



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

**Academic Program
Review**

Updated Fall 2020

This document is a guide for departments and schools to prepare for, conduct, and respond to academic program reviews. The original report, issued in 2015 by a committee of deans and data staff, was a useful foundation for the initiation of comprehensive external academic program reviews for all departments. In 2020, a group of department heads who have used the document suggested several improvements that will clarify how to conduct these reviews.

External academic program reviews are required by the Provost. The goal of these reviews are to:

- (1) Provide an opportunity for faculty to reflect on their department holistically and to consider the future directions of the department;
- (2) Solicit feedback and advice from distinguished external colleagues regarding departmental strengths, weaknesses, and plans;
- (3) Promote discussions between a department head and a dean on both the self-study and the report of the external academic reviewers; and
- (4) Provide information to both the Graduate School and to the Provost that reflects departmental strengths and needs.

The intended audience for the Self-Study should be the external academic reviewers and the dean. The Provost and the Graduate School Dean will pay close attention to the self-study and to the report of the external reviewers; however, most issues that arise out of the report—both positive and negative—will be addressed through conversations with a dean of the unit.

This document provides guidance and an outline for the Self-Study.

1. Timeline and Goal

The Office of the Provost requires that Purdue should conduct a periodic, comprehensive Academic Program Review (APR) of each academic unit at the department, school, or college level on a major cycle of between five and eight years. Units that undergo accreditation by professional associations may need to adjust the focus and/or timing of an external APR to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. Each unit reviewed should adapt the external APR to focus on areas that will be most instructive and useful.

The goal of Academic Program Review is to gauge the general health of academic units and their alignment with and contributions to institutional goals.

“Academic units” are defined to be undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree majors/programs. The APR is conducted at the level of the academic unit and includes all undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree majors/programs offered by the unit or in which the faculty of the unit provide instruction. As noted above, external APRs should be adapted to fit individual programmatic needs. Academic unit heads should work with the dean to determine what will be included in the APR.

“Health” here is defined broadly to include both the unit’s past performance and it’s positioning for the future in all phases of the land-grant mission: teaching/learning, research, engagement in a global context, as well as the unit’s climate (work environment) and financial health. Specific objectives of the APR include:

- Providing a periodic opportunity for the unit to self-assess performance in all of its activities;
- Providing external feedback on the unit's past performance and future plans;
- Facilitating a dialogue between the unit and college leadership about the unit's current position as well as future directions, plans, aspirations, and needs; and
- Providing insight and information that is useful for improving the overall health of the unit.

This academic "health" is to be assessed through a review that includes a self-study process and resulting document, accreditation outcomes if appropriate, review by an external visiting panel, and feedback from the dean. Metrics for the self-study are proposed in section 4 of this report.

2. Indicators of Health

A succinct introduction to the character and history of the department or school should be followed by a report that gauges the health of the academic unit in six review areas:

- A. Teaching and Learning
- B. Discovery
- C. Engagement and Extension
- D. Global and National Leadership, Faculty Excellence, and External Indicators of Health
- E. Climate and Diversity
- F. Human, Physical, and Financial Resources

The Provost Office recommends that each of the review areas be treated in five pages or fewer; however, some departments may need to expand some areas. The general guidance is to manage the number of pages that external reviewers are provided.

The review is to include both quantitative and qualitative metrics. The core quantitative metrics for the academic unit will be provided by IDA+A in the form of a Common Data Set, and by the Graduate School. Departments should also contact their college data office, which can provide specialized data. The Registrar's Office and Sponsored Programs might also be data sources. Typically, a kick-off meeting is held which provides introductions to an IDA+A contact and a contact in the Graduate School.

The typical metrics to be supplied in the document are enumerated in Appendix A. The narrative, including discussion of the quantitative and qualitative metrics, will be the heart of the external APR process. Metrics can be included at appropriate points in the body of the document rather than in an appendix if that is desired.

3. Process and Document for Periodic Academic Program Review

Each academic program will be reviewed on a major cycle of between five and eight years. The process for the major cycle assessment of an academic program's general health is described in more detail below. Appendix B provides a sample timeline for the initiation and steps involved in an external APR.

Preparation of the Self-Study is the responsibility of the academic unit. This drafting is handled differently in different units; however, involvement by the faculty is encouraged. Some units create a committee to develop the Self-Study. The Self-Study typically requires extensive preparation time and must be completed on a timeline that allows the document to be vetted by the faculty, the head, and the dean.

Principle components of the recommended general health assessment are:

1. A narrative **self-study** created by the unit that includes an introduction and is organized around the six review areas. A general guide for the self-study is presented in Appendix C.
 - a. Where possible, the self-study should make use of data from IDA+A to allow consistency across units on key definitions and metrics. This should include analysis of trend data over a period of several years. It is recognized that not all metrics will be relevant for all units, and it is also recognized that units may wish to augment the metrics with indicators that are germane to that unit. Units are especially encouraged to consider “leading indicators” of health that may be specific to the unit.
 - b. Possible relevant surveys include COACHE (contact the Provost’s Office), the undergraduate and graduate Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) survey (accessed through IDA+A), Purdue’s Graduate School annual exit surveys (accessed via the Graduate School), and Gallup-Purdue indices for the department. Academic Analytics can also provide useful benchmarking information and is accessed through the office of the dean or IDA+A. The Center for Career Opportunities has exit survey/career information.
 - c. Peer benchmarking should be a component of the self-study. Peer institutions should be recommended by the department, and are to be approved by the dean. The department’s list of peer institutions should be reviewed periodically, as peer institutions may change over time. It is recognized that a discipline’s peers may not be the same as the university’s peers.
 - d. In recognition that Purdue’s academic units vary in mission and emphasis, the unit may customize the report by augmenting the topics presented.
 - e. It will be desirable for the APR to leverage accreditation/certification reviews already being conducted. For each unit, it should be determined how the APR can be an input into accreditation, how the accreditation can be an input into APR, or if the accreditation review provides sufficient insights that align with the purpose of the APR that the accreditation review can in fact serve as the APR. This will likely differ by discipline, so there may be variations in the ordering of the APR and the accreditation review, and in the timing of the APR cycle. Either ordering should be acceptable: accreditation precedes the APR and serves as input to the APR or the APR precedes accreditation and serves as input to the accreditation self-study. The APR cycle for a given unit can be adjusted to align with the accreditation cycle within a range of 5-8 years.
2. A review of the academic program by an **external visiting panel**, commissioned by the dean and resulting in a report to the dean from the review team. The review panel, which should be comprised of members from peer institutions, is to be

nominated by the academic program/department and approved by the dean. Appendix D provides a sample itinerary for the external visiting panel. Most colleges find it useful to provide the external visiting panel with a list of questions that they would like to have addressed. Appendix E provides a sample list of questions.

3. A **response** from the academic program to the dean and a subsequent response from the dean to the program.
4. A comprehensive **report to the Provost** that includes the self-study plus the external review report and related responses.
5. Based upon the comprehensive report the dean and the Provost will discuss next steps. Then, the dean and the department head will discuss next steps. Depending on the findings, the next steps may involve a specific plan developed by the Provost, dean, and head to address specific issues.
 - a. If the review surfaces problems or opportunities, the unit prepares a follow-up response. As appropriate, the Provost, dean, and head together develop a plan to address the specific issue(s). The timeframe for the plan depends on the problem, and is to be determined by the Provost and dean.
 - b. If no serious issues are raised, the next major cycle review must at a minimum include a discussion of how recommendations from the last report were addressed.

Timing: As noted above, the timing of the APR may vary based on the disciplines' accreditation cycles. The Advisory Group recommends that the timing be flexible, within the requirement that each unit conduct a review every 5-8 years. The units should be given the opportunity to recommend the timing of their APR in order to best leverage the work that goes into the two reviews.

Periodic Review of the APR Process: The Academic Program Review process should be reviewed periodically. It is the intent that the APR process be stable over a period of at least 10 years. Nonetheless, it will be important to take stock of how the processes are working over the intermediate term. It will also be important to review periodically the set of metrics used in order to allow the review processes to capture changes in the disciplinary, institutional, and higher education landscapes. The responsibility for these reviews of the process rests with the Office of the Provost, guided by input from heads and deans.

1. A decision must be made about the role of peer benchmarking in the self-study. This should be coordinated with the dean.
2. The Provost's Office will maintain a university-wide calendar for external academic program reviews.
3. The goals of a college strategic plan may provide a more specific context for review.

APPENDIX A
External Academic Program Review Metrics¹

A. Teaching/Learning

1. Credit Hour Production
 - Separated out online versus face-to-face
 - Clinical teaching broken out
 - Broken out by students in and out of the major
 - Broken out by offering department as well as by unit paying the instructor
2. Faculty teaching load by type of faculty and by type and level of course
3. Majors/Minors
4. Retention to major
5. Degree production/graduation rate
6. Time to degree
7. Placement/Post-Graduate activities – Modify as appropriate for graduate students
8. Career advising
9. Scholarly activities of graduate students
10. Gallup-Purdue / personal metrics
11. Teaching awards – departments must supplement
12. Innovative teaching practices and incentives for innovation in teaching
13. Honors
14. Cross-discipline, cross-college activities
15. Opportunities for non-majors to explore majors/programs
16. Experiential learning
17. Scholarship of teaching and learning
18. Professional development of students – teaching, grant writing, scholarly publications/presentations. Enrollment in all program levels—undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral programs—reflected over five years or the appropriate snapshot period.

B. Discovery

1. MS students/faculty
2. PhD students/faculty
3. Professional students/faculty
4. Publications
5. Citations
6. Awards for centers/grants over \$1M
7. Annual expenditures
8. Percent of faculty with external funding
9. Contract/grant expenditures per tenured/tenure track + research faculty FTE
10. Tech transfer metrics (patents, licenses, startups)
11. Collaboration, interdisciplinary activity (measured in grants/publications)
12. Recognized national leadership areas
13. New scholarly directions

C. Engagement/Extension

1. Units define/submit metrics (both measures of activity and measures of impact)
2. Scholarship of engagement
3. Interdisciplinary collaboration
4. Opportunities for external stakeholders to provide advice/perspective

D. Global and National Leadership, Faculty Excellence, and External Indicators of Health

1. Units define appropriate faculty excellence metrics (CAREER awards, fellows, academy memberships, etc.)
2. Prestigious awards, academy members
3. Respect among peers
 - faculty called on for expertise (testifying, media)
 - grant panel service
 - editorial service
 - professional society leadership
4. National and international rankings
5. Gallup-Purdue indicators
6. Accreditation/certification reviews
7. Inclusion on industry "priority school" recruiting lists
8. Ability to recruit desired undergraduate students
9. Ability to recruit desired graduate students
10. Ability to recruit desired professional students
11. Ability to recruit desired faculty
12. Enrollment trends in relation to national trends

E. Climate and Diversity

1. Gender and ethnicity for faculty, students, staff (by all categories)
2. Faculty retention broken down into retirements, leadership/administration, moves up, lateral moves, dual career moves
3. Promotion and tenure by level and demography
4. Student retention by level and demography
5. Gallup-Purdue metrics
6. Efforts to enhance climate (faculty, staff, students)
7. Efforts to enhance diversity (faculty, staff, students), including innovative practices, incentives, and outcomes regarding diversity/climate
8. Climate survey measures (COACHE, SERU, HR Engagement Survey, etc.)
9. Transparency assessment
10. Mentoring of assistant and associate professors
11. Leadership changes over time

F. Human, Physical, and Financial Resources

1. Appropriate labs, classrooms, research space
2. Adequate S&E, including life cycle replacement
3. Student to faculty ratio
4. Percentage of faculty in various categories (tenure/tenure-track, clinical, research, continuous term lecturer)
5. Staff support by category
6. Funding sources and amount for graduate students, including percent of students supported, in units of 0.5 FTE

APPENDIX B—SAMPLE TIMELINE FOR THE ENTIRE PROCESS

Departmental Academic Program Review Procedures College of Science Revised May 2019

Dean's Area Responsibilities:

- Work with department to agree on 1-2 potential dates for the review. **This needs to be done a year in advance to allow adequate time for committee and material creation.**
- Dean's assistant will send the department the current Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide.
- Once department provides list of possible reviewers, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will begin to contact the reviewers taking into consideration areas of expertise and genders so that there is a diverse committee. Associate Dean will ask one of the individuals to serve as the committee chair.
- Once committee is finalized, an official letter of invitation will be sent to each committee member from the associate dean.
- Dean's assistant will create a listing of committee members, which is sent to the department head and the College business office.
- Dean's assistant will make room reservations for the committee members at the Union Club Hotel (or other local hotel if unavailable). Confirmations will be sent to the committee members once received.
- Dean's assistant will reserve the Director's Dining Room (or appropriate location) in the PMU for the 6:00 p.m. Sunday evening dinner with the committee. Requests for dinner selection (normally sent in the e-mail with the room confirmation) will also be sent.
- Dean's assistant will schedule appointments with appropriate upper administration individuals as requested by the Provost's Office (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Associate Dean of the Grad School).
- Dean's assistant will schedule appointment with the department heads for Monday morning in MATH 942.
- Dean's assistant will schedule readout appointment for the committee with the dean, associate dean for academic affairs, vice provost, associate dean for graduate school and department head on Tuesday afternoon in MATH 942.
- Dean's assistant will get the completed agenda and self-study materials electronically from the department **one month prior to the visit** and distribute to the committee. Will also distribute the materials to all non-departmental individuals on the agenda.
- Dean's assistant will get the payee certification form to the committee members during their initial meetings. The completed form will get collected from the members at the wrap-up meeting on Tuesday.
- Once report is received from the committee, it will be sent to the department head for a response. Once both report and response are received, materials will be sent to the Provost's Office (currently Candiss Vibbert).
- Once report received, a thank you letter for their service will be sent to the reviewers by the dean.

Department's Responsibilities:

- Work with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to agree on 1-2 potential review dates.
- Create a list of suggested reviewers for the dean's consideration. In the committee make-up, please consider diversity issues.
- Once finalized by the dean's office, notify the department of the finalized review dates and share the list of reviewers.
- After receiving the information from the dean's office on meetings they schedule for the visit, create an agenda for the review. Agenda must be sent to the dean's office and chair of the committee for comments and revisions before finalizing and distributing to the department. Items to remember when crafting the agenda:
 - Department schedules and oversees all meals during the visit after the Sunday evening dinner.
 - Working time should be included for the committee to begin crafting the report. Suggested committee only working times would be Monday evening dinner (in a private room if possible at selected restaurant) and extended lunch on Tuesday. Other times appreciated by the committee if possible.
- Once the committee report is sent from the dean's office, a departmental response will be crafted and sent back to the dean's office by a requested date.

CoS Business Office Procedures:

- Items covered by the Dean's office:
 - committee members' honorarium,
 - committee members' travel expenses, and
 - dinner with Dean and Associate Dean on the evening prior to the review.
- Departments cover costs of all meals with the exclusion of the Sunday evening dinner.
- Expenses covered by the College of Science are to be charged to 3200002645.
- All receipts can either be sent electronically to the dean's assistant or via email to:
College of Science
Attn: Dean's Assistant
150 North University Street
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2067

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

**Academic Program Review
Self-Study Document**

[Insert Department Name]

[Date Submitted]

Academic Program Review

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

(note: this is not meant to be a rigid template, but should be used as a guide and adapted to the needs of each unit)

A. Teaching and Learning

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of teaching and learning at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree levels. These questions serve as guidance in this area:

1. Briefly describe your academic programs in terms of current majors/areas of focus, recent changes in majors/focus or planned changes, key initiatives relating to teaching and learning programs, key accomplishments and challenges, and any national/international trends that may be relevant for your program.
2. Using the Common Data Set as guidance, discuss enrollment, credit hour production, degree production, retention, graduation rates, teaching load of faculty (including online teaching and clinical teaching), ratio of students per faculty, and placement/post-graduate activities, both in terms of success and challenges.
3. How do the faculty in the program support student career advising and professional development at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree levels?
4. How is your unit engaged in on-line education at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels? What opportunities exist for growing on-line education and how will your unit pursue those opportunities?
5. What types of scholarly activities do your graduate students participate in? How widespread are these activities across your graduate students?
6. How does your curriculum provide opportunities for students to understand their learning in a global perspective, experience other cultures, etc.?
7. What types of experiential learning activities do your students participate in and what fraction of your students participate in them? What does your department do to reinforce the other Gallup metrics such as . . . ?
8. What types of scholarship of teaching and learning do your faculty participate in? Are there other innovative teaching practices that your faculty participate in and what types of incentives are provided by the department for faculty to do so? What teaching awards have your faculty received?
9. What types of opportunities do undergraduate non-majors have to explore your discipline?
10. How are the particular needs of transfer students addressed?
11. Please address other topics related to teaching and learning as appropriate.

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

B. Discovery

One of a unit's main missions is to conduct original research. This section of the report asks the unit to reflect on its research productivity. Academic Analytics should be used as a way to benchmark the unit with peers. These questions are a guide for this section's response:

1. Briefly describe the key areas of research focus in your unit, recent changes in focus or planned changes, key initiatives relating to research, key accomplishments and challenges, and any national/international trends that may be relevant for your program.
2. What is learned about the unit from the Academic Analytics data? How will the unit address any areas that fall below the average of peer units?
3. What prestigious awards or academy memberships have been won by your faculty?
4. Discuss your unit's annual expenditures, percentage of faculty with external funding, contract/grant expenditures per faculty FTE, and note any awards for centers/grants over \$1M.
5. To what degree is the research activity interdisciplinary? If it is interdisciplinary, please identify the other disciplines within or outside of the college.
6. To what extent is the research activity international?
7. What is the impact of the research being conducted in the unit? Comment on any patents, licenses, startups, etc. that have occurred since the last review.
8. To what degree is your unit respected amongst its peers? Comment on faculty called on for their expertise (testifying and/or media), grant panel service, editorial service, professional society leadership, etc.
9. How is your unit recognized as a national leader in targeted areas?
10. Is your unit moving in new research directions? If so, what are they and what do you think will be the impact?

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

C. Engagement and Extension

The purpose of this section is to comment on the engagement and/or extension activities of the unit. Engagement programs differ greatly across the campus in form, scope, and scale. Please comment on the following areas to provide an overview and assessment of the engagement/extension program for your unit:

1. Provide an overview of your unit's engagement program in terms of key areas of focus/stakeholders served. Describe any recent changes in focus/any planned changes in the focus of your engagement program, key engagement initiatives, key accomplishments, and challenges. Please describe any relevant national and/or international trends affecting your engagement program.
2. Describe some of your most innovative engagement programs and what makes them unique/creative. How is your unit engaged in and supporting the scholarship of engagement? Provide any relevant metrics which characterize your unit's involvement in the scholarship of engagement (publications, citations, presentations, posters, books, other creative works, etc.)
3. How does your unit assess the impact of your engagement activities? Provide any evidence supporting the impact of your engagement program.
4. How is your engagement program linked to your learning and discovery programs? Present any high impact examples of engagement programs that are explicitly linked to your discovery and learning missions.
5. How does your unit participate in and support collaborative engagement activities with partners on and off campus? Provide examples of high impact on and off campus engagement partnerships.
6. How does your unit fund engagement activities? Provide a summary of your resourcing strategy and any relevant metrics which help characterize your unit's external funding for engagement.
7. What approaches does your unit use to collect input and feedback from stakeholders? How do you insure your unit is serving stakeholder needs in your learning, discovery, and engagement programs?

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

D. Global and National Leadership, Faculty Excellence, and External Indicators of Health

The purpose of this section is to comment on how the unit and its faculty, staff, and students are viewed globally and/or nationally as leaders in the discipline. Please discuss the following topics:

1. National and international rankings
2. Accreditation or Certification reviews
3. Inclusion on industry “priority school” recruiting lists, if relevant
4. Ability to recruit desired faculty, graduate students, professional students, and undergraduate students
5. Enrollment trends in relation to national trends

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

E. Climate and Diversity

Understanding the climate and diversity within a unit is a measure of its health and vitality. These questions are a resource to guide the responses for this section of the report:

1. Discuss the breakdown by gender, race and ethnicity of faculty, staff and students within the unit. What efforts have been made to support diversity within the unit? Consider recruiting strategies, training, on-boarding approaches, and any other initiatives your unit is pursuing in support of a more diverse group of faculty, staff, and students. What barriers do you see in becoming a more diverse unit and how are you addressing these?
2. Discuss faculty P&T and retention by gender, race and ethnicity.
3. What do the most recent climate surveys (COACHE, SERU, etc.) say about your unit? What efforts have been made to support a positive climate / address issues of climate within the unit?
4. What processes are in place within the unit to mentor assistant and associate professors? New staff members?
5. Discuss student retention and graduation rates by gender, race, and ethnicity. What plans does the unit have for addressing any gaps in student success?
6. Identify any leadership changes since the last review.

Academic Program Review Self-Study Guide

F. Human, Physical and Financial Resources

Understanding the staffing, physical space and financial resources of a unit provides important insight into the health of a unit. These questions are a resource to guide the responses for this section of the report:

1. Does the unit have appropriate lab and research space?
2. Does the unit have adequate S&E funding, including life cycle replacement of computers, lab equipment, etc.?
3. Is the current student to faculty ratio at the graduate, professional, and undergraduate levels appropriate? If not, what is necessary to address this?
4. Are the percentages of faculty in various categories (TT, clinical, research, CTL, LTL, etc.) appropriate? If not, what is necessary to address this?
5. What level of staff support is available to the unit? Is staff support adequate for the scale and scope of the unit?
6. How well are startup resources aligned with the unit's needs?
7. What are the funding sources and associated amounts devoted to graduate student and professional student support?
8. Discuss trends in the unit's total budget of the unit by source (general funds, research, development, etc.).

APPENDIX D. Sample Itinerary

VCS Academic Program Review Itinerary

Wednesday, November 29, 2017

7:00pm	DINNER – Dr. Catharine Scott-Moncrieff, Department Head and Dr. Duncan Hockley, Veterinary Teaching Hospital Director
--------	--

Thursday, November 30, 2017

8:30am	Meet Dr. Scott-Moncrieff in Purdue Memorial Union Hotel lobby
9:00-9:30am	Associate Dean James Mohler, Graduate School, Lynn Hall 1192
9:30-10:00am	Small Animal Surgery, Neurology, and Ophthalmology Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
10:00-11:00am	Dean Willie Reed, Veterinary Administration, Lynn Hall 1175
11:00-11:30am	Large Animal Medicine and Surgery Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
11:30am-1:00pm	LUNCH, VCS Graduate Students and Senior Residents, Lynn Hall 1348
1:00-1:30pm	DVM Students, Lynn Hall 1192
1:30-2:00p	Ambulatory Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
2:00-3:30pm	Dr. Duncan Hockley, VTH Director (30 minute session, 1 hour tour of VTH) , Lynn Hall 1192
3:30-4:00pm	Dr. Scott-Moncrieff (review meeting with Department Head), Lynn Hall 1192
4:00-5:00pm	Reviewer Wrap-Up/Planning Session, Lynn Hall 1192
5:00pm	Jesse Mabbitt, Graduate and International Program Coordinator, transport to Purdue Memorial Union Hotel
6:00pm	DINNER, Dr. Ann Weil, Clinical Professor and Assistant Department Head, Dr. Nickie Baird, Professor, and Dr. Jean Stiles, Professor (meet Dr. Stiles in Purdue Memorial Union Hotel lobby at 5:45pm)

