I. Purpose of External Program Reviews

The purpose of external reviews is systematically to periodically assess the contributions that specified academic units make to research and teaching, at all levels (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) of all academic programs within the University. The committee and governance structures evaluate the academic units' roles and provide recommendations to the University administration strategies for enhancing the program effectiveness of these programs, with explicit attention to opportunities for improvement within the context of current resource constraints.

II. Authority to Conduct Reviews

Reviews are typically implemented through the office of the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School for Academic Affairs, under authority delegated by the Provost, with the assistance of the relevant school Deans for all programs, and the Dean of the Graduate School for units that have graduate degree programs. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs may delegate the Graduate School normally serves as the Coordinator of all: coordinating reviews, inviting the external team, letters; inviting and liaising with the Review Team; scheduling the events of the site visit; overseeing the preparation and distribution of materials; keeping the involvement of university committees in the review process on track; keeping records of previous reviews; and archiving of all necessary documents. Maintaining engagement with units between reviews to provide support and accountability in addressing past review recommendations.

III. Periodicity of External Reviews

Reviews of departments and similar units are typically conducted on a regular cycle of approximately seven years, although decisions about when to schedule particular reviews are made by the Provost, the Dean of the relevant school, and the Vice Provost for...
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Academic Affairs, and, where appropriate, the Dean of the Graduate School. Faculty members from the Provost’s Academic Programs Committee and the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty and other School councils, where appropriate, may also suggest call for the review of a given program should be reviewed. The Within the School of Medicine, the Basic Sciences Faculty Steering Committee will represent the faculty council of the School of Medicine may offer such suggestions about departments in that division.

IV. Procedures for External Reviews

1. **Charge:**
The charge to the External Review Team is developed by the Associate Dean Vice Provost for Academic Affairs of the Graduate School, in consultation with the Provost, the Vice Provost/Dean of the program’s home school, and the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the school, or Director of the institute in which the program to be reviewed is situated. Members of where appropriate. The Provost may also consult the Academic Programs Committee and the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, and other school councils, where appropriate, may also be consulted concerning the charge. Normally, the charge will seek to address all internal aspects of a given program, as well as its interrelations with other units of the institution, its contributions to university priorities, and its general position among competitive academic research universities.

2. **External Letters**
The Review Team will receive three confidential letters from external scholars who are prominent in the relevant area, at least one of whom should have significant administrative experience. These letter-writers will be asked to reflect on the success of the unit in research universities.

2. **External Review Team**
In forming the External Review Team, the Associate Dean Vice Provost for Academic Affairs or (or delegate), with teaching, mentoring, and where appropriate, community/public engagement and other forms of scholarship and service, based on the written self-study (explained below, and which they will receive well in advance of the deadline for their letters), their appraisal of the unit’s external reputation with regard to the quality of faculty research output and instruction, and their knowledge of wider intellectual and pedagogical trends. In selecting letter-writers, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs or (or delegate) may solicit nominations from the department or program to be reviewed, develop a separate list of prospective reviewers, frequently soliciting advice from members of the school’s senior leadership, and present a potential team to the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of the relevant school. These individuals will engage with decanal and provostial leadership, and present a potential team to the Vice Provost/Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of the relevant school. These individuals will approve the final team. The Chancellor as appropriate. The Executive Vice President for Health Affairs may, if needed, also be consulted on letter-writers for reviews of Basic Medical Science departments. These letters will not be shared with the department but will be shared with the Review Team and university leadership (see below).
3. Review Team

The Review Team will consist of two to three external scholars and one Duke scholar from a unit distinct from that being reviewed. At least one of the external reviewers should have significant administrative experience, such as service as a department chair or dean. In forming the Team, the Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies Academic Affairs (or delegate) will engage with decanal and provostial leadership as appropriate. The Executive Vice President for Health Affairs may, if needed, also be consulted on external teams for reviews of interdisciplinary programs, Basic Medical Science departments.

