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GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
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College-wide Program Review Guidelines based on
SUNY-wide Program Review Requirements and Guidelines

Note: This document is for programs without external disciplinary accreditation.
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Overview

This is a program review process. A program is an academic course of study leading to a degree or certificate.\(^1\) Departments with multiple programs are expected to complete the comprehensive review of all programs at the same time. Any exceptions will require the approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

SUNY Potsdam has developed a system of peer review for academic programs to encourage academic excellence and to provide a high-quality education to the students for whom it is responsible. This procedure, which reflects SUNY’s academic policy ([Memorandum to Presidents 77-3](#)), is a process of regular, systematic review and evaluation of all academic programs not already subject to review by an established accrediting agency. While the primary goal of academic program reviews is to improve student learning through assessment and enhancement of program quality, the process also assists the college in (a) planning, (b) setting institutional priorities, and (c) allocating resources.

SUNY Potsdam’s review system is on a 7 year cycle.\(^2\) As part of this cycle, academic departments complete a full self-study and external review of their program, either (a) as part of an accreditation process (if externally accredited by a disciplinary accreditor) or (b) in conjunction with the Academic Assessment Coordinator, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and the appropriate Associate Dean. The self-study document contains a description and analysis of important aspects of the program; it informs both the program faculty and the Review Team about the state of the program. A document of this scope includes many things, two of which are an Assessment Report and an updated Assessment Plan.

The Assessment Report as well as the updated Assessment Plan are due to the Office of Academic Assessment every 3-4 years\(^3\): once at the midway point of the assessment cycle, and then again as part of the full self-study and external review that is completed every 7 years. The Academic Assessment Cycle shows when each department/program is expected to complete these submissions. The Office of Academic Assessment has worked in conjunction with the Deans to develop a schedule that coincides with accreditation and other departmental needs. Should your department have any questions or recommendations regarding this schedule, please contact the Academic Assessment Coordinator. The Academic Assessment Cycle is located here: [https://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/academicassessment/cycle](https://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/academicassessment/cycle).

*Note:* Our College’s participation in the program review process is critical not only for improving the quality of instructional and educational experiences for our students and faculty, it is also integral to the College’s educational effectiveness assessment that is required by Middle States Commission on Higher Education. When units fail to complete program reviews in a timely and/or comprehensive manner, our College’s ability to meet accreditation requirements related to assessment are put in jeopardy.

---

\(^1\) Throughout this document, we refer to program (singular). All information applies equally to programs (plural).

\(^2\) Please note: the timeline for each program review cycle is 7 years unless otherwise specified by an external disciplinary accreditor.

\(^3\) Midway is considered 3 years for those on the standard 7-year cycle; departments on a different self-study cycle due to external accreditation will have an altered midway point.
potentially leading to significant and negative consequences for the institution. Middle States accreditation is required in order for the institution to offer students federal financial aid; without this ability, the College would not be able to function financially. Given the benefits to programs by participating in a robust process of reflective review, as well as the significant consequences to the institution when this important assessment process is not followed, those units/departments who are substantially delinquent in completing the Self-Study process or the subsequent Action Plan (see page 9) may jeopardize their OTPS funding and/or the ability of faculty and staff to participate in the College’s discretionary award process.

Occasionally, very unusual circumstances may warrant a request for an extension of the midway due date or the program review process. In these rare cases, the department chair /program coordinator should notify the appropriate Dean, in writing, of both the circumstances and the request, with a clear proposal for a reasonable new due date. This request must be submitted at least six months prior to the established due date. If the Dean supports the extension, they will notify the Provost’s Office, in writing, and the Provost (or designee) will make the final decision. If the Provost grants the extension, the decision will be archived in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The Provost’s Office will notify the Dean, the department chair, and the Academic Assessment Coordinator in writing. The Academic Assessment Coordinator will then update the Academic Assessment Cycle timeline with the new due date for the Assessment Report and updated Assessment Plan. Please note that too many extensions will negatively affect our campus accreditation, so consider this as an emergency measure only.

The program review should focus on critical questions affecting the program’s current academic stature and future prospects including, but not limited to, ongoing or projected curricular redesign, anticipated new courses, efforts in student recruitment and retention, and a thorough analysis of enrollment trends. To this end, faculty may wish to consult the Dean and the Provost to examine the most recent external report and/or the most recent reaccreditation report in order to determine whether the review should address any special issues. The chair or director of the program may wish to propose additional topics/priorities for (a) the self-study and (b) the review team’s investigation and report. (The review team comprises on-campus and external examiners, described in more detail, below.) Once program review priorities have been decided upon, the chair, director, or Dean will communicate these to the review team.

