

**Name of additional contributor(s) who should be recognized for contributing to the Work, and role for the Work:[[2]](#footnote-2)2. Information on the Work**

**Please provide a short summary (approx. 200-500 words) of the Work in terms of goals, current status, and how it constitutes an impact or contribution to the field. Please explain if the Work is a contribution to multiple fields and/or public scholarship.**

**How is the Work preserved or assured to be maintained and accessible over the long-term?
*For instance, a library may commit to supporting and preserving the Work.***

**How is the Work accessible?**

**Please describe other review processes already in place for the Work.**

***For instance, please include information regarding competitive funding awarded for the Work; conference presentations on the Work; reports and papers about the Work (published formally, integrated support documents, etc.); reviews of the Work that have already been conducted; assessments of the Work; expert consultations and opinions; impact and integration measures (e.g.; usage statistics for an online site; evidence of an active core user community with partnerships and other similar arrangements); and the like.***

**For Works that are technical or technologically dependent, please provide a short description of the Work’s technical structure and dependencies.**

***Please note: this may be a description of the abstracted, logical technical elements and not necessarily the technologies in particular. If appropriate, please include contact information for a technical contact or representative for the Work.***

**Please provide a brief explanation on the status of the Work in terms of the life cycle of the Work. Does the Work represent the completion of a project? Does it represent a milestone in an ongoing cycle of development for a long-term program? What is the significant date range for the Work, and how is it relevant?**

***For instance, reference books are often created to cover a certain topic or period. Depending on their focus, a standard reference book may be reviewed and updated every five years. Similar activities may occur for data collection conducted for longitudinal studies. Please note any comparative genres or forms that could be informative for understanding this information for the Work.***

**3. Peer Review and Peer Reviewers**

**Please provide a recommendation for the level or equivalency at which the Work should be evaluated. For instance, please state “Refereed Journal Article” for a Work that represents an equivalent impact in the field with the norm for a journal article, or similar form. The equivalency could take any form—sole author book, edited book, contributor of a chapter to a book, refereed proceedings, refereed journal articles, etc. – recognized as currency in the author’s field.
*While equivalencies are imperfect, equivalencies may aid authors and institutions for the evaluation and proper crediting for alternative scholarly works. As such, a way to represent the Work within existing categories commonly included in tenure and promotion documents and CVs is needed. Authors in different fields may contribute in the same manner to a Work where the equivalency for each author, because of the field or discipline, is different. Please explain how the equivalency relates to the discipline for the author(s). Please note: equivalencies should be based on impact. Other measures, like hours of labor and costs, should not be considered unless they are factors for impact.***

**Please provide names of at least two potential reviewers in the field; institutional affiliations; if applicable, affiliation or relationship of these reviewers to the Work; and brief bios/summaries of their expertise for reviewing the Work.**

**4. Agreement and Submission**

***All authors for the Work, as listed in Section 1, are required to sign the completed form before the review can begin. Submission of the completed application is the first formal step in the facilitated peer review process.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature** | **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Signature of Author Requesting Review****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Printed or Typed Name of Author****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Date of Signature**  |

***Please designate a single corresponding author, if appropriate. If appropriate, please note contact information for any additional individual(s) to be included on correspondence with the author(s). This may include: department chair(s), mentor(s), and the like.***

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. Alternative scholarly works are often produced by authors working with others. For example, information technology professionals and graduate students are frequent contributors to digital humanities scholarly works. In some cases, they may be collaborators who should be recognized as one of the authors. In other cases, they may have contributed to some degree but should not be recognized as one of the authors for the work. Including contributors and their roles is needed to ensure full and appropriate attribution for work; to support further refinement of the facilitated peer review process; and to provide feedback to the relevant institutional entities regarding the importance of the contributors for producing the work. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)