Review teams generally consist of 3-5 external reviewers, with one designated member of the Review Team will be named as Chair by the review team. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Associate Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, (or delegate), the Chair will assume responsibility for the final version of the Team's written report. The Team as a whole, however, will be provided with time during its site visit to compose jointly an outline or first draft of that report. The Chair will also speak for the Review Team during the site visit.

3. External Review Team Visit Procedures:

Approximately two weeks prior to the site visit, the External Review Team will be sent electronically a set of confidential materials furnished jointly by the Office of Academic Affairs and the department under review and the Graduate School. These materials will include: the formal charge; a detailed site visit schedule; a cover letter from the department chair or program director; and a “self-study” document (see described in detail below) which includes, and the program’s most recent five year plan, descriptive and statistical information on the department’s academic programs, two-page faculty vitae, and other materials—confidential external letters. Any external letters received later will be provided to the Review Team as they are received, through the date of starting the formal review.

Graduate students of the unit under review will be invited to meet with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the Graduate School prior to the review and will be invited to prepare a confidential consensus or survey document for the review team about the department, which may be based on a survey of graduate students in the unit. This graduate student report is not shared with unit faculty until the external review report has been submitted but will be shared with the Review Team.

Typically, the External Review Team will arrive in time for dinner the evening preceding the in-person site visit. At that meeting, the Provost, the Vice Provost, Dean, and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Dean of the Graduate School, together with the Dean(s) of the relevant school(s) (and the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs in the case of Basic Science departments), or appropriate designees thereof, will discuss with the Team the plan for the visit, the critical questions to be answered from the perspective of senior university leadership, and the plan for the written report. There will be time for each
visitor to pose particular questions to the central administration; and the administrators, in turn, should provide whatever historical or institutional background the Team may need to conduct a thorough investigation/examination of the program in question.

Over the next two days, in-person site-visit, the review team will meet with groups of faculty, (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track), undergraduate and graduate students, staff, and departmental administrators of, as well as other faculty and administrators with important perspective on the unit’s role within the wider university. The associated Dean’s office can provide more specific guidance to the department. The reviewers will, on selection of the above. A set of meeting slots should also be reserved for confidential 1:1 meetings with key unit stakeholders from outside the department, such as secondary faculty, chairs of collaborating departments, institute directors, etc. Review visits of individual programs sponsored by a larger academic unit, such as a master’s degree program, may be a single full day unless the program or administration requires a full two-day review who request them.

Prior to the Exit Interview with the senior administrators indicated above, the review team will be given ample time, few hours to draft the initial version of its report, including key findings and recommendations. The major findings and recommendations of that report will then be delivered orally to the administration at the Exit Interview. The Associate Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (or delegate) will take full notes of this meeting, which will remain confidential to the administration.

4. External Team Written Report.

The final written report should be submitted electronically to the Associate Dean, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (or delegate) within approximately one month of the site visit. The report should be public in nature, rewritten with the expectation that it will be circulated to the full department faculty. If the review team wishes to provide a more private document, additional confidential analysis to the administration, that communication should be appended as a codicil, confidential appendix to the public report.

5. Departmental/Program Response to the External Team Written Report: Review reports are circulated via the program director or chair. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (or delegate) circulates the Team’s report to all faculty members in the program or department, and the unit is asked to provide the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with a written response to that report, addressing each point raised in the team’s report. This must be written in consultation with the voting faculty of the department or program under review, as documented by indicating which faculty members were involved, with evidence of faculty endorsement (e.g., co-authorship or
6. Institutional Response to the External Review: The external review team’s

The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (or delegate) will forward the Review Team’s report, along with the departmental response, will then be forwarded sequentially to the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty, the Academic Programs Committee, and, when appropriate, other School councils. These committees will prepare written resolutions on the review detailing their recommendations for subsequent departmental or institutional action. The resolutions will be provided to the chair/head of the unit under review and forwarded to the Provost and the relevant Deans. The Dean or institute director will discuss the review report, departmental response, committee resolutions, and other documentation with the chair/head of the unit reviewed, addressing implications for the immediate future of this unit together with expectations that the administration has for the department/program (in the case of ECGF, focusing solely on issues related to graduate education), which the Provost will forward to the department or program in question, along with any additional context or commentary. Any committee charged with assessment of the review must ensure that it organizes its work to ensure a timely completion of the review process.

