

Academic Unit Review at Brigham Young University

Fall 2006 – Winter 2007 Version

Office of Planning and Assessment

Table of Contents

Purpose and goal	1
Nature of review	1
Rationale	1
Schedule for academic reviews.....	2
University academic review process.....	2
Self-study	4
Unit strategic plan	4
Faculty.....	4
Degree programs.....	4
Students.....	5
Assessment and evaluation	5
Facilities and resources	5
University academic review committee and unit review teams.....	5
On-site visit.....	6
Reviews with graduate programs.....	8
Internal review team report.....	8
University academic review committee meetings	9
The follow-up process.....	9
Additional information.....	9
Appendix A: Seven year schedule of academic unit reviews	10
Appendix B: Guidelines for nomination of external reviewers	11
Appendix C: University Academic Review Committee.....	15

...for it is required of the Lord, at the hand of every steward, to render an account of his stewardship, both in time and in eternity. (D&C 72:3)

I. Purpose and Goal

The purpose of academic unit review is threefold: facilitate a regular comprehensive self-study by the academic unit, facilitate college and university processes of evaluation and strategic planning, and provide information and documentation for the decennial accreditation of BYU. The goal of reviewing academic units is to encourage the use of effective assessment practices and processes relative to university, academic unit, faculty, and student performance and learning outcomes as established in BYU's mission, Aims, and institutional objectives.

II. Nature of Review

Academic unit review at BYU is a collaborative process designed to bring to bear the judgment of respected colleagues in assessing and improving the quality of academic units. Drawing on the academic unit self-study external specialists in the discipline and internal university colleagues, unit reviews encourage and establish effective assessment practices and processes across campus. This is accomplished by making connections between the unit review and strategic planning, decision-making, and resource allocation at departmental, college, and university levels. The involvement of university-level administrators ensures that meaningful and effective follow-up for each unit review will occur. Unit reviews should facilitate continuous improvement and renewal of individual units and the university.

III. Rationale

The rationale for academic unit review at BYU is based on six assumptions:

- Academic units are the heart of BYU.
- Academic unit reviews should be conducted on an integrated basis at the “department” level.
- Academic units should be accountable for their performance in contributing to BYU's mission, Aims, and institutional objectives.
- Academic units should assess their effectiveness primarily based on the achievement of faculty and students as measured by a set of reliable and valid indicators.
- Academic unit review is an integral part of university assessment and planning, the unit's self-regulatory endeavor, and an indispensable element in the continuous improvement and renewal of each unit and the university.
- Academic unit review is essential to effective strategic planning and use of resources.

IV. Schedule for Academic Reviews

Each academic unit is reviewed approximately every six to seven years. The current schedule (as of January 2006) of when each academic unit on campus will be formally reviewed is provided in Appendix A. The schedule is changed from time to time to accommodate the needs of the units being reviewed or the University. All changes are negotiated between the unit, the applicable college or school, and the Office of Planning and Assessment. Notice of these changes will be given to the head of the unit and the appropriate dean.

V. University Academic Unit Review Process

Although academic units are expected to engage in their own process of continuous assessment and improvement, it is nevertheless important to have a regular comprehensive evaluation that includes perspectives external to the unit. The review process provides an opportunity for the unit to reflect on and evaluate its plans, goals, programs, organization, personnel, procedures, and activities against best practices in the discipline as well as BYU's mission, Aims, and objectives. Academic units can then systematically evaluate their performance and level of efficiency of operation, effectiveness of endeavors, and the direction proposed for future programs and scholarly contributions.

The unit provides its own analysis in a self-study report and a subsequent on-site visit is conducted by a team made up of external specialists and members of the University Academic Review Committee (UARC). The on-site visit serves to explore and validate the unit's self-study from the perspective of qualified disciplinary experts (external specialists) and campus colleagues (UARC members); to gain first-hand observations and data from faculty, staff, and students; to promote a university-wide culture of assessment and continuous improvement; and to demonstrate evidence of the existence of that culture.

Full-time faculty members on assignment as Associates with the Office of Planning and Assessment are responsible for supervision of the review process. The following is a brief outline of the components and sequence of the review process.

