THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON

Academic Program Review Guidelines for 2018-2019

Welcome

We at the Graduate School's Office of Academic Affairs and Planning seek to make the academic program review process useful and informative to the academic unit under review. The goal of this process is to provide an opportunity for reflection and visioning: What has worked well? What can be improved? Where would the unit like to be in five or ten years? It is in that spirit that we provide detailed information on the program review process and instructions on writing a self-study.

- Kima Cargill
Associate Dean, Academic Affairs & Planning

Introduction

The University of Washington conducts program reviews as stipulated in the *University Policy Directory* (Presidential Orders: Executive Order 20.4):

> *Reviews of all academic units including the graduate and undergraduate degree programs offered by these units are required at least every ten years and are conducted jointly by the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs in cooperation with the relevant School or College Dean. Among the outcomes of the above reviews should be a clearer understanding of the academic unit's:*
> 1. *quality of instruction, research, and public service;*
> 2. *value to students' general education and preparation for society;*
> 3. *role within the University and effectiveness in fulfilling that role;*
> 4. *resource requirements;*
> 5. *future objectives and changes necessary to achieve them.*

The University of Washington has designated the Graduate School's **Office of Academic Affairs and Planning** to oversee the academic program review process. Academic program reviews focus on <u>both</u> the graduate and undergraduate program offerings of units and serve the University's academic assessment process, as required by the University's accrediting body. Program reviews also provide the University with an assessment of the academic quality of undergraduate and graduate programs.

The Academic Program Review Process: What to Expect

The review affords faculty within academic units an opportunity to reflect on their goals and accomplishments, to consider their future direction and goals, and to receive a constructive assessment on their work from their peers.

For questions and guidance about this document or any of the program review process, contact:
- Chris Partridge (chrisrp@uw.edu), Academic Program Review Specialist, who manages the program review process, AND/OR
- Becky Corriell (bfran3@uw.edu), Director, Academic Program Review & Strategy, who oversees program reviews on behalf of the Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The process unfolds in the following way:

Autumn Quarter of the Year before a Review

1. **Attend an Orientation**
   Each unit to be reviewed will send a representative to attend an orientation for all reviews taking place the following year. The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning sends the invitation during the summer and the orientation takes place in October. This orientation initiates the process for scheduling and preparing for a review.

2. **Identify Guiding Questions and Potential Committee Members**
   The first step is to allow the unit to identify questions that are unique to its work and foci. The unit to be reviewed will engage in an internal conversation (among its faculty members and—as applies—its chair/director, divisional dean, dean and/vice chancellor or chancellor, etc.) aimed at:

   - Identifying the core questions the unit wants addressed by the review committee (Part B of the self-study). The unit may structure these questions in any fashion it wishes, keeping in mind that they are not set in stone. The unit will work with the review committee to determine the extent to which the list of questions should be modified. The unit will provide context to the self-study questions. It is our experience that a focused set of questions elicits the most robust input from the review committee.

   - Identifying the names of potential internal and external review committee members and possible dates for the site visit (**using the *Academic Program Review Planning Form* found at the end of this document**).

3. **Submit Forms to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning**
Send the completed Part B questions and the *Program Review Planning Form* electronically to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning at progrev@uw.edu.

For questions and guidance throughout the process, contact:
- Chris Partridge (chrisrp@uw.edu), Academic Program Review Specialist, who manages the program review process, AND/OR
- Becky Corriell (bfran3@uw.edu), Director, Academic Program Review & Strategy, who oversees program reviews on behalf of the Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Winter and Spring Quarter the Year before a Unit's Review

1. **Site Visit Scheduling**
The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will work with academic units to schedule the site visit (to occur the following academic year), and establish the review committee.

2. **Forming the Review Committee**
Based on the suggested list of faculty members submitted by the unit in the Program Review Planning Form, the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will assemble a review committee.

For degree-offering units (including ones that also offer graduate certificate programs) the review committee shall include:
- Two University of Washington faculty members with graduate faculty status (one of whom shall serve as Chair of the Review Committee) and
- Two external reviewers from peer institutions who are widely recognized experts in the field.