The program review process is composed of four parts: (1) self-study (inclusive of information from the Assessment Report and Updated Assessment Plan), (2) site visit and report, (3) the action plan, and (4) mid-cycle review. A more detailed description of these parts follows.

I. Self-Study

The self-study has the dual purpose of (a) involving the faculty in a critical scrutiny of all aspects of the program: scholarship, service, student learning environment, recruiting and retention of students, continuing faculty development, enrollment trends in the major and in the service of the College, interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary contributions, and (b) informing the Review Team about the program.
Process Overview

To ensure broad involvement, the chair or director will inform the program faculty and staff of the upcoming review and solicit input from them regarding the overall review of the program as well as the identified review priorities. The chair or director—and/or appointed designee—will be responsible for collecting pertinent information and documents and writing the self-study.

When the self-study draft has been written, the department chair or program director will give program faculty and staff at least two weeks to (a) read the draft, (b) provide input, and (c) 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.

Then, the department chair or program director will provide copies of the signed self-study document to the Provost and the Dean. The Provost and the Dean will have at least two weeks to review copies of the self-study draft. The Provost or Dean may require revision of the draft before releasing the self-study to the Review Team.

Overview of Self-Study Content

The self-study comprises two parts: (1) a narrative and (2) appendices with relevant data.

The narrative should provide an overview of the current state of the program, any institutional history that is needed to properly grasp that state, and a list of current and prospective opportunities and challenges. It should not exceed twenty-five pages in length, excluding attachments.

The relevant data to be incorporated as appendices should include the following (see Appendix C for data sources):

1. Current/updated curriculum vitae for all faculty, including current adjuncts. CVs should (a) be in a clear format and (b) include the following:
   - faculty professional activities for the last five years in reverse chronological order
   - faculty member’s rank and tenure status
   - educational and employment background
   - professional affiliations and activities
   - awards and honors
   - publications, presentations or performances, and descriptions of current scholarly projects

2. A list of other professional and support staff and a brief description of their roles/responsibilities.

3. A summary of personnel changes over the course of the previous five years.

---

4 See Appendix A for a detailed description of the Self-Study content.
4. The undergraduate, and graduate if appropriate, course descriptions from the current college catalog, with note taken of which courses serve the following: majors; non-majors; majors offered by other programs; the General Education Program; FIGs; teacher preparation programs; interdisciplinary programs; Honors Program; Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion goals; and other college-wide programs.

5. A list of undergraduate, and graduate if appropriate, course offerings over the course of the previous five years, including any additions or deletions of course offerings (with the rationales for those additions and deletions, if available).

6. The most recent “Academic Department Profile Trends” report from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

7. The undergraduate, and graduate if appropriate, faculty/student workload (including both headcount and FTE) for each of the past five years.

8. Three-year trends for courses with a Drop, Fail, Withdrawal (DFW) rate of 40% or more.

9. Available data concerning the academic profile of undergraduate majors and minors, and graduate students if appropriate:
   - Average SAT scores and HS average of majors
   - GPA of students transferring into the program
   - Average cumulative GPA for majors
   - Average GPA of program-specific courses for majors
   - Number of full-time and part-time majors for graduate programs
   - Retention rates for majors
   - The composition of majors and minors with respect to age, gender, and ethnicity
   - A list of the positions and places of employment of department or program students who received degrees in the past five years, and a list of earlier graduates who have gained positions of significance within or without the academic discipline of the program

10. Relevant bylaws, department or programmatic strategic plans, and/or faculty or student handbooks.

11. List of members of Advisory Boards, with affiliations.

12. A list of major professional activities sponsored by the department or program in the last five years, e.g., special colloquia, conferences, seminars, and workshops.

II. Site Visit & Report

The charge of the review team is to evaluate the overall state of the program, its success in fulfilling its mission, and its future needs. The review team is encouraged to make suggestions for improvement.

