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I Purpose

SUNY Potsdam has developed a system of peer review for academic departments and programs to encourage academic excellence and to provide a high quality education to the students for whom we are responsible. This system reflects and is consistent with SUNY academic policy (Memorandum to Presidents 77-3). This academic program review is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs not already subject to review by an established accrediting agency. It is designed to assess and enhance department or program quality, and to assist the college in planning, in setting institutional priorities, and in allocating resources.

Each department or program will be reviewed at seven-year intervals although, under certain circumstances, this interval may be either longer or shorter. The appropriate Dean will initiate reviews and will develop a rolling schedule for reviews, and will notify the relevant department or program no later than the semester prior to the start of the review. The program self-study should be completed by the end of the semester prior to the planned visit of the review team. Circumstances may occasionally require a less comprehensive review than that required by these guidelines; in such a case, the Academic Council shall determine appropriate review procedures.

The review is composed of three parts: (1) preparation of a self-study by the department or program; (2) site visit by a panel of reviewers and submission of their report; (3) the institutional response to the visit and review.

It is important to focus the review of the academic unit or program on critical questions affecting its current academic stature and its future prospects. To this end, the Provost and appropriate Dean will examine the most recent external report and/or, where applicable, the most recent reaccreditation report to determine whether there are special issues that should be addressed by the review.

A description of the review process, outlining general questions ands requirements, follows. The Provost and the Dean of the relevant School will discuss special issues to be addressed with the department Chair or program Director. The Chair or Director will be invited to propose additional topics to be included in the review.
II Self-Study

The self-study has the dual purpose of involving the faculty in a critical scrutiny of all aspects of the department – undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) programs, scholarship, service, student learning environment, recruiting and retention of students, continuing faculty development – and of informing the reviewers about the department.

To ensure broad departmental involvement, the Chair or Director will inform the department or program of the review and solicit input from the faculty on questions and issues to be addressed in the self-study. The Chair or Director will be responsible for a summary of the self-study that will serve as the statement of the state of the department. A one-course reassignment (or equivalent stipend) may be made available to the primary author of the self-study.

Members of the department will be given at least one week to read the completed document and to sign the signature page although it is expected that the self-study will represent a diversity of views, anyone wishing to provide minority views on materials or conclusions may add them as a signed statement at the end of the appendices.

Copies of the self-study draft will be provided to the Provost and the Dean for review. The Provost or Dean may require revision before releasing the self-study to the reviewers. The self-study will comprise two parts: a narrative and an appendix of relevant factual data.

The Narrative should provide an overview of the current state of the department and its current and prospective opportunities and challenges should be limited to twenty-five pages, excluding attachments. The questions in Appendix A are offered as a guide for this section.

The Factual Data (to be included as appendices) should include the following (some of this data will be made available by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness):

1. Faculty curriculum vitae, including rank and tenure status, educational and employment background, professional affiliations and activities, awards and honors, publications, presentations or performances at professional meetings and at other institutions, brief description of current scholarly projects;

2. Summary of faculty activity for the past five years; brief appraisal of the most significant projects;

3. List of other professional and support staff;

4. Summary of personnel changes for past five years;

5. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course descriptions from the current college catalog, noting the department’s courses oriented towards majors, non majors, service to other majors; and towards participation in the General Education Program, Learning Communities, support of teacher preparation, interdisciplinary programs, Honors Program, and any other college-wide programs;
6. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course offerings, past five years, including addition and deletion of course offerings (with rationale for such additions and deletions, if available);

7. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course enrollments, numbers of majors and minors, number of degrees awarded, for each of past five years;

8. Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) faculty/student workload (headcount and FTE), past five years;

9. Summaries of student course evaluation data, past five years (if available);

10. Data reflecting undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) student profile and quality:

    Academic profile of majors and minors:
    - average SAT scores, HS average, and HS percentile rank of majors;
    - transfer GPA of students transferring into the program;
    - average cumulative GPA and major GPA of majors;
    - number of full-time and part-time student majors; and
    - retention rates for majors.