Professional programs may include an expert in the field of practice in lieu of one of the external faculty reviewers, as appropriate and with the support of the relevant dean.

For reviews of a single degree or graduate certificate program, the review committee shall include, minimally, one University of Washington faculty member and one external reviewer.

3. **The Charge Meeting**
The charge meeting will occur when a full committee is established, typically before the end of the academic year.

- Participants can attend either in-person or virtually. These participants include (with each having the discretion to send a designate):

- Participants in the charge meeting may include (with each having the discretion to send a designate) the:
    - Chair/Director, or otherwise faculty lead, of the unit;
    - Primary academic administrator having administrative oversight over the unit (e.g., a Dean for a non-departmentalized unit or a Divisional Dean for an Arts & Sciences unit)
    - Vice Chancellor/Chancellor for program reviews at UW Bothell or UW Tacoma
    - Associate Dean of the Graduate School or their staff representative;
    - Associate Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, for units that have undergraduate program offerings;
    - At least one representative from the Graduate School Council;
    - Review committee members

- During the meeting, participants will review the core questions the unit has submitted for the review committee to consider, agreeing upon any possible revisions. The review committee will also have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions of the unit's leadership. All participants are full and active contributors to the discussion.

    - The relationship between the unit and its review committee should be cordial, but an appropriate distance should be maintained from the time the committee is constituted until the review has been completed in order to preserve the integrity of the review process and avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

- The meeting will result in a formal charge to guide the committee's review and the unit's composition of the self-study.

4. The Self Study:
The general recommendation is that the self-study should be no more than 25 pages. The unit may exercise discretion in writing the self-study, but it must minimally accomplish three tasks:

- Respond to the required questions common to all reviews conducted at the University (Part A). These questions are outlined in this document.
- Provide context for the questions the unit, administrators, and review committee have specifically identified (Part B).
- Provide data in the form of appendices (Part C).

5. Program Review Website Creation
The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will create a password-protected website where all program review material will be located and available to all key constituents.

The Site Visit

1. **Site Visit Agenda:**
   Approximately six weeks prior to the site visit, the unit submits a draft site visit agenda to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning for comment. Following OAAP input, it is shared with the review committee along with the self-study.

2. **Site Visit Meetings:**
   The site visit allows the review committee to meet with key stakeholders who can provide information about, and advice to the unit. Additionally, if there are any other individuals or groups (e.g., an advisory board) the committee wishes to meet, the academic unit should arrange the meetings.
   a. Stakeholder categories typically include unit leadership, faculty, staff, students and, when applicable, governing bodies, advisory boards, and alumni groups.

3. **Exit Meeting:**
   The site visit concludes with an exit discussion including all individuals who were present at the initial charge meeting and a representative from the Office of the Provost. The first half of this meeting will allow the review committee to share its initial findings and recommendations. The second half of the meeting will be an executive session during which academic unit representatives, including the chair/director of the unit, will not be present.

Final Events

1. **Review Committee Report**
   No later than four weeks after the site visit, the review committee will send its report electronically to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning.

   The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will make the response available to the committee and review stakeholders represented at the exit discussion.

2. **Unit Response to the Committee Report**
   The unit being reviewed, in collaboration with its Dean/Chancellor/Vice Chancellor, should submit a response to the report electronically to progrev@uw.edu.

   The unit response offers a unit's leadership the opportunity to formally respond to the recommendations contained in the review committee's report. This document is included in Graduate School Council discussion of the review, and is also archived with the review materials, which are shared during the next program review.

   There is no formal requirement of length or structure. Often, departments submit 1-5 pages outlining any perspective they want to share in the context of the review. Some respond to each individual recommendation, while others respond in summary. It might include any of the following:

Agreement or disagreement with any of the statements contained in the report
Any updates the unit has regarding any of the topics in the report
Short- or long-term plans based on findings through the evaluation process

When preparing a unit response, departments are advised to share the review committee report among members of the unit, taking their input into consideration.