Academic Programs Committee
(http://www.provost.duke.edu/committees/index.html)

Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty
(http://gradschool.duke.edu/academics/ecgf/index.php)

• Academic Programs Committee
• Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty (ECGF)

7. Mid-Cycle Check-in

At roughly the mid-point of the review cycle, and within five years of the last external review, the Provost’s office will convene a check-in meeting of the department or program leadership, along with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the relevant school, the Dean of Historical Archives, The Graduate School (if the unit has graduate degree programs), and other leaders as appropriate. The Provost’s office will ask for a brief memorandum in advance, outlining the state of efforts to implement the
recommendations of the most recent review, and may consult members of the Provost’s leadership team or other appropriate stakeholders for input before the mid-cycle check in.

8. Historical Archives
The Provost’s Office of Academic Affairs will maintain complete files on all external program reviews, including self-study documents, the external report and the department/program’s response, the recommendations of the various faculty committees, and the final Memorandum of Understanding. Provost’s communication of recommendations to the reviewed unit. Individual units will also maintain copies of final versions of all materials that the unit submitted or received at least until the conclusion of a subsequent review.

MATERIALS TO BE FURNISHED FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS

V. Materials to Be Furnished for Program Reviews
The unit chair will provide safe and confidential opportunities for all stakeholders to contribute to the self-study during its preparation. The following materials constitute the self-study for the external review. Preparation. The Office of Academic Affairs will ensure that the reviewed unit receives key statistical components for the self-study, as specified below, if possible the semester before the self-study is to be submitted. Departments may also request additional specific data, with a minimum of one-month’s notice (the respective offices will do their best to accommodate). Collation of all materials, preparation of other components, and timely delivery of the full self-study, is the responsibility of the department chair or program director, though he or she would be wise to unit head, who should recruit additional faculty as well as staff to assist in its preparation. All faculty in the department or program should also be consulted in the process of preparing the self-study. The document is due as a single PDF to the Associate Dean of the Graduate School/Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (or delegate) no less than one month/two months before the scheduled review date. Alphabetized Faculty CVs may be included together as a single separate PDF. All PDF documents should have bookmarks to demarcate individual items and sections.
I. DEPARTMENT/ PROGRAM MATERIALS

Information

1. Departmental Materials
   1. Chair’s cover letter to review team, which should highlight significant issues for reviewers’ exploration and include a brief description of how faculty provided input into the overall self-study.
   2. Description of the department’s vision and mission
   3. Statement on the intellectual life of department
   4. Department’s most recent long-term strategic plan or other planning document
   5. Description of the unit’s intellectual and workplace climate, including efforts to address issues around equity, diversity, and inclusion

provided by the Provost’s Office and shared with Department/ Program

1. Most recent previous review and review response documents
2. List of all departmental faculty, by area of specialization, separated by rank and track, along with demographic breakdown of faculty, both overall and separated by rank and track
3. Research funding by area of specialization
4. Laboratory and computer facilities
5. Graphs of total and direct-cost external research funding for the unit in last 5 years, as well as total value associated with submitted grant applications
6. Compendium of courses taught in last 5 years, along with overall course enrollments (departments may request Tableau access for more granular analyses if they so choose)
7. Inventory of office, teaching, and laboratory space
8. Tabulation of Departmental administrative staff composition and retention rate over last 5 years
9. Data on faculty participation in signature university programs

Information provided by the Department/ Program

1. Chair’s cover letter to review team. This letter should also include the chair’s assessment of the department’s national standing, defined as they see fit, as well as a brief description of how unit faculty participated in the preparation of the self-study.
2. Statement of the department’s vision and mission (one page, if not already subsumed in item #3 below).
3. Department’s most recent strategic plan, or summary thereof (not to exceed five pages)
4. Narrative highlighting especially successful broad scholarly areas or research collaborations (e.g., humanities labs, cross-school centers, etc.) and describing nature of direct support for faculty scholarship (e.g., standard yearly allocations for faculty discretionary accounts, types of external funds typically available) (one page).

