

APASP Task Force Report Review Process (6-22-17)

Purpose

In anticipation of several hundred reports from Academic Programs and Administrative Units, a method of report review based upon NIH grant review mechanisms is proposed to facilitate fair, thorough, and accurate evaluation of these reports.

Procedure

The general procedure will have three primary reviewers examine the report in detail. These three reviewers will then be responsible for summarizing their findings for the entire APASP Task Force. The APASP Task Force will collectively assign a final score.

Conflict of Interest (COI)

APASP Task Force members MUST disclose any conflicts of interests prior to the start of the review process. APASP Task Force members may not participate in discussion or score any program or unit that they have a COI with.

<http://www.umt.edu/policies/browse/personnel/conflict-of-interest-financial-disclosure>

The review process will be as follows:

1. Training on review process will take place prior to review of the Pilot.
2. Reports from Academic Programs and Administrative Services are received and logged.
3. Three reviewers, without any previously identified conflict of interest (COI), are chosen at random and assigned to each report.
4. Each reviewer will complete and upload their own independent review of the report without consultation with other reviewers and assign the report a score.
5. After all reviewers have submitted their score, reviewers will view the two other scores and comments for the report.
6. All three reviewers will assess congruency and disparity among their reviews of the report.
7. Reviewers will have the opportunity to modify their reviews based on those of the others assigned to the same report if they choose.
8. All reports and reviews will read by the APASP Task Force prior to the meeting.
9. At this meeting, reviewers will present their reviews to the APASP Task Force in the following manner:

- a. Each reviewer will announce their preliminary score of the report.
- b. The first reviewer will present an overview of the Program/Unit being assessed and give a BRIEF rationale for their score.
- c. The following two reviewers will present any additional information that had not been included by the previous reviewer(s).
- d. A brief discussion may occur if the TF wishes to clarify any points.
- e. The reviewers will present their final scores (which may change based upon the discussion).
- f. The final scores will provide the range in which full APASP Task Force members can assign a score.
- g. Any APASP Task Force member wishing to assign a score outside the range must declare their score and reasoning.
- h. All APASP Task Force members will record their scores on individual score sheets.
- i. Sheets will be collected at the end of the meeting and the final score for the report will be determined by the average of all scores.

Planning Draft