1. Faculty Associates from the Office of Planning and Assessment conduct a pre-review meeting in which the entire process is outlined, expectations are set, data are made available, and names of external specialists for the on-site review and student performance evaluation are requested (see Appendix B). This meeting should take place 8-12 months prior to the date of the on-site visit.
2. The academic unit engages in the process of strategic self-study leading to the production of a self-study document.

3. The academic unit administrator submits the self-study document one month prior to the scheduled on-site visit.
4. When applicable, external reviewers evaluate graduate student culminating experiences (e.g., capstone projects, theses, dissertations, exhibits, portfolios, etc.)
5. A review team is constituted, consisting of two external disciplinary specialists and three or more BYU colleagues selected from the University Academic Review Committee.
6. The review team conducts a two-day on-site visit.
7. The external specialists submit a report of their findings.¹
8. Drawing from the unit self-study, on-site visit, and external team report the internal team members draft a report and present the report at a meeting of the University Academic Review Committee.
9. The internal report is given to the unit administrator for a check of factual accuracy.
10. A copy of the unit self-study, external team report, and internal team report are submitted to the members of the Academic Vice President's Council.
11. The chair of the internal team, accompanied by members of the Office of Planning and Assessment, presents the internal report at a meeting of the AVP Council.
12. The Assistant to the President for Planning and Assessment, accompanied by a Faculty Associate, visits the academic unit administrator to present the final internal team report and discuss issues relevant to the process of unit review. The Dean is also visited in a separate meeting and receives a copy of the internal report.
13. Members of the academic unit meet to review the final report and determine what actions they wish to propose to the Dean and Academic Vice-President.
14. The academic unit administrator presents the results of the unit proposal for action to the Dean and they collaborate on what proposals for action they want to make to the Academic Vice-President.
15. The Academic Vice-President meets with academic unit administrator and Dean for a review of the recommendations in the report, negotiation regarding what future actions should be undertaken, commitment of resources for implementation, and specification of goals and objectives that will be used in future evaluations of the implementation.
16. The Academic Vice-President generates a memorandum of understanding based on the meeting with the academic unit administrator and Dean.

¹ The external report is a limited access document. The Dean and unit administrator will be provided access to read the report, but it is not available for release into the public domain unless specific permission to do so is given by the external reviewers. The Dean or unit administrator may submit a formal request to the Office of Planning & Assessment that all or part of the external report be made public. The Office of Planning & Assessment will be responsible for negotiating the possible public release of the report with the external reviewers.

VI. Self-Study

Members of the academic unit being reviewed prepare a self-study document. Since the review fills a need for information necessary to college and university processes of evaluation and strategic planning, and provides information and documentation for the decennial accreditation of BYU, the content of every self-study is constructed around six general themes applied to every unit. While this level of thematic consistency between academic units is necessary, some latitude exists in how each academic unit constructs their self-study within those six general content areas. No two academic units share the same history or future. Therefore it is anticipated that each self-study report will have some unique dimensions according to the conditions and plans of each academic unit.

The self-study is not meant to simply describe the history and current conditions of an academic unit. More importantly, the self-study is meant to be a strategic reflection and planning experience by the faculty of an academic unit in terms of what historical decisions and issues shaped the present, and what present and future trends and needs will re-shape the unit in significant ways in the future. In other words, the self-study should document the nature and circumstances of the historical conditions and decisions (1/4 or less of the text) that situate the unit in the present. Then the unit should evaluate and elaborate what decisions and choices are involved in visioning and planning for the future of the unit (3/4 or more of the text).