5. Categorization of faculty by area of scholarship or teaching load in department, as defined by the department.

6. Description of the most important collaborations across departmental lines.

7. List of collaborative degree programs that span departmental lines, if relevant.

8. Overview of the most significant recent evidence-informed DEI efforts, noting when implemented. Possible topics include hiring practices, graduate student recruitment practices, climate and culture initiatives, inclusive faculty and student mentoring practices (if not already covered in next section and in III.2.), efforts to make classes more inclusive, etc. (not to exceed three pages).

9. Present administrative structure of department:
   - Numbers, titles and Organizational chart, including starting dates for faculty supervisors/leadership
   - Table including committees within department and committee leadership assignments over last three years

10. Record of all postdoctoral fellows major university-level and any other non-student research trainees national/international service undertaken by unit faculty (such as major university committee chairs, society presidencies, senior editorships, national committees; limited to 2 pages; use of tables and bullets encouraged).
   - Description of how postdoctoral fellows and other non-student research trainees are integrated into the departmental community.
   - Professional development activities or other support provided for postdoctoral fellows and other non-student research trainees.

11. 5-10 bullets that convey key aspects of the intellectual life and community-building elements of the unit. Suggested items may include departmental seminars/workshops, opportunities for scholarly interaction such as book or journal clubs, social events, etc.

12. Statement (or series of bullets) on significant community and public engagement by the department faculty, staff, and trainees (one page).

13. OPTIONAL: A narrative statement with any data or context not covered in the above documents that the department wishes to convey, not to exceed four pages.
II. Faculty Materials

FACULTY MATERIALS

1. Short vitae for each member of the primary faculty (either updated 2-page vita, or first page of Scholars@Duke profile)

1. Description of Two-page vitae for each member of the faculty, including short description of current research interests, recent honors, recent scholarly works appropriate to the field (e.g., publications, performances, exhibitions, etc.) and major external research support. The Provost’s Office will export these vitae for all department faculty from Scholars@Duke, unless departments specify, within one month of learning about the timing for the review process, that they prefer to generate their own two-page vitae using their own resources.

2. List of faculty members hired in the last five years.

III. Each member’s current research interest, limited to 250 words

External research support

GRADUATE MATERIALS

Information provided by The Graduate School and shared with department

1. Graphical data for each degree program for the past five years (with master’s and PhD data provided separately):
   - number of students in the program
   - number of applications
   - number of admits
   - number of matriculants
   - breakdowns by demographic categories

2. Time-to-degree and attrition statistics, with contextual averages for all programs in that division of knowledge, as defined by the Graduate School

3. Number of master’s and Ph.D.’s awarded per year over last 5 years

4. List of dissertations supervised

5. Current teaching load/schedule

6. Major service over the last five years (including roles and enrollments in the department, university, and/or research field)

III. Graduate Materials

4. For each graduate degree sponsored by the department or unit under review, The Graduate School will provide a statistical overview, consisting of:
   - Level courses over last 5 years
   - Application and admissions data over each year
   - Involvement of the past five years, including a demographic breakdown of applicants, admitted students, and new matriculants
   - Demographic analysis of the enrolled graduate student cohort over each of the past five years
   - Pattern of graduate student financial support over the past five years, including the balance between internal fellowships and external fellowships
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- Five-year data on attrition, time-to-degree, and annual # of degree recipients
- Five-year data, where applicable, about graduate student participation students in TGS teaching certificate, Preparing Future Faculty program, Leadership Academy, and Duke Doctoral Academy
- Trends in career outcomes for degree recipients, split out into cohorts who received their degrees 11-15 years previously, 6-10 years previously, and 1-5 years previously. This information should reflect the categories of career outcomes maintained on TGS’s website, including the major employment sectors of graduates; for those with faculty positions, it should distinguish, tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track, and also mentoring undergraduates (including common research universities from teaching intensive institutions).