    Composition/distribution of student majors and minors with respect to age, gender and ethnicity.

    List of positions and places of employment of department/program’s students who receives degrees in the past five years, and earlier graduates who have gained positions of significance within or without the academic discipline of the program.

11. List of major professional activities sponsored by the department in the last five years, e.g. specials colloquia, conferences, seminars, workshops.
III Site Visit: Review Team

The charge of the evaluation team is to evaluate the overall state of the department/program and its success in fulfilling its mission and to assess its future needs. Where appropriate, the review team will make suggestions for improvement.

As part of the site visit, the team will assess the accuracy of the self-study; interview faculty and students, both to understand their perspectives on the department and assess the state of their morale; examine the facilities; review student work; discuss with administrators the unit’s role in fulfilling the overall mission of the institution, and ascertain the institution’s commitment to the department’s programs and its financial, physical and personnel resources. The key questions posed for the self-study will provide the basis for the evaluation team’s review. The reviewers may request additional information from the college prior to the visit.

Selection and Composition of the Evaluation Team

The Provost (upon recommendation of the relevant Dean) will select two to three highly qualified persons (at least one and preferably two external to the college) to serve as the evaluation team, one of who, will be asked to chair the committee and to coordinate the writing of the site visit report. The chair of the review committee will typically be an external member and external reviewers will be from the same academic discipline as the department being reviewed. The Department Chair or Director may recommend people to serve on the evaluation team, together with a brief explanation of their qualifications. To ensure fairness and impartiality of their observations, persons with close professional relationships to members of the department – including current research collaborations, current and prior co-author relationships – will normally be excluded from the team. The evaluation team will be assembled by the appropriate Dean’s office and members will be reviewed both by the Dean and the academic unit for potential conflicts of interest. In the case where there are more than one major housed within a single department or program, it is advisable for an external member of the evaluation team to represent each major.

Site Visit Arrangements

The dates and arrangements for the site visit will be handled by the office of the relevant Dean. The schedule for the visit will be determined by the Dean and the host department In general the department will plan the visitors’ schedule with faculty, students, non-teaching professionals, and will submit a proposed schedule to the Provost at least one week prior to the visit. The schedule should include at least one focus group with students. The Academic Council will charge the site visitors during an initial meeting with them on the first full day of the visit. The visitors will meet separately with the Provost, the Dean of the relevant College and /or other campus staff as determined by the Provost, Dean and Chair.

The site visit will end with an exit interview with delete: the President, the Provost, the appropriate Dean, and other college representatives selected by the Provost. This exit interview will be open to department members. Toward the end of the second day and prior to the exit interview, the evaluation team will be given several hours to prepare an initial draft or outline of
their report. This draft could be used as the basis for the team’s initial evaluation to be given at the exit interview. The final written report will normally be submitted within four weeks of the team’s visit.

Site Visit Report

The site visit report is a crucial element of the College’s evaluation of the department/program and must be objective, complex, accurate, and specific. Using the self-study, the Guide for Reviewers (appendix B), and any specific items in the charge to the team, the report should evaluate the unit’s effectiveness in defining and fulfilling its mission, evaluate its strengths and challenges, and assess, in detail, the state of all important components and functions. The chair of the evaluation team assumes responsibility for the preparation of the full written report.

IV Joint Action Plan

The self-study and the site visit report will lead to agreements between the departments and the administration in the form of action plans for improvement. The Joint Action Plans will be realistic in terms of what actions can be expected and supported through the resources available within SUNY Potsdam.

Follow-up Procedures

Upon receiving the report, the Provost will forward copies to the Dean and the department Chair. The Provost will also acknowledge the receipt of the report and send letters of appreciation to the review team.