As part of the site visit, the review team will do the following:
• Assess the accuracy of the self-study
• Meet with faculty and students separately\(^5\)
  o to understand their perspectives on the program, particularly in relation to strengths, opportunities, and challenges
  o to understand how the program is supporting students’ success post-graduation
  o to identify future priorities as they align with the strategic missions of School and College
  o the review team has the option to request a separate meeting with untenured faculty as well
• Assess the facilities, particularly those that are program-specific
• Review student work
• Identify areas of opportunity, particularly related to program design, recruitment, and retention
• Discuss with administrators the program’s role in fulfilling the overall mission of the institution

In this work, the review team will start with the findings and questions that the self-study provides. The review team may also request information from the college prior to the visit.

Selection and Composition of the Review Team

The review team shall consist of two reviewers—one internal and one external. These reviewers will be experienced—preferably tenured—college or university-level faculty members, one of whom (the internal reviewer) teaches at SUNY Potsdam but is not a member of the program under review. The external reviewer will teach at another institution within the academic discipline under review. Requests for additional reviewers will be considered only in rare circumstances, based on the variety/range of programs in a department.\(^6\)

The department that houses the program under review begins the process of team selection by submitting a list of potential reviewers and a brief description of their qualifications to the Dean by the fourth week of the semester prior to the site visit. The department then works with the Dean’s office to finalize a review team proposal. The Provost (or designee) either approves that team or asks for changes. A final decision is made by the sixth week of the semester prior to the site visit.

When choosing review team members, consider the following:

1. To ensure fairness and impartiality in observation, please exclude external review candidates with close professional or personal relationships with members of the department, including current research collaborations, and those in current and prior co-author relationships. In the effort to avoid any conflicts of interest, the department and the Dean will vet potential reviewers.

---

\(^5\) Please note: the meeting with students should have no faculty present and the meeting with faculty should have no members of the administration present.

\(^6\) If more than one program housed within a single department is under review, please make an effort to choose external members of the review team who represent the different programs (should resources allow).
2. Please consider external reviewers who work at a fellow SUNY institution because they offer the benefit of proximity and will be familiar with challenges typically faced at public institutions.

Site Visit Arrangements

The Dean’s office, in consultation with all concerned, will handle dates and arrangements for the review team. The Dean will work with the host department to develop the schedule for the site visit. The following schedule elements are required during the two- to three-day site visit.

1. Throughout the visit, the review team will be provided with a room where they may confer with each other, write, and store their personal effects during the day.

2. The site visit begins with the review team and available program faculty attending a meal or meeting to start exchanging ideas and information. (The Dean’s office will inform the program under review how all meals will be budgeted.)

3. The second meeting should include the review team, the Dean, and /or other campus staff so the review team may formally receive its charge.

4. Other meetings include:
   - Students
   - Program faculty (tenured, untenured, and adjuncts, as available)
     - Group or individual meetings, as appropriate
   - Department Chair
   - Stakeholders, as appropriate, such as:
     - Director of Honors Program
     - Chief Information Officer
     - Computing & Technology Services
     - Director of General Education
     - Director of Accommodative Services
     - Director of International Education and Programs
     - Director of Academic Advising and Support
     - Director of Admissions / Transfer Coordinator
     - Director of Libraries
     - Faculty members of departments that collaborate with the program under review
     - Members of the Advisory Board and/or program alumni

5. The review team will be given time to begin preparations for an initial draft or outline of their report. This is often accomplished by scheduling a review team-only dinner and leaving the rest of the evening to them. The team can then use the draft of their report as the basis for the team’s initial evaluation to be given at the exit interview.

6. The review team ends the site visit with an exit interview with the Provost, the Dean, and other college representatives selected by the Provost.

---

7 Please remember that this information applies to more than one program if multiple programs are under review.
Post-Site Visit Report

The review team submits a final written report to the Dean. This is normally expected within four weeks of the team’s visit. The external reviewer chairs the team and assumes responsibility for the preparation of the full written report. This report is a crucial element of the college’s evaluation of the program and must be objective, complex, accurate, and specific. The review team should use the self-study, the Guide for Reviewers (Appendix B), and the charge given to them (received both in writing with the self-study and in person at the initial meeting on campus) to craft a detailed report that evaluates (1) the program’s effectiveness in defining and fulfilling its mission, (2) its strengths and challenges, and (3) the state of all its important components and functions.