In general, the strategic planning and evaluation experience by the unit faculty presented in the self-study report should account for the following issues and questions:

- a) **Unit Strategic Plan.** What is the relationship between the academic unit's strategic plan, goals, and efforts, and BYU's mission, Aims & objectives? Specifically, how do the unit's strategic plans for the future coincide with BYU's institutional mission, Aims, and objectives? In this section the unit should establish where the unit is headed in terms of what areas of impact (disciplinary trends, research strands, scholarly contributions, etc.) are seen as primary to the future of the unit.
- b) **Faculty.** Evaluate central issues in the unit dealing with faculty productivity, career cycles, collective endeavors, etc. What are the most significant contributions being made by the unit, faculty research groups, and individual faculty members? Why are those accomplishments significant, and/or of particular value to the future plans for the unit and BYU's mission, Aims, and objectives? What are the most pressing needs and challenges of the unit in terms of faculty issues? Does the unit have a document specifying performance expectations and criteria for faculty evaluation (CFS, rank advancement, annual stewardship reviews, etc.)?
- c) **Degree Programs.** What degree programs are supported by the unit? How did the current programs come to be, and what present and future issues should impact the continuation or adaptation of these programs? What are the costs (real and opportunity) of sustaining or introducing the planned programs? What

- internal shifts in faculty and staff resources are planned to support future programs?
- d) **Students.** What is the number, quality, and type (major, minor, non-major, etc.) of students serviced by the unit? What decisions and mechanisms in the past led to the current number, quality, and type of students? What future trends and needs might change composition of the unit's students? Are there adequate faculty resources to mentor the students and provide sufficient exposure to faculty members and their research? Is there a distinct and vibrant student culture in the unit?
 - e) **Assessment and Evaluation.** How does the unit assess and evaluate student performance? What is the relationship between course syllabi, student performance and outcome assessment, program objectives and expectations, unit goals, and BYU's mission, Aims, and objectives? If there are programs in the unit with specialized accreditation requirements, how do those requirements impact the ongoing assessment and evaluation efforts in the unit?
 - f) **Facilities and Resources.** Evaluate the adequacy of unit facilities and resources (including any available for joint use between units). This evaluation should include items such as research and lab equipment, staff and technical support, space and furnishings, computers and software, and library and information access.

The academic unit self-study is not meant to be a lengthy document. Most units should be able to complete their self-study in about 25 to 30 pages of narrative (excluding tables, figures, and appendices). The self-study document is, however, the foundation document of the review process. The external and internal reviewers will use the self-study document as the basis for their evaluation, and it becomes an official archival record at the university. Therefore, academic units should mold the self-study document to fit their particular circumstances and portray the reality of the functioning of the unit from a unit-centric perspective. While each unit functions within the larger context of the university, there is considerable variation between academic and disciplinary conditions. Consequently, each self-study document should be unique within the latitude created in responding to the six general themes.

VII. University Academic Review Committee and Unit Review Teams

The University Academic Review Committee is comprised of one to three faculty members from each college. Each committee member serves for a period of three years. Some of the members of the committee also serve on the Graduate Council. Appendix C contains a list of the committee membership for the academic year 2005/2006.

Committee members are nominated by their Deans and selected based on their reputation in the university community, excellent academic record, and their ability to conduct rigorous, constructive reviews. They are expected to maintain confidentiality of any sensitive unit issues that surface during the review process.

The expectation is that each member of the Academic Review Committee will serve on two academic unit reviews per year. Additionally, a few members may be asked to serve on review teams for educational support units during the year. Because of additional university citizenship responsibilities, every attempt will be made to keep those members of the committee who also serve on the Graduate Council to just one academic review per year.

Three or more members of the university committee will serve on the on-site review team with the two external reviewers. If the unit under review has a graduate component then at least one university reviewer will be a committee member who also serves on the Graduate Council. Typically committee members who also serve on the Graduate Council will only be involved in the review of units with graduate programs. Due to the number of reviews done in a given year, however, the need may occasionally arise that a member who also serves on the Graduate Council will be assigned to review a unit without graduate programs, or to review an educational support unit. Such assignments will only be made with the concurrence of the Graduate Dean.

VIII. On-site Visit

The on-site visit affords the opportunity for the internal and external reviewers to explore firsthand the personnel, students, staff, and operation of the academic unit. It is intended that the review team will meet in pairs or in small groups with most, if not all, of the members of the faculty in the unit, as well as with staff and students. The on-site visit will be scheduled at a time convenient to the unit under review and generally will cover a two-day period of time. If at all possible, all reviewers should clear their calendars during the days of the interviews to be able to focus their attention on the review with which they are assigned.