As an important component of the campus assessment program, findings from the report should be incorporated into planning within the academic department (course and curriculum improvements) and within the School and the College (administrative support and campus-wide planning). To these ends, the Provost, Dean, and Department Chair should meet within two weeks of the receipt of the report to discuss issues and priorities. Following this, within one month, the Department Chair should submit a set of responses and needs for review by the Dean, the Provost, and whatever additional campus agencies should become involved. The Department Chair should receive within the next month a review of his/her responses and identified needs from the Dean, the Provost, and other involved agencies to allow planning and improvement to continue. In addition, the Academic Council will meet with the Chair and Dean to assess the review, to discuss ways of implementing recommended improvements, and, if necessary, to address any specific concerns. [The final result of these consultations will be a joint action plan, a set of actions for improvement agreed to by both the department and the administration, with an appropriate time frame and a commitment of resources adequate to support these actions.]
Periodic Review

Three to four years following the site visit, the Dean shall meet with the Department Chair to assess the progress of the implementation of the joint action plan. The Department Chair shall report on the results of any recommendations implemented and any new changes that may have become necessary.
Appendix A - Common Questions to be Addressed in the Self-Study

These questions are provided as a guide for the narrative sections of the self-study.

Overview
What are the major strengths of the unit? What are its major concerns? What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next five-ten years? How do the activities of the department contribute to the overall goals of the institution?

Faculty

- What changes are anticipated in the faculty for the next several years: What new positions or replacement positions have been authorized; what reductions, if any, are foreseen? How do these changes affect the department’s direction and its ability to fulfill its mission?

- How does the faculty’s range of interests compare with the breadth covered in typical peer departments? If disciplinary groupings of faculty in the department are identifiable, what working relationships exist among them and what procedures ensure communication? Are there major research/scholarly foci within the department or program?

- How effective is the faculty’s teaching? What procedures are there for evaluating the quality of instruction? What consideration is given to the quality of teaching in the granting of tenure, promotions, or discretionary salary increases?

- How well does the department distribute responsibility for teaching, scholarship, service, advising and other activities that contribute to the health of the College across faculty?

- What role, if any, do faculty other than the Chair or program Director have in determining departmental objectives or policy? How do they participate in departmental governance, including deciding intra-departmental budget allocations and assignment of new or replacement faculty lines?

- What is the state of faculty morale? What factors have promoted it and what have tended to lower it; what efforts are being made to foster the former and reduce the latter?

- What efforts are made to support and sustain new faculty as they advance toward continuing appointment?
• If necessary, what effort is the department making to address gender imbalance and increase ethnic diversity of its faculty?

Undergraduate Program

• How do the activities of the department contribute to the formation of the Potsdam College Graduate?

• What is the focus of the undergraduate program and its majors and minors?

• What innovations have the department initiated to enhance undergraduate education? How well has the department kept up with external changes in the discipline (e.g., new areas of research, technology).

• What efforts has the department made to contribute to an integrated undergraduate curriculum across departments? To encourage, where possible, interdisciplinarity?

• How do the offerings of the department contribute to the college’s General Education program? Does the department participate in learning communities?

• What opportunities exist for undergraduates to engage in research and/or scholarly activities? What proportion of undergraduate majors are involved in research, creative, or scholarly activity?

• How do the activities of the department contribute toward a more integrated undergraduate student experience at the college? Describe any collaborations with student/residence life?

• What are the department’s procedures for academic advising of undergraduates? How many faculty are directly involved in undergraduate advising? Are non-faculties involved in undergraduate advising?

• How effective is academic advising in the department? Describe evidence of its effectiveness.

• By what procedures are freshman-level courses designed, and faculty assigned to them?

• How satisfied is the department with the quality of its current undergraduate students? How has the quality of undergraduate student preparation affected the content and method of undergraduate instruction?
• What are the special needs of transfer students in the department? How has the department met those needs?

• Does the department utilize graduate assistants or student interns? If so, what are their specific responsibilities, and how are they trained, supervised and compensated?

• Describe any special student recruiting efforts the department is involved in and describe the results of these efforts.

**Graduate Program (if relevant)**

• What is the focus of the graduate program? How is the graduate curriculum designed? To what extent does it overlap with the undergraduate curriculum? To what extent do undergraduates participate in graduate courses?

• What is the quality of graduate students attracted to this program? What recruitment efforts are in place? What type of student body is served by the graduate program?