The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will make the response available to the unit and review stakeholders represented at the exit discussion.

3. **Graduate School Council Review**
   Within one academic quarter after the unit's response to the review committee's report, the Graduate School Council will review all documents generated during the review process and, if necessary, ask clarifying questions of the unit and/or review committee. The Graduate School Council will make final recommendations on the review to the Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Planning.

4. **Summary and Final Recommendations**
   A summary of the review, along with final recommendations, will be sent to the Dean, Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of the unit and review stakeholders represented at the charge meeting and exit discussion.

   In addition, the Summary and Final Recommendations document is sent to the Office of the Provost and the President of Graduate and Professional Student Senate.

The Self-Study Structure and Format

Self-Study Structure
The self-study has three parts:

Part A represents a unit's responses to a set of questions that will provide important background information and context for the review committee. These questions are also crafted to fulfill the expectations for reviews set forth in the University Policy Directory, and the standards articulated by the University's accrediting body.

Part B represents the core questions the unit set forth for the review committee and negotiated at the charge meeting. These questions are crafted to ensure that review outcomes are of unique value to the unit. They will also help guide the review committee in addressing the unit's current strengths, challenges, and the best path for achieving its future goals. As such, Part B should include any background information the review committee will need to adequately address the core questions.

Part C consists of the required appendices for the self-study. The unit may include supplementary material as additional appendices, but it is recommended that these appendices be kept to a minimum.

Self-Study Format
- The self-study, including all appendices, must be provided in a **single pdf document**.
- Exclusive of appendices, text should be comprised of *no more than 25 single-spaced pages*, using 12-point font and 1 inch margins.
  - The unit should provide only information that is relevant for the review committee to conduct a quality review. In our experience, self-studies that exceed the 25-page recommended limit are not necessarily more useful.

Special Note for Units that Undergo National Accreditation Reviews
These units may exercise discretion in using elements from their accreditation self-study to fulfill the requirements of the University of Washington's self-study—so long as that external accreditation occurred within the past two years. If there are questions in the University of Washington's guidelines that are similar to what was asked as part of the unit's external accreditation, then the unit may use content from their external accreditation self-study with minimal adjustments. The unit may also wish to use Part B of the self-study to articulate questions that are useful in preparing for an upcoming accreditation.

Special Note Regarding FERPA
Self-Study documents are posted on the Academic Program Review Archive page at the conclusion of the review and become accessible to members of the University community. As a result, academic units should refrain from including students' names and other identifying information in the document or in the required appendices. Academic units may

elect to provide information about students (e.g., awards or the placement of recent graduates) in a non-required appendix.

Self-Study Submission Deadlines
To ensure that the review committee has adequate time to read the unit's materials, the self-study, including all appendices, must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning by the date included in the program review charge letter. As a general guideline, the self-study and draft agenda should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning six weeks before the site-visit.

The Office of Academic Affairs and Planning will make all review materials available (via a password-protected website) to the review committee and other stakeholders, as represented at the charge meeting.

Submission Checklist
- ❑ The cover page listing: Name of unit, including name of school/college/campus
- Official title(s) of degrees/graduate certificates offered by the unit
- Year of last review
- Name of Academic Unit Leadership (Dean/Chair/Director)
- Name(s) of Self-study coordinator/author (if different from above)
- Date submitted

❑ Table of Contents

❑ Part A: Required Background Information

❑ Part B: Unit-Defined Questions

❑ Part C: Appendices

❑ Submit a single pdf version of the self-study, including all appendices, to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning via progrev@uw.edu.