One month prior to the on-site visit personnel from the Office of Planning and Assessment will meet with the unit administrator to discuss the schedule for the on-site visit. The unit administrative assistant will work closely with personnel from the Office of Planning and Assessment to draft and finalize the two-day interview schedule. This schedule should be completed within one week following the meeting. The following issues should be addressed as the interviewing schedule is being drafted:

- What unit administrative personnel should meet with the reviewers? (i.e., unit administrator, associate administrator, graduate coordinator, undergraduate coordinator, “area” leaders and/or groups, administrative assistant, etc.)
- Are there logical subsets of the faculty that should be interviewed in small groups?
- Can a time be included for individual faculty members to meet with the reviewers?
- What student groups should meet with the review team?
- Are there particular areas in which the unit can demonstrate excellence in programs or performance?

- Are there particular concerns or issues that should be addressed during the review?
- Are there issues that were identified in a prior review that need to be addressed?
- Are there outside entities (stakeholders) that the review team should be interviewing? (i.e., significant employers of graduates, other campus units involved in the programs, etc.)

Following are typical components in an on-site visit schedule:

- Assistant to the President for Planning and Assessment (30 min.)
- Academic Vice-President (30 min., external reviewers only)
- Unit Administrator (30-45 min.)
- Associate administrators(s), graduate coordinator (30 min.)
- Dean (30 min.)
- Dean of Graduate Studies (30 min.)
- Faculty (individuals in units of ≤ 10 , program/theme groups)
- Staff (30 min.)
- Other personnel integrally related to the unit (30 min.)
- Students - undergraduate and graduate groupings (60 min.)
- Tour of facilities and resources (30 min.)
- Off-campus constituents

During the on-site visit, care should be given by the reviewers to the following considerations:

1. Individual and group interviews should be conducted with at least two team members present.
2. Reasonable accounting should be made for potential personal bias either on the part of the reviewers or those being interviewed.
3. Appropriate and proportional credence to minority opinions within the unit should be given without presenting those opinions as majority concerns.
4. Accuracy of the comments made by faculty members within the unit should be verified before including them in the written report.
5. Adequate attention should be given to both the undergraduate and graduate programs, where applicable.
6. All significant stakeholders should be given the opportunity to be heard.

In the weeks leading up to the on-site visit, members of the internal review team should carefully read the unit self-study, reports from prior reviews, and meet together to strategize regarding interview questions and other data gathering methods. Assignments should be made for the on-site visit regarding interviews, meetings, and data gathering. Strategies for writing the internal report should also be decided at this time.

IX. Reviews with Graduate Programs

Reviews of academic units include review of graduate programs, when the unit has any. Because of the emphasis on undergraduate education at BYU, graduate programs are sometimes overlooked or under-emphasized in the review process and report. Reviewers need to take special care to consider the graduate programs. The following questions, drawn from the Graduate Council pamphlet entitled *Principles and Characteristics of Graduate Education*, provide useful guidelines for the review of graduate programs. (Please refer to the pamphlet for additional detail.)

1. Does the program have a clear definition of purpose in line with the University mission and the mission of the unit? Is this purpose evident in both the planned programs and the theoretical orientation of the program?
2. Are there sufficient numbers of qualified graduate faculty who mentor students effectively? Are faculty members productive scholars with research/creative programs into which they can incorporate graduate students?
3. Are the academic standards within the unit high as evidenced by admissions standards and practices; curriculum and coursework; student dissertations, theses, and projects; and comprehensive and oral examinations? Are the curriculum and program requirements appropriate, current, and clearly graduate-level?
4. Are procedures for program governance and advisement of students well defined, clearly articulated, and helpful? Is student progress monitored so that students complete their degrees in a timely fashion?
5. Are there sufficient resources to support the graduate program? Consider resources including faculty expertise, faculty availability, research support, student funding, library resources, outside funding, and space.

In addition to assessing these characteristics, it is important to include supporting information such as the numbers and characteristics of graduate students, graduation rate, time to completion, and placement after graduation. Other sources of data include external reviews of student work, student surveys and interviews, faculty interviews, unit records, etc.

