

Peer Review Form for Alternative Scholarly Works

Please complete this form and return it by email to Dr. Laurie Taylor, UF Digital Humanities Librarian:
Laurien@ufl.edu.

Note: All information from this form will be shared with the author(s) whose work is being reviewed. Please ensure all comments are frank, constructive, and relevant for the evaluation and validation processes.

1. Please choose one of the following in relation to the equivalency that represents 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.) as indicated in the attached *Application for Facilitated Peer Review Support for Alternative Scholarly Works*.

__ Equivalency is appropriate as recommended by the author(s) as **INSERTED BY COMMITTEE FROM AUTHOR APPLICATION**

Comments:

__ 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 _____

Comments:

__ Equivalency is not appropriate as recommended by the author(s). The Work is not at a level that would merit an equivalency.

Comments:

2. Please indicate your judgment as to the quality of this work:

Rankings have been attached to the following criteria as an aid to you. You may use this system or modify it as you see fit to assist in the final evaluation.

Please rate the Work in the following areas:

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Unacceptable
Level of Context					
Sufficiency of background information provided					
Appropriateness of citations to prior work					
Methods/Process (if applicable)					
Clear description of process or methods to create the Work					
Quality of the data collection					
Impact					
Placement of the Work within the field, multiple fields, and/or within public scholarship					
Level and importance of contribution and impact for the field ¹					
Demonstration of new insights about the issue or problem					
Significant contribution to the understanding of the topic					

¹ Because the facilitated peer review process cannot have a journal impact factor or other measures, the peer reviewer assessment of the level and importance of the Work is critical.

<u>Presentation of the Work</u>					
Clarity and professionalism of written material					
Clarity and professionalism of visual and other material					
Appropriateness of language, terminology, and tone for the intended audience					
Usability					
Archival integrity (e.g., the work is located in an appropriate venue, is intuitive to locate, and has a stable presence)					
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>					

3. Please provide comments for the author(s) and Facilitated Peer Review Committee Members:²

Please provide a thoughtful review and commentary, including any suggestions for improving the work:

- Overall assessment, including whether the project accomplished the stated goals or intent, its contribution to one or more disciplinary audiences, and comments in general to its scholarly/intellectual value
- Comments on the appearance, usability, and location of the Work (if applicable)
- Suggestions for future phases, possible further implications, and/or opportunities to leverage or maximize impact from the work

4. If you have any relation to the work being reviewed, please note that relation.

² Reviewers should recognize that constraints may prevent the author(s) from implementing reviewer suggestions.