III. Action Plan

Upon receiving the site visit report, the Dean will forward copies to the Provost and the department chair or program coordinator. As appropriate, findings from the report will then be incorporated into planning either within: (1) the program (e.g. course and curriculum improvements) or (2) the appropriate school and the college (e.g. administrative support and campus-wide planning). To this end, the Dean and the department chair/program coordinator will meet soon after the receipt of the report to discuss issues and priorities.

The final result of this process of consultation will be the creation of an Action Plan by the department chair/assessment coordinator, and the Dean. This Action Plan should be completed within two months of receipt of the site visit written report. The Action Plan includes a description of planned actions in pursuit of improvement, an appropriate time frame, and suggested resources. The proposed Plan is then presented to the Provost or designee by the Dean and department chair in order to finalize and approve the Plan. If changes are warranted, the department chair/assessment coordinator will complete a finalized Plan based on the feedback from the Dean and Provost. The department chair/assessment coordinator will submit the finalized Plan to the Dean and Provost, and share the finalized Action Plan with the department/program faculty.

IV. Mid-Cycle Review

This review occurs mid-way between the dates for each department’s self-study (generally, in the third year after an external review). During the first week of the semester in which the mid-cycle review is due, the Dean will inform department chairs/assessment coordinators of their upcoming mid-cycle review. The review entails a meeting between the Dean and department chair to review (1) an updated Assessment Report, (2) an updated Assessment Plan, and (3) the progress still needed to comply with the Action Plan based on site-visit recommendations.
Appendix A: The Content of the Self-Study

Overview

The self-study should answer the following questions: What are the program’s major strengths, opportunities, and concerns? What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next five years? How do the activities of the program and/or department contribute to the overall goals of the institution and the future success of its graduates?

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 program?
- How does the faculty’s range of interests compare with the breadth covered in typical peer departments and/or programs? If disciplinary groupings of faculty in the department are identifiable, what working relationships exist among them and what procedures ensure communication? What, if any, major research/scholarly foci exist within the department or program?
- How effective is the faculty’s teaching? What procedures are there for evaluating the quality of instruction? How are the faculty incorporating strategies for a range of learners including non-traditional students and those from diverse backgrounds?
- How well does the program distribute responsibility among its faculty members for teaching, scholarship, service, advising, and other activities that contribute to the health of the college?
- What role, if any, do faculty members other than the chair or program director have in determining program objectives or policy? How do they participate in governance, planning, and budgeting?
- What efforts are made to support and sustain new faculty as they advance toward continuing appointment?
- What effort is the program making to address the diversity of its faculty (e.g. gender, race, age, ethnicity, etc.)?
- How does the program ensure appropriate compliance related to mandated SUNY, state, and federal policies, including compliance training (i.e., “We Comply”) and timely submission of textbook orders?

Undergraduate Program

- How do the activities of the program contribute to the formation of the Potsdam Graduate?
• What innovations has the program initiated to enhance undergraduate education? How well has the program kept up with external changes in the discipline (e.g. new areas of research, technology)?

• In what ways does the program contribute to an integrated undergraduate curriculum across programs? What effort has been made by faculty (when appropriate) to encourage interdisciplinarity and applied learning? Other initiatives?

• How do the courses in this program contribute to the college’s General Education program? Are courses in this program part of any Learning Communities Program (i.e., FIGs)?

• How does the program support the institution’s Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion and access goals, including (a) the integration of varied perspectives in course content, (b) appropriate pedagogies for a range of learners, (c) use of Open Educational Resources or other strategies to help reduce the cost of attendance, and (d) strategies to recruit a diverse student body?

• For students in this program, what opportunities exist to engage in research and/or scholarly and creative activities? What proportion of undergraduate majors in this program are involved in research, creative, or scholarly activity?

• Does the program appropriately support the Information Literacy development of its students? Are students introduced to the creation, communication, and dissemination of knowledge in the discipline? Do students have opportunities to practice identification, retrieval, and evaluation of information resources in all formats using print and electronic tools? Do students practice ethical use of information?

• Does the program faculty collaborate effectively with the library faculty in selecting resources in support of the curriculum?

• How do the activities of program faculty contribute toward a more enriched undergraduate student experience at the college (e.g., department-sponsored clubs and/or travel, contributions to LoKo Arts Festival or the Learning and Research fair, etc.)? Describe any collaborations with student/residence life.

• What are the procedures for advising students in this program? How many faculty are directly involved in advising students in this program? Do college personnel who are not faculty members engage in advising students in this program? If so, who, and what is the rationale for that practice?