For questions and guidance throughout the program review process, contact:
- Chris Partridge (chrisrp@uw.edu), who manages the program review process, AND/OR

- Becky Corriell (bfran3@uw.edu), who oversees program reviews on behalf of the Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Self-Study Guidelines

PART A
REQUIRED BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE

[Please Include a Table of Contents]

Section I: Overview of Organization (+/- 4 pages)

Mission & Organizational Structure
- Describe the overall mission of the unit.
- List:
  - Undergraduate and graduate degrees offered in the unit, including program options, or majors/minors, and fee-based programs within these degrees.
  - Graduate Certificate programs offered, if any.
  - In addition, provide detailed information on enrollment and graduation patterns for each degree program (these data should appear in aggregate form, i.e., no student names).
- Describe how the unit supports academic services (e.g., advising) and non-academic faculty and student services (e.g., technology support, fiscal services). Refer to the organizational chart in Appendix A.
- Describe the manner in which shared governance works in the unit, along with how the unit solicits the advice of stakeholders such as students, advisory boards and faculty from other academic units.

Budget & Resources
- Provide an outline of the unit's budget including all sources of funding. Please refer to the budget summary in Appendix B.
- Indicate how the unit evaluates whether it is making the best use of its current funding, human capital and other resources.
- Describe any advancement plans as well as strategies to pursue additional funds through grants or contracts.

Academic Unit Diversity
- Describe the academic unit's diversity plan.
- Provide an overview of representation on the unit's diversity committee.
- Describe the diversity of the unit's faculty and staff.
- Describe how the unit utilizes institutional resources or partners with organizations such as the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity (OMA&D) or the Graduate Opportunities and Minority Achievement Program (GO-MAP) to recruit and retain traditionally underrepresented minority undergraduate and graduate students.
- Describe outreach strategies the unit employs with underrepresented students of color, women, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ students to diversify its student body.

- Describe initiatives the unit has employed to create an environment that supports the academic success of underrepresented students of color, women, students with disabilities, and LGBTQ students.
- Describe how the unit utilizes institutional resources such as the Office of the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement to recruit and retain faculty from underrepresented identities.
- Describe strategies the unit employs to support the career success of faculty members from underrepresented identities, and where applicable, female faculty, and the extent to which the unit has been successful in diversifying its faculty ranks.

Section II: Teaching & Learning (+/- 6 pages)

Student Learning Goals and Outcomes

Answer the following questions for <u>each</u> undergraduate and graduate major, degree program, and graduate certificate program. There are reports provided by various university offices that may be useful in answering this section, and the Office of Educational Assessment can provide guidance regarding assessment.

- Describe student learning goals and outcomes (i.e., what are the students expected to learn? what are the students expected to be able to do as a result of the education provided?).
- Provide an overview of the ways in which the unit evaluates student learning (e.g., classroom- and/or performance-based assessment, capstone experiences, portfolios, etc.).
- Describe methods used to assess student satisfaction. Additionally, articulate efforts to gauge the satisfaction of students from underrepresented groups.
- Describe how the unit has used these findings to bring about improvements in the programs, effect curricular changes, and/or make decisions about resource allocation. If applicable, in what ways and were the intended improvements realized?
- Note the courses typically taken by undergraduates who will <u>not</u> be majors in any of the unit's programs, if applicable. Are there specific learning goals in those courses designed to accommodate "non-major" students? If so, how is student achievement in reaching these goals assessed?

Instructional Effectiveness

- Describe and discuss the method(s) used within the unit to evaluate quality of instruction, including the use of standardized teaching evaluation forms.
- Note all opportunities for training in instructional methods that are made available to any individuals teaching within the unit (including graduate students). For example, these may be opportunities that support teaching improvement, innovation, and/or best practices.
- Describe specific instructional changes that have been made by instructors in response to evaluation of teaching within the unit.

Teaching and Mentoring Outside the Classroom

- Describe how faculty members are involved in undergraduate and graduate student learning and development other than through classroom teaching (e.g., informal learning, independent studies, research involvement, specialized seminars or workshops, etc.).
- Describe how the unit works with undergraduate and graduate students to ensure steady academic progress and overall success in the program.
- Describe how the unit works with undergraduate and graduate students to prepare them for the next phases of their academic or professional lives.
- Consider including artifacts supporting this section in the appendix (e.g., a link to students' video presentations, select photos of poster presentations, a description of projects featured in the Undergraduate Research Symposium, etc.). This is encouraged but not required.