• What plans are there for graduate program development or change in the immediate future, and what are the reasons for the change?

• What are the procedures for academic advising, for supervision and evaluation of student progress through degree completion, and for assisting graduate in job placement? Does the department monitor and assess graduate student outcomes?

**Assessment**

• What is the department trying to accomplish with the major program? What student learning outcomes do you expect in program graduates? Are these outcomes made explicit and included in your program assessment plan? (Attach a copy of your Assessment Plan.) How do you know whether or not you are accomplishing these objectives?

• How does the department monitor and assess student outcomes? What mix of direct and indirect assessments of learning outcomes does the department utilize? Are student learning outcomes communicated effectively with students through inclusion in course syllabi? Are samples of student work that demonstrate competence at various levels of achievement archived?
  a. Direct assessments include, but are not limited to, standardized tests, capstone experiences, performance assessments, portfolios, job placements, performance in admission and licensing tests, and placement in graduate school programs.
  b. Indirect assessments include, but are not limited to, surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups.
• Describe how department uses program assessment data/review to make programmatic, curricular, and pedagogical enhancements in the program.

Scholarship/Research

• What provisions are made in the department or program to support faculty to engage in scholarship/research? Are all of Boyer’s four forms of scholarship (discovery, application, integration, and teaching) valued and supported?

• What level of external (to the department/program) support exists to assist faculty in their scholarship/research? Does the department have plans to try to increase this level of support? If so, describe how.

Service

• Describe how the department contributes in service to the college, faculty governance and the wider community.

College Libraries

Information Literacy

Are students introduced to the creation, communication, and dissemination of knowledge in the discipline? Do students have opportunity to practice identification, retrieval, and evaluation of information resources in all formats using print and electronic tools? Do students practice ethical use of information?

Resources

Do departmental and library faculty collaborate effectively in selection resources in support of the curriculum and appropriate for the students in the program?

Do faculty and students have adequate access to resources that support the curriculum and faculty research?

Are students encouraged/required to use information resources?

Services

Are students encouraged to use key library services that enhance access? (e.g. reference, interlibrary loan)
Continuing Education and Other Activities (where applicable)

- Describe the unit’s continuing education efforts; summer session offerings, Winterim offering, off-campus courses, evening and part-time programs, and lectures, symposia, or workshops available to the college community.

- Describe special collaborations with other departments of the college.

- Describe advancement-oriented activities (i.e., fundraising and alumni development initiatives) that the department is engaged in.

Resources and Facilities

How satisfactory are the following provisions for the department’s needs and how might they be improved?

(a) General and disciplinary library holdings and acquisitions  
(b) Research and laboratory facilities and equipment  
(c) Computer facilities and services  
(d) Technical and secretarial services for faculty and students  
(e) Office, classroom, and study space  
(f) Any special resources or support facilities  
(g) Funds for other than personnel services (OTPS)
Appendix B – Guide for Reviewers

**Overall**

What are the major strengths of the unit? What are the major concerns? What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next five to ten years? How do the activities of the department contribute to the overall goals of the institution?

How do its teaching and research foci compare with other similar units at comparable institutions? Does it have a distinctive identity?

**Faculty**

- What is the overall assessment of the quality of the faculty? What is the quality of their teaching effectiveness and scholarship? What is the extent and quality of other current professional activities? Which faculty members are outstanding in their specific scholarly areas? In what areas is the department weak? Are significant areas of specialization inadequately represented for the instructional needs of the department or the college? Are there areas of available faculty expertise that might be more fully exploited? Do the department’s requirements for teaching and administrative responsibilities leave sufficient time for scholarship?

- Is the department anticipating its future needs? How effective has it been in recruiting promising junior faculty to replace retiring senior faculty? How are its character and function likely to be affected by retirements in the next few years? Is there a healthy balance of tenured and non-tenured faculty? Is the gender and ethnic distribution of the faculty appropriate?

- How effective is undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) instruction? How do students rate the teaching in the department?