• How effective is academic advising for students in this program? Describe evidence of its effectiveness.

• By what procedures are (1) first-year-level courses in this program designed, and (2) faculty assigned to teach them?

• How does the program address curricular issues that impede students’ success and academic progress including courses with high Drop, Fail, Withdrawal (DFW) rates, “bottleneck” courses, and course scheduling?
• What are the special needs of transfer and non-traditional students in the program? How has the program and/or department met those needs?
• Does the program utilize graduate or undergraduate teaching assistants or student interns? If so, what are their specific responsibilities, and how are they trained, supervised, and compensated?
• Describe (1) any special student recruiting and retention efforts the program and/or department is involved in, and (2) the results of these efforts.

Additional questions for Graduate Programs

• 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 academic preparation 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 (1) academic advising, (2) supervision and evaluation of student progress through degree completion, and (3) assisting graduates in job placement? How does the department monitor and assess graduate student outcomes?

Assessment

• List the program’s clear, simple, and measurable program student learning outcomes. How does the program faculty communicate the program student learning outcomes to its students?
• How do the program faculty measure and assess the learning outcomes?
  o 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.
  o Indirect assessments include, but are not limited to, surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups.
• How does the program faculty use assessment data to make curricular and pedagogical enhancements?
• What process does the program use to review consistently low-enrollment courses? What actions have been taken as a result of this review?

Scholarship/Research/Professional Development

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

- What sources and levels of support exist to assist faculty in their scholarship, research, and professional development?
- Are faculty members familiar with, and do they take advantage of, professional development offered through the campus’ Center for Creative Instruction (CCI) and Office of Research and Sponsored Programs?

**Service**

- Describe how the program and/or department contributes in service to the college, faculty governance, and the wider community.

**Continuing Education and Other Activities (where applicable)**

- Describe the program faculty’s efforts in the following:
  o Continuing education
  o Summer session offerings
  o Winterim offerings
  o Off-campus courses
  o On-line courses
  o Evening and part-time programs
  o Study abroad or faculty-led courses
  o Lectures, symposia, or workshops available to the college community
- Describe collaborations with other programs and/or departments of the college.
- Describe advancement-oriented activities (i.e., fundraising and alumni development initiatives) in which the department or program is engaged.

**Resources and Facilities**

How satisfactory are the following provisions for the program’s needs and how (if needed) might they be made more satisfactory within the realistic context of current funding?

(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
Appendix B: Guide for Review Team

**Overall**

The report should answer the questions below as well as the specific review charge shared with you.

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

How do the program’s teaching and research foci compare with other similar programs and/or departments at comparable institutions? Does the program have a distinctive identity? In what areas is the program weak?

**Faculty**

- What is the overall quality of the faculty?
  - What is the quality of its teaching effectiveness and scholarship?
  - What is the extent and quality of the faculty members’ other current professional activities?
  - Which faculty members are outstanding in their specific scholarly areas?
  - Are significant areas of specialization inadequately represented relative to any instructional needs?
  - Are there areas of available faculty expertise that might be more fully utilized?
  - Do the faculty’s teaching and administrative responsibilities leave sufficient time for scholarship?

- Is the faculty adequately diverse (e.g., gender, race, age, ethnicity, etc.)?

- How effective is the instruction?
  - How does the program address courses with persistently high levels of Drop, Fail, Withdrawal (DFW) rates?
  - How do students rate the teaching in the program?
  - To what extent are high impact practices, including student research and applied learning, regularly incorporated into the program?
  - To what extent does the faculty utilize the professional development offered through the CCI to continuously improve their instructional practices?

- How successful is the faculty in generating funding for research, facilities, and equipment? How do the levels of available funding compare with those of comparable departments or programs in the same discipline? Describe the mix of funding sources (e.g., federal agencies, corporate, private, and on-campus sources).

- What are the credentials of the members of the adjunct or part-time faculty? Is the program’s use of that faculty appropriate?

- What is the current state of faculty relationships within the department/unit?
  - Is there consensus within the program about its goals and policies?
o Is programmatic and or departmental leadership effective?
o Are burdens, responsibilities, rewards, and privileges equitably distributed?
o Are junior faculty members’ interests respected?
o Are compensation levels, teaching loads, and working conditions equitable?
o Does the program have difficulty retaining faculty, and/or is that a potential problem? If it is a problem, what do you believe is causing the problem?