Section III: Scholarly Impact (+/- 5 pages)

- Describe the broad impact of faculty members' research and/or creative work. Feel free to note specific individuals and how their work embodies the unit's mission or distinguishes the unit from those at peer institutions.
- Describe undergraduate and graduate students' significant awards, noteworthy presentations, or activities that have had an impact on the field while enrolled in the program.
- Describe post-doctoral fellows' participation in the research and teaching activities of the unit, if applicable.
- Describe how program graduates have had an impact on the field either academically or professionally.
- Describe the ways in which advances in the field or discipline, changing paradigms, changing funding patterns, new technologies and trends, or other changes influenced research, scholarship or creative activity in the unit.
- List any collaborative and/or interdisciplinary efforts between the unit and other units at the University or at other institutions and the positive impacts of these efforts.
- Describe the academic unit's established promotion and tenure policies and practices that provide mentoring and support the success of junior faculty.
    - Describe how these policies and practices support the success of other faculty in the unit.
    - Describe the ways in which the expectations are shared with faculty (e.g., orientation meetings, documents on the website, one-on-one meetings).

Section IV: Future Directions (+/- 5 pages)

Rather than simply addressing this section by reiterating previous sections of the self-study thus far, address these questions in a way that is constructive for the unit as it thinks about its future.

- Where is the unit headed?
- What opportunities does the unit wish to pursue and what goals does it wish to reach?
- How does the unit intend to seize these opportunities and reach these goals?

- Describe the unit's current benefit and impact regionally, statewide, nationally, and internationally. Given the unit's envisioned future, describe how reaching this future will augment that benefit and impact.

PART B
UNIT-DEFINED QUESTIONS (+/- 5 PAGES)

Part B represents the core questions the unit set forth for the review committee and negotiated at the charge meeting. These questions are crafted to ensure that review outcomes are of unique value to the unit. They will also help guide the review committee in addressing the unit's current strengths, challenges and the best path for achieving its future goals. As such, Part B should include any background information the review committee will need to adequately address the core questions.

PART C
APPENDICES
(*Reminder: include all appendices in the single pdf file for submission*)

Appendix A: Organizational Chart
Provide a chart or list(s) that depicts the unit's organizational structure, including titles of those in leadership positions, names of departments/centers/units, etc.

Appendix B: Budget Summary
Provide a summary of the unit's three most recent biennia. Prepare this summary in any way that makes most sense for your unit while providing a comprehensive overview for the review committee.

Appendix C: Information about Faculty
Provide a list (reflective of the past academic year, autumn to summer) of all faculty members' names, ranks, appointment types, and affiliations with other units. If they are available online, provide links to faculty CVs. If these are not available online, you may choose to include them digitally as part of this appendix.

Appendix D: Diversity Plan (if the unit has one)

Additional Appendices
The unit may include supplementary material as additional appendices, but it is recommended that these appendices be kept to a minimum.

PROGRAM REVIEW PLANNING FORM

*Complete **this form** and send electronically to the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning via progrev@uw.edu.*

For questions and guidance about this document or any of the program review process, contact:

- Chris Partridge (chrisrp@uw.edu), Academic Program Review Specialist, who manages the program review process, AND/OR
- Becky Corriell (bfran3@uw.edu), Director, Academic Program Review & Strategy, who oversees program reviews on behalf of the Graduate School Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Provide the following contact information for your unit:

Unit name:
Chair:
Email:
Phone:
Staff Liaison:
Email:
Phone:
Chair Designate or Key Faculty *(if applicable)***:**
Email:
Phone:

Please check to confirm the following:

☐ The names of potential review committee members have been actively shared with all faculty within your unit to check for conflicts of interest.

☐ The list of potential committee members has received approval from your dean and vice chancellor, for reviews at UWB and UWT.

Degree Program Offerings

List all **undergraduate minors, undergraduate majors**, **graduate certificate programs**
and **graduate degrees** offered by your academic unit.
(It is not necessary to include all degree options.)