The Department (projects or other unit) will be responsible for preparing and including:

1. Statement of intellectual mission for the graduate program
2. Description of the graduate curriculum, including an overview of all courses and requirements, relation of the curriculum to important disciplinary or interdisciplinary trends, and any-learning experiences), fostering vertical integration with offerings from other Duke programs; indication of how the curriculum fosters the unit’s mission for graduate education; and discussion of how curriculum relates to any statement of best practices in graduate education from relevant scholarly societies (one page)
3. Description of opportunities for Teaching Assistant/Research Assistant/Project Management positions, and patterns of assignment
4. Description of approach to advising/mentoring (training for DGS and DGSA; training for new faculty; creation of other roles, such as faculty career adviser, ombuds, etc.; and any formal structure of peer mentoring)
5. Statement of expectations/responsibilities Graduate student experience survey results
6. Overview of data about “first placement” career outcomes for master’s and PhD students over past 5 and 10 years
7. Participation in signature university-wide programs within or outside The Graduate School
8. Overview of exit survey data and alumni survey data for degree recipients

INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM

1. Description of graduate program Items to cover include a brief overview of mission and expected career trajectories, requirements, brief description of any major revisions to the graduate program in the last five years, and overview of the role of graduate students in departmental/program governance (no more than 2 pages)
2. Statement of faculty mentoring expectations and brief overview of efforts to ensure excellent mentoring of graduate students. Departments are encouraged to use existing documents for this section, if available (no more than two pages)
3. Approximate fractions of students whose funding in a typical year is tied to key aspects of training, such as teaching assistantships, research assistantships, or external fellowships, and one paragraph on how the unit assigns teaching assistantships, if applicable.
4. One page (or series of bullets) describing TA training, expectations, and evaluation, if applicable.

5. Reflection on unit strategy for faculty advisers and Ph.D. or master’s students

6. Assessment of climate related to diversity and inclusion

7. Descriptions of mechanisms to receive student input/learn about student concerns (e.g., annual reporting, annual meeting with DGS, if relevant; confidential communication channel to unit head; exit interviews); and assess student progress

8. Overview of the most important departmental (or unit) opportunities for career and professional development, along with a sketch of the most important communities elsewhere at Duke for unit graduate students

9. Overview of most important professional activities undertaken by graduate students, along with lists of major external grants and fellowships, and external or university-wide prizes/awards, over the past three years

10. Overview of the extent to which your graduate students take advantage of university-wide opportunities such as certificates, external internships, DukeEngage service learning projects, Bass Connections research teams, and interdisciplinary doctoral cohorts hosted by university institutes and initiatives

11. Explanation of major reasons for attrition and analysis of time to degree statistics for each graduate degree program

12. Description of type and frequency of interactions with departmental (or unit) graduate alumni (e.g., regular newsletter; updating alum information; practice of bringing alums back for professional development/career discussions; matching of current students with alum mentors)

13. Assessment of student learning outcomes and program effectiveness—including the assessment plan as well as the most recent annual report for each graduate degree program of the unit under review, with a summary of how the results have been used for program improvement

5. opportunities for academic and non-academic career trajectories (up to one page).

IV. Undergraduate Materials

Note: In spring 2010, Trinity College revised the guidelines for providing undergraduate program materials for external reviews, as outlined in the following section.