X. Internal Review Team Report

Following the on-site visit, the chair of the internal review team should make sure everyone understands the writing assignments and plan for a draft to be completed within two weeks of receiving the report from the external reviewers. The internal team report should account for the substantial issues from both the unit self-study and external reviewer's report, but also include unique evaluative material. Also, careful accounting for issues raised by a previous review should be addressed in this final report. Written reports normally consist of fifteen to twenty pages.

The internal report should include a one page executive summary indicating the strengths, challenges and issues, and recommendations reflected in the body of the internal report. The internal report should include evaluative material for each of the five sections of the academic unit's self-study, and conclude with a section enumerating the internal team's summary and recommendations.

XI. University Academic Review Committee Meetings

University Academic Review Committee meetings are a key part of the review process. It is important that each member of the committee prepare well by reading the entire report(s) scheduled for discussion. The meeting should be conducted in a way that committee members will feel the importance of contributing to a rigorous, constructive dialogue with the understanding that confidentiality of all comments will be maintained. The internal review team members, led by the chair, should prepare a presentation for the meeting that will stimulate and focus this critical discussion.

XII. The Follow-up Process

Within two weeks of presenting the report in the Academic Review Committee meeting, the report should be finalized and submitted to the Faculty Associate, who will then schedule a time for the report to be presented in a future meeting of the AVP Council. Prior to meeting with the AVP Council copies of the unit self-study, external unit reviewers' report, external reviewers' report on graduate student culminating experiences, and internal team members' report will be delivered to the members of the AVP Council.

Following the meeting with the AVP Council the Office of Planning and Assessment will meet with the unit administrator to present the final internal report and discuss the unit review process. A separate meeting will be scheduled with the dean.

In subsequent weeks, the Academic Vice President, Dean, and unit chair will conduct follow-up meetings to respond to the recommendations of the review process. These meetings will provide a discussion for strategic and resource planning for the unit.

XIII. Additional Information

For the information of the members of the Academic Review Committee, Appendices E and F contain instructions for the unit administrative personnel regarding the Self-Study and external reviewer requests, respectively.

Appendix A

Seven-year Schedule of Academic Unit Reviews

BYU Office of Planning & Assessment

Gerrit Gong, Assistant to the President

Steven Hite, Planning & Assessment Associate

Fall 2005	Winter 2006
French & Italian (98-99)	Geography (98-99)
Physics & Astronomy (98-99)	Statistics (98-99)
School of Social Work	Nursing (99-00)
Home & Family Living	Health Science (99-00)
	Microbiology & Molecular Biology (99-00)
Fall 2006	Winter 2007
Linguistics & English Language (98-99)	Educational Leadership & Foundations (98-99)
Philosophy (99-00)	Theatre & Media Arts (99-00)
Teacher Education (99-00)	Anthropology (00-01)
Economics (99-00)	Asian & Near Eastern Studies (00-01)
	School of Technology (99-00)
Fall 2007	Winter 2008
Audiology & Speech Language Pathology (00-01)	Exercise Sciences (00-01)
Counseling Psychology & Special Education (00-01)	Accountancy (01-02)
Dance (00-01)	Information Systems (01-02)
Nutrition, Dietetics, & Food Science (00-01)	Geology (01-02)
Visual Arts (99-00; F 04)	
Fall 2008	Winter 2009
Political Science (00-01)	Organizational Leadership & Strategy (01-02)
Business Management (01-02)	Public Management (01-02)
Ancient Scripture (01-02)	English (02-03)
Humanities, Classics, & Comparative Literature (01-02)	History (02-03)
Psychology (01-02)	
Fall 2009	Winter 2010
Chemical Engineering (02-03)	Communications (02-03)
Civil & Environmental Engineering (02-03)	Instructional Psychology & Technology (02-03)
Mechanical Engineering (02-03)	Recreation Management & Youth Leadership (02-03)
Electrical & Computer Engineering (02-03)	Sociology (02-03)
Church History and Doctrine (02-03)	
Fall 2010	Winter 2011
Computer Science (97-98; F 03)	Physiology & Developmental Biology (W 04)
Germanic & Slavic Languages (97-98; F 03)	Biology program (W 04)
Mathematics (F 03)	Marriage & Family Therapy (W 04)
Mathematics Education (F 03)	Spanish & Portuguese (F 03)
Fall 2011	Winter 2012
Integrative Biology (W 05)	Plant & Animal Sciences (W 05)
Chemistry and Biochemistry (F 04)	Marriage, Family & Human Development (W 05)
School of Music (98-99; F 04)	Law School (W 05)

Appendix B

Guidelines for nomination of candidates for external reviewers

A vital component of reviewing academic units is the proposal and selection of external reviewers. The informed perspective of highly qualified professionals regarding the functioning, accomplishments, and goals of academic units is critical in providing informed feedback in affirming significant unit, faculty, and student accomplishments, and in suggesting the best plans and priorities for future action. The university views the selection of reviewers who are acknowledged leaders in their disciplines as an indispensable part of the overall strategy of continuous unit and university renewal and improvement.

No later than two weeks following the orientation of the unit administrator the names of at least six candidates for the external review of the unit should be submitted to the office of Planning and Assessment. For each candidate the unit must provide a description of the following details:

- The specific aspects of the candidate's professional qualifications that best suit them to serve as an external reviewer for the unit.
- The nature of relationships (e.g. co-authored publications and/or professional presentations, joint research or grant endeavors, etc.) between the candidate and faculty in the unit.
- The nature of past and/or current connections between the candidate and BYU.

In nominating candidates the unit should consider the following general guidelines. Individuals conforming to the following criteria have provided the most insightful reviews in the past.

- For university faculty:
 - a) Tenure and the rank of associate or full professor at a respected university.
 - b) A consequential scholarly record disseminated in peer-reviewed forums acknowledged as prestigious, according to the normative standards of the discipline.
 - c) Significant experience in undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring and teaching, consistent with the relative focus in the units' programs.
 - d) Prior experience as an external reviewer.
- For professionals from other institutions:
 - a) Significant length of service at a nationally-acknowledged institution and positional standing equivalent to a tenured associate or full professor.
 - b) A consequential scholarly/research/creative record disseminated in peer-reviewed or other significant forums acknowledged as prestigious, according to the normative standards of the discipline.
 - c) Acknowledged experience in the educational aspects of the discipline.
 - d) Prior experience as an external reviewer.

In addition to the nomination of external reviewers for the units, those with graduate programs that require theses, dissertations, projects, performances, or other culminating experiences must nominate six additional candidates. External review of the various culminating graduate student experiences, apart from the review of the unit itself, can provide very helpful information for improving the quality of the education and preparation of graduate students. For this review to be useful, however, the candidates must have the credentials and experience to provide an expert review.

Some candidates might appropriately serve as either unit or culminating experience reviewers. A matrix should be provided by the recommending unit that specifies which review function each of the 12 candidates are qualified to perform. In any case, 12 names must be submitted, and at least six must be viable candidates for each of the two review functions. Experience has shown that candidates with that meet the following criteria have provided the best reviews in the past.

- Graduate Faculty Status at a respected university.
- A consequential research/creative program disseminated in prestigious peer-reviewed forums, according to the normative standards of the discipline.
- Significant experience in graduate education and with advising in the type of culminating experience(s) to be reviewed.
- Expertise and experience in the areas in which our students are writing. (If the unit has several graduate programs or emphases where the theses/dissertations are diverse it may be necessary to have more than one thesis reviewer for the unit.)

Finally, for the purpose of reviewing units, as well as students' culminating work, it has proven most useful in the past to choose individuals who represent the discipline but have limited personal connections to BYU. Unless a reasonable rationale is presented, it is best to avoid nominating reviewers who have been:

- Faculty members of BYU.
- Students (undergraduate or graduate) of BYU.
- Visiting faculty, visiting scholars, or guests of BYU.
- Dissertation advisors or committee members of BYU faculty.
- Research collaborators or personal friends of BYU faculty.

An example of the description of a candidate, and of a matrix of 12 nominees, has been provided for illustrative purposes. If there are any questions on aspects of nominating candidates for unit and student culminating experience review, please contact the office of Planning and Assessment immediately.

