**CLA RTP Policy (proposed revisions for Disclosure of Peer Review Process)**

*CLA Equity Task Force, Team 4: Raven Pfister & Emily Berquist Soule, co-leads*

*Equity Task Force Members: Linna Li, Jacqueline Lyon, & Varisa Patraporn*

**2.2.6 Disclosure Requirements and Conflict of Interest**

 **2.2.6.1 Disclosure of Peer Review Process**

Candidates are responsible for providing proof of peer review. All such proof must be provided in English.

 Proof of peer review can include, but is not limited *to the following. Any of the following forms of proof of peer review* are equally *suitable:*

a. A printout of the venue's editorial policy.

 b. Copies of reader reports. *Candidates who submit these for evidence of peer review should be aware that any materials submitted in RTP files can be used by evaluators to assess their work in any capacity. Candidates who are concerned that critiques in their readers' reports may reflect negatively on their overall RSCA are encouraged to submit one or more of the other forms of proof listed here (a and/or c).*

 c. Letters from editors or readers in which editorial policy is stated.

*Note to readers*

- our proposed policy revisions are based on the crowdsourcing work done by the CLASP team in the 21-22 a.y., extensive secondary research prepared by our team members, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the proposed new RTP policy for the university, and discussion with Dean Thien

- as much as possible, new/changed language is marked in *green italics*

- in this case our proposed revisions are not adding or subtracting from the current policy -- they are simply clarifying.

- the need for this policy was made clear during our crowdsourcing phase and in COVID Equity Task Force work with AVP Kirsty Fleming 21-22 a.y., when we learned that several CLA faculty who recently went through RTP actions felt that they were advised to submit readers' reports as the "best" way to prove peer review, and then were dismayed to see that those readers' reports were used by evaluators not simply as evidence of peer review, but to actually critique the faculty member's RSCA

- AVP Fleming made clear at this time that anything a candidate puts in their file may be used by the evaluators however evaluators see fit. We understand this policy and do not seek to change it in any way, simply to strengthen the language so that candidates are aware of this possibility, and also aware that they may choose to provide alternate forms of peer review instead, with no negative impact to their files