Please expand the text box as needed.

Dates of Site Visit
Indicate your preferred quarter for the program review site visit.
☐ Autumn Quarter 20___
☐ Winter Quarter 20___
☐ Spring Quarter 20___
One-day site visits (for graduate certificate programs only) can be scheduled on any day of
the week.

Two-day site visits (for degree offering units or units that have degrees and certificates)
are generally scheduled for a Monday/Tuesday or Thursday/Friday between the second
week of the quarter and the last week of classes.

List five sets of dates your unit would prefer for the site visit, taking into account the
availability of faculty, students and key staff.

Preferred dates for the site visit:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Unit-Defined Questions

The unit may structure these questions in any fashion it wishes. Questions will be finalized during the charge meeting, and units can submit an updated draft prior to the charge meeting. The unit will provide context for these questions in Part B of the self-study.

Use this space to provide a current draft of unit-defined questions for the review committee's consideration.

Please expand the text box as needed.

The Review Committee

Identify potential committee members from both the UW and peer institutions.

- Strive to identify individuals for whom, to the best of your knowledge, there exist no conflicts of interest.
- Circulate the names under consideration to your faculty to ensure that they have no conflicts of interest.

The following are examples of common conflicts of interest for a candidate:

- ✓ holds joint, adjunct or affiliate position with the unit
- ✓ has published with unit faculty
- ✓ engaged in collaborative research with a member of the unit
- ✓ was a mentor for or mentee of a faculty member in your unit
- ✓ is an alumnus/alumna of your unit
- ✓ considered for a position in the unit within the last five years
- ✓ previously chaired a review committee in the unit

✓ served on a visiting committee in the unit

✓ has a significant personal or professional relationship with a unit member

Additional criteria for review committee members:

- UW review committee members must have graduate faculty status.
  - o Verify that each recommended UW committee member has graduate faculty status by using the Graduate Faculty Locator: https://grad.uw.edu/for-faculty-and-staff/faculty-locator/.
  - o Contact Becky Corriell (bfran3@uw.edu) for questions about graduate faculty status.

- Review committee members are typically tenure-track associate or full professors.
  - o If you think a representative from industry or clinical faculty will make important contributions as an external member of the review committee, attach verification from your dean indicating support for the individual.

- The Graduate School provides transportation and accommodations for external committee members only.

- Do not include suggestions for faculty living abroad.

If you have a question regarding a potential conflict of interest with a potential committee member or other committee composition questions, please contact the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning for advice.

Names of Potential Internal Review Committee Members
Please identify ***eight members of the graduate faculty*** at the University of Washington who might serve as internal members of the review committee. They must be from outside the unit under review, free from conflicts of interest, and able to appreciate the unit's scholarship. Please provide a ranked list in order of preference, using the following format:

Choice #1

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #2

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #3

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #4

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #5

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #6

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #7

Check box to indicate potential committee chair:	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address:

☐ Chair	Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Choice #8

Check box to indicate potential committee chair: ☐ Chair	Name: Rank and title: Academic unit: UW box number: Office address: Phone: Email: Additional information: ☐ Check box to verify graduate faculty status

Names of Potential External Review Committee Members

Please identify ***eight individuals who might serve as external members*** of the review committee. External candidates should be experts in the unit's field; currently engaged in research, scholarship, creative work, or other activity relevant to the field; and free from conflicts of interest. Please provide a ranked list in order of preference, using the following format:

Choice #1

Name: Rank and title: Institution and Academic unit: Mailing address: Phone: Email: Faculty URL: Area of research: Additional information:

Choice #2

Name: Rank and title: Institution and Academic unit: Mailing address: Phone: Email:

Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #3

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:
Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #4

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:
Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #5

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:
Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #6

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:

Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #7

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:
Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information:

Choice #8

Name:
Rank and title:
Institution and Academic unit:
Mailing address:
Phone:
Email:
Faculty URL:
Area of research:
Additional information: