

## Periodic Program Review: Selection of External Reviewers Disclosure of Existing Relationships\*

For all periodic program reviews, the Office of the Provost has final responsibility for the selection of the external reviewers. In preparation for the site visit, academic units—in consultation with the cognizant dean—are invited to submit a list of potential external reviewers for consideration. The *disclosure of existing relationships* guidelines were developed to assist departments in identifying those situations in which an academic unit or a potential reviewers need to make a disclosure regarding a relationship between that potential reviewer and a member of the academic unit to be reviewed.

### **Reviewers**

The following guidance will assist in determining whether a member of the academic unit under review needs to disclose an existing relationship with a potential external reviewer. These guidelines were developed to help members of the academic unit determine what constitutes an existing personal or professional relationship and to help avoid a situation that might jeopardize, or give the appearance of compromising, the integrity of the program review. This guidance is not all-inclusive. Therefore, it is important that you consult the Office of Periodic Program Review when there is any question about a potential reviewer's participation.

If any member of the Temple University academic unit that is under review has a relationship with a reviewer that could be construed as creating a problem situation then the head of the unit (department chair, dean) should inform the Office of Periodic Program Review. If you are not sure if there is a problem, the Office of Periodic Program Review will assist you in determining whether or not a problem exists.

Examples of problem situations are:

- Reviewer has been, or is likely to be, directly involved in some work of the academic unit e.g., as a consultant or collaborator;
- Reviewer and a member of the academic unit have a personal, family, or financial relationship;
- Reviewer and a member of the academic unit have been related as a student and thesis advisor or post-doctoral advisor;
- Reviewer and a member of the academic unit are known to be close friends or open antagonists;
- Reviewer and a member of the academic unit have ***collaborated in the last three to five years*** on research, creative work or any other significant professional activities or have plans to collaborate on a future initiative
- Reviewer and a member of the academic unit were co-authors on a paper published ***in the last three to five years*** or are presently engaged in writing or planning to write a jointly authored manuscript.

**Exception:** Where permissible, the Office of the Provost may grant an exception relating to these guidelines.

As reviewers themselves are most familiar with their own situations, it is their personal responsibility to alert the Office of the Provost to any possible situations, whether real or apparent, that may impact on the review process. Reviewers will be asked to maintain the confidentiality of the review process and associated materials and to not disclose to another individual any matter or information related to the review.

*\*Source: The above guidelines are modified from guidelines developed by NSF and NIH.*