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

• How is the teaching of faculty members (including adjunct and part time members) assessed, and what sort of mentoring and support is provided (if any)?

• Is the total number of full-time faculty members sufficient to support the needs of untenured faculty and to establish a robust community of scholars? If not, what recommendations can be offered for restructuring the program/department?

Undergraduate Program

• How does the character and quality of the undergraduate major and minor programs compare with those at similar institutions?
  o What, if anything, is distinctive about them?
  o How well do they prepare students for graduate study?
  o How well do they prepare students for teaching in the schools?
  o How well do they prepare students for other occupations related to the field?

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

• How effectively is the program incorporating the institution’s strategic goals related to Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion?
  o How are the needs of diverse learners being met in the classroom?
  o How does the curriculum reflect a diversity in and respect for varied perspectives, cultures, and backgrounds?
  o How are the faculty enhancing access to a wide range of learners?

• How large is the program’s instructional responsibility in the form of service courses to the college? Service courses are courses required by one program but housed in another department and reserved for students from that first program (e.g., General Education requirements for certifications, and requirements for other programs).
  o To what extent are undergraduate course offerings utilized by non-majors?
  o How effective are these service courses?

• How effectively do faculty utilize appropriate technologies within instruction (e.g., Moodle, online, Open Educational Resources, hybrid, video capture, etc.)?
• How effective are the faculty and staff in supporting the institution’s goals with recruitment and retention?
  o What new initiatives/strategies are being used to recruit and retain students?
  o What are the data indicating related to enrollment trends over time, and how are the faculty responding to these trends?
  o How are faculty using data to inform them regarding program revision or new programs to attract students and prepare them for success beyond graduation?

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

Additional Questions for Graduate Programs

• How does the character and quality of the graduate program, including its curriculum and degree requirements, compare with those at similar institutions?
  o What, if anything, is distinctive about it?
  o How well does it prepare students for research, teaching, and non-academic careers?

• How does the academic preparation of graduate students compare with those at similar institutions?
  o How rigorous are admissions standards?
  o How effective are recruiting methods?
  o How might they be improved?

• How effective is the advising system?
  o How helpful are faculty in directing student research?
  o What, if anything, is done to foster a scholarly community of faculty and graduate students within the department?
  o How does faculty advising impact 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, studios, 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 or deteriorating?

• Is the secretarial, clerical, and technical support staff adequate to the needs of the programs and faculty?
• 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.

• To what extent does the faculty utilize the services and professional development offered by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs? Are faculty regularly taking advantage of internal funding/grants to support their research and scholarly activities?

**General Conclusions**

• What are the areas of distinction as they relate to the program, faculty/staff, and students?

• How effective is the program in aligning with the strategic goals of the department and the institution?

• How effective is the program in recruiting and retaining students? What do the data indicate regarding short- and long-range enrollment trends, and how are the faculty responding to these trends?

• How well does the program distribute its interest, energies, and resources among advising, individual research, collaborative research, college service, and governance? Are its efforts skewed disproportionately in one direction? Is the program making the best possible use of its resources?

• How does the program fare in comparison with its peer programs in similar institutions? What is unique about the department or program?

• Are there important steps that should be taken to maintain and/or to improve the program’s quality?
## Appendix C: A Quick Guide to Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitae</td>
<td>Faculty</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 5 years (additions/deletions, rationale)</td>
<td>Banner data, Department Files, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Profile Trends</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/departmentprofile">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/departmentprofile</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Enrollment Trends (5 yr.)</td>
<td>Course Enrollment Trends Report (see below: IE resources for self-study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors/Minors</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Student Fact Book (look for the “Degrees Granted” section under each year) <a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/studentfactbook">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/studentfactbook</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation Summaries</td>
<td>Department Files/Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT Scores, HS average</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention/Persistence rates by major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Ethnicity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats">http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/statistics/majorstats</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Employment &amp; 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, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Mission Statement (if available)</td>
<td>Departmental Files, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Bylaws (if available)</td>
<td>Departmental Files, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Handbooks (if applicable)</td>
<td>Departmental Files, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board Members</td>
<td>Departmental Files, Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Diversity, Equity, &amp; Inclusion Strategic Plan [<a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/about/administrative-offices/division-diversity-equity-and-inclusion">https://www.potsdam.edu/about/administrative-offices/division-diversity-equity-and-inclusion</a> стратегический план]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Strategic Plan</td>
<td><a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/about/leadership/provost-academic-affairs/plans-and-goals">https://www.potsdam.edu/about/leadership/provost-academic-affairs/plans-and-goals</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Potsdam Strategic Plan</td>
<td><a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/sites/default/files/strategicplan18.pdf">https://www.potsdam.edu/sites/default/files/strategicplan18.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These links may break as plans are updated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Diversity, Equity, &amp; Inclusion (DEI) plan can be found through the DEI website, the Academic Affairs plan through the Provost’s website, and the campus plan through the President’s website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drop, Fail, Withdrawal (DFW) rates</strong></td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research; Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerous Navigate Reports</strong></td>
<td>Navigate has many reports that may provide useful information to departments completing the self-study process. Consider the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grad Rate by Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GPA &amp; Predicted Support Level by Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• # of Students with Missed Success Indicators by Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avg GPA for Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attempted &amp; Earned Credit Completion by Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population Dashboard for Majors: Academic Performance, Academic Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institution Reports: Course Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grad Rates by Student Attribute, Grade Earned, Credit Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Progress Report for Students Flagged at Risk, by Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Resources for Self-Study