- How successful is the faculty in generating funding for research, facilities, and equipment? How does funding compare with that of other comparable departments in this field? Discuss the mix of funding – federal agencies, corporate, private, special campus sources.

- What are the credentials of adjunct or part-time faculty? Is the department’s use of such faculty appropriate?

- What is the current state of faculty morale? Is there consensus within the department about
its goals and policies? Is departmental leadership effective? Are burdens and responsibilities, rewards and privileges equitably distributed? Are junior faculty’s interests respected? Are compensation, teaching loads, and working conditions commensurate with the quality of the faculty? Is the department likely to have difficulty retaining faculty?

- Are junior faculty mentored adequately on the development of their careers? Is their academic progress reviewed periodically?

**Undergraduate Program**

- How does the character and quality of the undergraduate major and minor programs compare with those at comparable institutions? What, if anything, is distinctive about them? How well do they prepare students for serious graduate study? For teaching in the schools? For other occupations related to the field? Does the department adequately monitor and assess student outcomes?

- How extensively are undergraduate course offerings elected by non-majors? How appropriate are they the general or liberal education of such students?

- How large is the department’s instructional responsibility in the form of service courses to the College. How effective are they?

- How do undergraduates, particularly majors, feel about the department and its courses? How accessible are faculty outside the classroom? How adequate is undergraduate advising? Are there opportunities for undergraduates to become involved in research, creative, or scholarly activity?

- Is there evidence that the department engages in systematic assessment of student learning outcomes? Does the department use an appropriate mix of direct and indirect assessment procedures? Is there evidence that the department has used program assessment review to make programmatic, curricular, and pedagogical enhancements in the program?

**Graduate Program (if relevant)**

- How does the character and quality of the graduate program, its curriculum and degree requirements, compare with those at other comparable institutions? What, if anything, is distinctive about it? How well does it prepare students for research and teaching? For non-academic careers?
• How does the quality of graduate students compare with those at other institutions? How rigorous are admissions standards? How effective are recruiting methods? How might they be improved?

• How effective is the advising system? How helpful are faculty in directing student research? What, if anything, is done to foster a scholarly community of faculty and graduate students within the department? What is the state of graduate student morale?

• What are the procedures for aiding the placement of graduates in appropriate academic or professional positions?

Resources and Facilities

• How adequate are the classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices, technical support, computer and audio-visual facilities, and their maintenance? Are conditions in these areas improving or deteriorating?

• Are the library holdings and facilities and other research resources in this field adequate to the needs of faculty and students? Are conditions in these areas improving of deteriorating?

• Is the secretarial, clerical, and technical support staff adequate to the needs of the programs and faculty? Is the allocation of funds for expenses other than salaries adequate?

• Are interdepartmental research facilities utilized by the faculty? Identify whether there are specific areas where increased investment in such facilities might be particularly effective in increasing research or scholarly activity.

• How does college support for research and scholarship compare to support for peer departments at other universities?

General Conclusions

• How well does the department distribute its interest, energies, and resources among undergraduate and graduate (if relevant) education and advising, individual and collaborative research, and college service and governance? Are its efforts skewed disproportionately in one direction? Is the department making the best possible use of its resources?

• How does the department or program fare in comparison with its counterparts in comparable institutions? What is unique about the department/program.

• Are there important steps that should be taken to maintain and/or to improve the unit’s quality?
## SUNY POTSDAM
### ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE
#### 2001-2002 to 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Self-Study</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Peer Visit &amp; Report</td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BusAdmin (IACBE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Info Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane School of Music (NASM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance &amp; Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Self-Study</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Peer Visit &amp; Report</td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE (Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