Friday, December 1, 2017

9:00-9:30am	Chiefs of Staff, Dr. Nickie Baird and Dr. Jean Stiles, Lynn Hall 1192
9:30-10:00am	Academic Program Review Committee, Lynn Hall 1192
10:00-10:30am	VCS Graduate Program Committee, Lynn Hall 1192
10:30-11:00am	Oncology and Radiation Oncology Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
11:00-11:30am	Small Animal Medicine and Cardiology Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
11:30am-1:00pm	LUNCH, VCS Teaching Technicians and VTH Supervising Technicians, Lynn Hall 1348
1:00-1:30pm	Vice-Provost Peter Hollenbeck, Faculty Affairs Lynn Hall 1192
1:30-2:00pm	Anesthesia, Emergency Critical Care, and Diagnostic Imaging Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
2:00-2:30pm	Community Practice, Dermatology, and Animal Behavior Faculty, Lynn Hall 1192
2:30-3:00pm	Dr. Scott-Moncrieff (Daily Wrap-up), Lynn Hall 1192
3:00-5:00pm	Reviewer Wrap-up/Planning Session, Lynn Hall 1192
5:00pm	Dr. Scott-Moncrieff transport to Purdue Memorial Union Hotel

**Sample
External Review Itinerary for Team Members
(FOR REFERENCE ONLY)**

Day One (Sunday)

3:30-4:30 p.m.	Review team arrives at Purdue
4:30-6:30 p.m.	Refresh/allow traffic delays
6:30 p.m.	Dinner with Associate Dean Wei Hong (and/or other Associate Deans), College of Liberal Arts

Day Two (Monday)

8:00-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast with Head and/or Assoc. Head; Meet in hotel lobby at 7:55 a.m.
9:15-10:00 a.m.	Meet with staff
10:10-11:00a.m.	Meet with Graduate Committee
11:10-12:00	Meet with Lecturers
12:00-1:30 p.m.	Lunch with graduate students
1:40-3:10 p.m.	Meet with tenured faculty
3:20-4:15 p.m.	Meet with tenure-track faculty
4:15 p.m.	Any other constituents
4:30-5:00 p.m.	Any other constituents/or a reception by the department
5:00 p.m.	Return to hotel
6:00 p.m.	Team dinner (provide transportation if off campus) Reservation under Department

Day Three (Tuesday)

8:00-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast; Meet in hotel lobby at 7:55 a.m.
9:20-10:15 a.m.	Any other constituents
10:15-10:45 a.m.	Meeting with Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Peter Hollenbeck (To be scheduled)
11:00-11:30 a.m.	Meeting with Associate Dean of Graduate School James Mohler (To be scheduled)
12:00-1:30	Exit Luncheon with Dean Reingold. (Reservation under the Dean's office)
1:30-4:00 p.m.	Review Team work on review report
4:00-	Depart

APPENDIX E
SAMPLE QUESTIONS/CHARGE FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Questions for External Reviewers (Sample – For Reference Only)

The following questions arose during our preparation of this self-study and outline some of the issues that we are grappling with as a department.

1. How can we enhance our visibility on and off campus to prospective undergraduate students?
2. What are the conditions under which it makes sense to develop an online masters/post-back program?
3. How can we more effectively use our existing resources?
4. What additional resources are essential to enhance our effectiveness?
5. How can we enhance our graduate program in areas of curriculum, attracting exceptional students, and enhancing racial/ethnic diversity?
6. How should we expand/modify our faculty expertise to build on our already existing strengths (bio-behavioral processes, early childhood, methodology, health, and military families)?
7. How can we be even more effective in our engagement efforts?
8. How can HDFS make the most of its relationship with Cooperative Extension?

Doran C. French, Ph.D.
Professor and Department Head
Human Development and Family Studies
Purdue University
1202 West State Street
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2020
(765)494-9511
dcfrench@purdue.edu

Sample – For Reference Only
CHARGES TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
College of Science, Purdue University

Programs: Actuarial Sciences, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Computer Science, Data Science, Earth Atmospheric & Planetary Sciences, Mathematics, Physics & Astronomy, Statistics