Nomination for an external reviewer for
The Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

We would like to submit the name of Dr. Renaldo Shupe² as an external reviewer for our upcoming unit review in fall semester of 2005. Since our department has several graduate programs with diverse emphases, we nominate Dr. Shupe to review our master's program in Comparative and International Development Education (CIDE). Below we briefly provide the rationale for his nomination. Contact data and more complete information regarding his professional qualifications can be drawn from reviewing his CV, which we have attached to this document.

Professional qualifications to serve as an external reviewer.

Dr. Shupe has been: academic unit head at four institutions - University of Illinois, University of Washington, The Ohio State University, and Florida State University; visiting professor at universities in Asia (3), and one in the Middle East; consultant and academic specialist multiple times for the USAID, World Bank, and UNESCO; promotion and tenure external evaluator for 14 universities in the U.S.A., and four international universities; editor of the top international journal in comparative and international education for over ten years, section and guest editor of 3 peer-reviewed journals; president of two international professional societies.

The nature of relationships between the candidate and faculty in the unit.

We do not believe that there are any significant complicating relationships between the candidate and any of our past or present faculty members. Dr. Shupe has served several times as a moderator or respondent to the conference papers of several of our faculty, but has never co-presented or co-authored any papers, articles, etc., with past or present professors in our unit.

The nature of past and/or current connections between the candidate and BYU.

To our knowledge Dr. Shupe's connection to BYU is limited entirely to his attendance a few years ago at a regional meeting sponsored by our department of the professional society to which he and a number of our faculty belong. Of course, the faculty members that belong to this same professional organization have occasionally interacted with Dr. Shupe in social settings associated with professional conferences. Given the success and increasing prominence of our own professors in essential professional organizations and settings this level of acquaintance would also be true of almost every prominent, viable candidate in our discipline.

² While the professional background and CV of an actual person was used to develop this example, this is a pseudonym, and the all names of universities, journals, etc., have been substituted for alternates of comparable stature.

Summary.

We feel very good about nominating Dr. Renaldo Shupe as one of our candidates. As you will see in the accompanying matrix, we also rank him as the first in priority among those that we would like to invite as external reviewers for this program. We feel that not only can he provide vital information concerning the progress we are making with our CIDE program, but we could benefit greatly in the future from having such a professionally prominent leader in our field familiar with our efforts. He represents a potentially important professional ally in helping our program gain in quality and prominence, and in aiding our students to enter prestigious advanced degree programs globally.

Candidates ³ for external reviewer for The Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations				
Candidate	Unit Review	Rank order	Culminating graduate experience review	Rank order
Renaldo Shupe	Yes	1	Yes	7
Barbara Walker	Yes	2		
Janet Bryson	Yes	3		
Robert W. Slowinsky	Yes	4	Yes	8
Donald Stanford	Yes	5		
Amara Ampadus	Yes	6		
Ulrich Atchoarena			Yes	1
Manley Begay	Yes	7	Yes	2
Stephania Sturzkova	Yes	9	Yes	3
Rachel Muirfield			Yes	4
Jonathan Dunford			Yes	5
Claudia Taylor	Yes	8	Yes	6

³ Only pseudonyms have been used in this example matrix.

Appendix C
University Academic Review Committee (UARC)

College or School	Reviewers
Biology and Agriculture	William McCleary* Jack Sites
Business School	Gary Cornia* Mike Pinegar
Education	Christopher Dromey* David Williams
Engineering and Technology	Steve Benzley Wynn Stirling*
Family, Home, and Social Sciences	Ralph Brown* Marie Cornwall
Fine Arts and Communications	Larrie Gale Steven Thomsen*
Health and Human Performance	Cathy Black Barbara Lockhart Ray Merrill*
Humanities	Kristine Hansen* Mark Peterson Jim Toronto
Law School	Kif Augustine-Adams
Nursing	Elaine Bond* Barbara Mandleco
Physical and Mathematical Sciences	Wayne Barrett Scott Grimshaw Justin Peatross*
Religious Education	Susan Black
*Also a member of the Graduate Council	