Guidelines for Self-Study of Information provided by the Provost’s Office and shared with Department Undergraduate or Program

Guideline: Departments are asked to provide information in the following seven broad categories. The questions below each category are meant to serve more as guidelines for responses, rather than a rigid list to be answered in sequence

A. General description of undergraduate program (intellectual foundations, program goals and student learning objectives)

1. What options do you offer undergraduates for having majors and/or minors in your department? If you have multiple majors, minors, concentrations, explain rationale, and any limits on courses counting for multiple majors/minors.

2. What are your educational goals and objectives for the major?

3. What are your educational goals for non-majors participating in your program?
4. In what ways does your program relate to Duke’s strategic plan, and to the general educational mission of Trinity College?

B. Curriculum

1. How was the curriculum of the department developed? What are the principles underlying the undergraduate curriculum? How has the department kept informed about and responded to national curricular trends?

2. Has the curriculum changed substantially in recent years, or is the department considering any changes? How and why?

3. What is the progression and sequence of courses through the major and minor? What is the rationale for the numbering of courses? For course sequencing? For requirements and prerequisites? Is it clear that courses are planned and offered as components of a larger program of study? Are there serious gaps in your offerings? What resources would be needed to fill them?

4. Are courses offered on a regular and rotating basis? What is the relationship of regular courses to special topics courses offered in a single term? Do students generally have a good idea of what courses will be offered during their progression through the major? Do they have any difficulties fulfilling the major requirements?

5. In what ways does your curriculum contribute or relate to the general educational goals of the Duke undergraduate curriculum (including modes of inquiry, FOCUS, freshmen seminars, service learning, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.)

6. What is the relationship of your curriculum to other departments and programs (including impact of changes on other majors, minors, certificate programs)? Do other departments offer “service courses” or prerequisites to your majors? If so, are they adequate for your majors? What agreements or procedures are in place to ensure continuity of course offerings when other departments are involved?

7. How do you articulate your program goals and curriculum to students (written materials/websites/advising, etc.)
C. Co-curricular connections
1. How are undergraduate majors and minors integrated into the intellectual life of the department?
2. Does the department support undergraduate clubs and/or co-curricular events?
3. To what extent do your majors/minors participate in research projects, DukeEngage, Bass Connections, study abroad, etc.?

D. Connection between undergraduate and graduate programs
1. How does the department foster vertical integration of undergraduate and graduate programs?
2. How and to what extent are graduate students involved in the teaching and/or mentoring of undergraduates (including common research projects or other learning experiences)?

E. Instructional Faculty / Teaching
1. How is the teaching load in your program divided between regular rank junior and senior members of the faculty? What is the ratio of courses taught by regular rank and non-regular rank faculty (graduate students and non-ladder faculty)?
2. On what basis are graduate and non-regular rank faculty assigned to courses? How are they trained and supervised for teaching these courses?
3. Is your program limited by inadequate faculty resources? In what ways?

F. Enrollment trends, recruitment and retention of majors/minors
1. What do enrollment rates, attrition, and numbers of majors and minors indicate about the effectiveness of the department’s programs?
2. How does the department attract students, majors, minors?

G. Assessment
1. To what extent and how frequently are courses and course sequences reviewed? How and on what basis are decisions made to add, drop, and modify courses?
2. What are the student learning outcomes for each undergraduate program of the sponsoring unit? How are these outcomes measured? Include the assessment plans and the most recent annual assessment report for each undergraduate program.
3. How does assessment and evaluation feed back into program development?

H. Data to accompany self-study:

(Pratt departments can submit most recent Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology [ABET] report in place of this section.)

1. Number of enrollments, majors, and minors over last 5 years, including demographics
2. List of cross-listed courses offered over last 145 years
3. Number of students completing credited research project, study abroad projects and graduation with distinction over the past five years
   - Quality statistics of majors
While items for inclusion are noted within the numbered sections below, the specific suggestions under each bullet serve more as guidelines than rigid lists, and departments should feel free to address other items that they determine appropriate, so long as they keep any additional material to match the lengths specified.