#### INFORMATION SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitae</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Activity (past 5 years)</td>
<td>Departmental Annual Reports/Faculty Information Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Roster</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Personnel Changes (past 5 years)</td>
<td>Human Resources/Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Course Descriptions &amp; supporting Information (e.g. Gen. Ed., Honors, etc.)</td>
<td>College Catalog, Department Files, Program Directors/Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offerings – Past Five Years (additions/deletions, rationale)</td>
<td>Banner data, Department Files, Dept. Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload Data &amp; Department Profile Trends</td>
<td>Faculty Workload Reports, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Enrollment Trends (5 yr)</td>
<td>Faculty Workload Reports, Course Enrollment Trends Report (contact IR Coordinator, 2188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors/Minors</td>
<td>Student Fact Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Student Fact Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation Summaries</td>
<td>Department Files/Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Distribution Reports</td>
<td>IR Coordinator (2188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Profile Data (SPD)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD – Average SAT Scores, HS average, Average Class Rank Percentile</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD – Age</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Employment/Placement</td>
<td>Alumni Office (Annual Alumni directory), Academic Departments, Career Services Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Sponsored (Service) Activities</td>
<td>Faculty, Departmental Files, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Mission Statement (if available)</td>
<td>Departmental Files, Dept. Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Review of Academic Departments / Programs
Self Study Report
Draft Checklist (as of 1/09)
(Special thanks to Dr. Arlene Stillwell)

___ Vitae: Faculty curriculum vitae, including rank and tenure status, educational and employment background, professional affiliations and activities, awards and honors, publications, presentations or performances at professional meetings and at other institutions, brief description of current scholarly projects
   Source: faculty

___ Faculty activity (past 5 years): Summary of faculty activity for the past five years; brief appraisal of the most significant projects
   Source: dept. annual reports and faculty information forms

___ List of other professional and support staff
   Source: dept. chair

___ Summary of personnel changes (past 5 years)
   Source: HRD / dept. chair

___ Current course descriptions (past 5 years): Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course descriptions from the current college catalog, noting the department’s courses oriented towards majors, non majors, service to other majors; and towards participation in the General Education Program, Learning Communities, support of teacher preparation, interdisciplinary programs, Honors Program, and any other college-wide programs
   Source: course catalog, department files, program directors/coordinators
___ Course offerings & additions/deletions (past 5 years): Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course offerings, past five years, including addition and deletion of course offerings (with rationale for such additions and deletions, if available)

    Source: Bearpaws (Banner), dept. files, dept. chair

___ Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) course enrollment trends (past 5 years)

    Source: faculty workload reports, Course Enrollment Trends Report (contact IR Coordinator, x2188)

___ Number of majors and minors

    Source: Student Fact Book

___ Number of degrees awarded, for each of the past 5 years

    Source: Student Fact Book

___ Faculty workload data (past 5 years): Undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) faculty/student workload data (headcount and FTE)

    Source: faculty workload reports, dept. chair

___ Department profile trends (past 5 years)

    Source: faculty workload reports, dept. chair

___ Summaries of student course evaluation data, past 5 years (if available)

    Source: dept. files / faculty

___ Grade distribution reports

    Source: IE Coordinator (x2188)

___ Data reflecting undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) student profile and quality (SPD)

    Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

    Academic profile of majors and minors:

        ___ Average SAT scores, HS average, and average class rank percentile of majors
Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

___ Transfer GPA of students transferring into the program
   Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

___ Average cumulative GPA and major GPA of majors
   Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

___ Number of full-time and part-time majors
   Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

___ Retention/persistence rates by major
   Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm

___ Composition/distribution of student majors and minors with respect to age, gender and ethnicity
   Source: http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/index.cfm and Student Fact Book

___ Alumni employment/placements (past 5 years): List of positions and places of employment of department/program’s students who received degrees in the past five years, and earlier graduates who have gained positions of significance within or without the academic discipline of the program
   Source: annual alumni directory (Alumni Office), dept. files, Career Planning

___ Activities sponsored by the department (past 5 years): (e.g. special colloquia, conferences, seminars, workshops)
   Source: faculty, dept. files, dept. chair

___ Department Mission Statement (if available)
   Source: dept. files, dept. chair

___ Department Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (including direct and indirect assessment tools; availability of archived samples of student work that demonstrate
competence at various levels of achievement; action plans for improvement based on assessment of student learning outcomes data.

Source: dept. files, dept. assessment coordinator

___ Department Bylaws (if available)

Source: dept. files, dept. chair