1. **Assess the overall quality of the Department by comparison with top programs in the nation.** What are the Department's most notable strengths and weaknesses, and challenges and opportunities? What must the Department do to strengthen? What issues are holding the Department back? What does the Department add to Purdue's ranking and reputation? How can this be enhanced?
2. **Assess the faculty in terms of national and international standing, focusing on overall quality of research and scholarly impact.** Is the intellectual climate at the level necessary to compete with top programs and do great science? Is the level of research quality and output (and grant support, if appropriate) at the level of a leading department? Are junior faculty a step up/step down from the quality of the Department as a whole? Has the Department hired wisely over the past several years? Is there sufficient strength and intellectual leadership at mid-career and more senior levels? What are the Department's sub-programmatic areas of strength? In which areas can it be globally top-tier?
3. **Assess the effectiveness of processes designed to help faculty at all career stages to be outstandingly successful.** Are there good mentoring plans, networks, and access to leadership opportunities in place? Are there ways in which these could be improved? Are start-up resources and onboarding procedures adequate? Is the career transition through tenure time well supported? Does the Department do a strong job of nominating faculty members for awards and external recognition?
4. **Assess the Department's stated strategic priorities.** Is the Department adequately oriented toward the future of its discipline(s)? Are current and future hiring plans sufficiently ambitious? Are there additional opportunities for leadership of, or participation in, multidisciplinary activities and partnerships, internally or externally? Does the Department have a compelling vision for where it wants to go, and a clear plan to get there? Are adjustments needed?
5. **Assess the climate of the Department.** Is the Department welcoming and collegial? Is the intellectual atmosphere rich? What can be done to make the Department better for faculty, staff, and students? What should the Department be doing that it is not, and vice-versa? Are the faculty search and hiring procedures working effectively to produce a highly successful, top-tier group of scientific leaders as faculty?
6. **Assess the leadership and management of the department.** Is the department being led and managed effectively overall? Are its goals sufficiently ambitious? How is the Departmental morale? Are there areas of faculty, staff or student concern that need to be explored? Do all faculty members, especially junior colleagues, feel invested in the Department's success and strongly engaged in setting the future directions and intellectual agenda of the Department?
7. **Assess the resourcing of the Department.** Is the level of internal (College/Purdue) investment in the Department appropriate for it to be able to strengthen considerably? Are budgets being used wisely? Are there efficiencies that could be achieved to free up existing monies for Departmental needs? Are there new programs/ideas/concepts that have been

successful elsewhere that should be considered at Purdue, particularly online learning either for new external audiences or to deliver service teaching? Is the Department well positioned and sufficiently agile to take advantage of current and likely future trends in public- and private-sector funding and research partnerships? Is the Department doing as much as it should/could to access industrial support and potential donors?

8. **Assess the overall quality of the graduate program.** What are the top factors that limit excellence in the program? Are the student numbers appropriate to the Department's size and ambitions? Is the length of time for the Ph.D. appropriate? Are the graduate program and its requirements appropriate? Are the graduate courses representative of the frontier of the field? Are the faculty adequately prepared to provide exceptional education and mentor graduate students for future success? Is the program well balanced within the discipline? Are the graduate students receiving the level of education and experience needed to be globally competitive today? Is the Department successful in recruiting and retaining a diverse graduate student population?
9. **Assess the undergraduate teaching of the Department.** Is the teaching of high quality and being delivered well? Are the proper courses being offered? Are the requirements for the major consistent with national expectations? Are the senior members of the faculty carrying their fair share of the lower level courses? Is the faculty teaching load consistent with the culture nationally? Are the courses and labs that are offered up to date? Are there too many courses offered? Too few? Are there courses that should not be taught, or perhaps taught less often or combined with other related courses, in order to better use teaching resources? Is the undergraduate teaching component getting its fair share of the Department's resources, both human and material? Are the undergraduates getting the education needed to succeed in industry or graduate school?
10. **Assess the infrastructure and the support staff of the Department, both quality and size.** Is the overall staff large/small for the size of the program? Is the distribution of the staff appropriate? Are there areas of support that are notably weak or absent? Areas that are excessively large?
11. **Assess the physical facilities of the Department.** Evaluate the quantity and quality of space (along with laboratory facilities and equipment, if appropriate). Is the research and office space used efficiently and effectively across the faculty?