1. Overview of undergraduate program (program goals and student learning objectives). Suggested items include a list of offered majors/minors/concentrations, broader educational goals for majors and non-majors, and rationale for & limits on courses that count toward majors/minors (tabular form encouraged). Note: this summary section should align closely with sections 2 and 7 below, and this section and subsequent sections should reference the data provided by central admin noted above (no more than two pages).

2. Description of undergraduate curriculum. Suggested items to cover (if appropriate) include scaffolding of pathways through the major (visual schematic recommended); any significant changes to the curriculum in the past three years; any responses to national curricular trends; difficulties students encounter fulfilling major requirements and indications of sociodemographic factors influencing success; and ways the curriculum contributes to other departments & programs, the broader school and overall Duke undergraduate curriculum, & Duke’s prevailing strategic plan. Suggested length is no longer than 3 pages.

3. Description of co-curricular activities and connection to experiential learning. Suggested items to cover (if appropriate) include how the department supports clubs and other co-curricular endeavors (financially or otherwise); how the department facilitates research experiences, DukeEngage, Bass Connections, community engagement, study abroad, and other related activities; and nature and extent of faculty involvement in such activities (one page).

4. Analysis of enrollment trends, recruitment, and retention of majors/minors. Please specify how the department perceives enrollment rates, attrition, and number of majors & minors as well as how the department attracts non-majors, majors, and minors (one page).
5. Assessment of undergraduate program. Please specify student learning outcomes and how the unit measures them, and how they have evolved in response to any evaluation mechanisms (two pages).
Appendix 1: Sample itinerary for external review visit

Sample Itinerary
Department of XXX External Review

Monday
External reviewers arrive and are transported to lodging.

5:00 – 6:00 p.m. Meeting with University Administrators:
- Dean and Vice Provost, The Graduate School
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Dean of college, example: Arts & Sciences. Possibly also in that case:
- Divisional Dean of Humanities and the Arts, Arts & Sciences
- Dean of Academic Affairs, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences
- Dean of Graduate Affairs, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences

6:45 p.m. Review Team Dinner w/ department chair, associate chair, possibly others

Tuesday
8:15 a.m. Transport review team from lodging to academic building. One conference room reserved for whole day for most meetings, except where noted.

8:30 – 8:45 a.m. Space/ facilities tour with Business Manager

9:00 – 9:55 a.m. Meet Full Professors

10:00 – 10:45 a.m. Meet Director of Graduate Studies and DGSA

10:45 – 11:00 a.m. Break

11:00 – 11:45 a.m. Meet Associate Professors

11:50 a.m. Walk to lunch

12:00 – 12:45 p.m. Lunch with Undergrad majors

12:45 – 1:15 p.m. Meet Unit Administrative Staff

1:15 p.m. Walk back to conference room

1:20 – 2:05 p.m. Meet Assistant Professors

2:05 – 2:40 p.m. Meet Director of Undergraduate Studies and DUSA

2:40 – 3:25 p.m. Meet Non-tenure-track faculty

3:25 – 3:40 p.m. Break

3:40 – 4:25 p.m. Meet Graduate Students

4:25 – 5:10 p.m. Meet more individuals from a faculty category above (which depends on relative number)
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5:15 pm Transport review team to lodging from academic building. Possible dinner discussion among review team members.

Wednesday

8:45 a.m. Transport review team from lodging to administrative building.

9:00 – 9:45 a.m. DGSs of affiliate programs

10:15 – 11:00 a.m. Exit meeting with chair (and associate chair)

11:15 – 12:00 p.m. Time for confidential additional meeting(s)

12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m. Exit interview with University Administration

   Dean and Vice Provost, The Graduate School
   Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, The Graduate School
   Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
   Dean, Arts & Sciences
   Divisional Dean of Humanities and the Arts, Arts & Sciences
   Dean of Academic Affairs, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences
   Dean of Graduate Affairs, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences

1:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m. Working lunch and preparation of draft report

2:45 p.m. Transportation to airport