IE Webpage – **Campus Statistics – Academic Department Profile (Trends)**
Provides five-year trends of academic department statistics. The data include: Academic Credits Generated, Student and Faculty FTE Generated, Number of Majors and Minors Student/Faculty Ratios.

IE Webpage – **Campus Statistics – The Academic Major Stats**
Fall data only. Spring data available upon request.

The Academic Major Stats provide data organized by age, gender, and ethnicity within major. Included is average high school GPA, rank, average test scores, and average transfer GPA by major. Also included is a one-year persistence report within major. The methodology used for the one-year persistence report within major is described in the retention methodology documentation.

- Persistence Report – shows the number of students who enrolled in your major for a specific term and then the percent who either returned or graduated from your major or from Potsdam.
- Gender and Ethnicity – shows the race/ethnicity and gender of students for specific majors/minors/concentrations.
- Average Cumulative GPA – shows cumulative GPA for students within specific major/minor/concentrations.
- Average High School & Test Scores – shows the average test scores and high school average for specific major/minor/concentrations.
- Average Transfer GPA – shows average transfer GPA of students in specific major/minor/concentrations.
- Age – request from IE office.

IE Webpage – **Campus Statistics – Student Fact Book**
Find the Degrees Granted Data at the link listed below. You will have to go to each fall term and click on the “Degrees Granted” link for each year that you need.

**To get Course enrollments, use BearPAWS.**
Login to BearPAWS and click on the Administrator and Staff Reports page. On that page, towards the bottom, click the option called "Subject Enrollment." Pick a term, click submit. Choose Subject Enrollment Setup, and select "Download Report into Excel." Enter the subject area you need.

Finally, click "Begin Subject Enrollment Report/Download." Once the download is complete, you may find the report downloaded at the bottom of your screen OR you may get a prompt asking what you want to do with the file. If you get the prompt, open the file. It will ask you if you want to open the file even though the extension does not match; click yes and you will have the excel file. (See sample below)
If you get a download at the bottom of your screen, then you can just click on that document to open it. Again, you might get a notice asking if you really want to open it; just click on yes.
## Appendix D: Program Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Involved Personnel</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year prior to SSDD Due Date (SSDD):</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic Assessment Coordinator, and Department Chair</td>
<td>Associate Dean notifies Department Chair of the due date for the upcoming Assessment Report and updated Assessment Plan. Depending on the schedule posted at <a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/academicassessment/cycle">https://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/academicassessment/cycle</a>, these documents will be due either the semester prior to the due date of the Self-Study, or during the same semester as the Self-Study. The Assessment Report and Updated Assessment Plan are always due on October 1st of the scheduled year. If they are due in the same semester as the Self-Study, it is essential to complete them prior to the Self-Study—as they will inform the writing of the Self-Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of appropriate school (Arts &amp; Sciences, School of Education and Professional Studies, or Crane) and Department Chair</td>
<td>Associate Dean notifies Department Chair of upcoming Self-Study and due date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair and primary writer</td>
<td>Department Chair appoints primary writer (faculty member) of the Self-Study document. Because the primary writer typically receives a course reassignment, planning ahead will help with workload/teaching assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months prior to SSDD</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator and Department Chair</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator sends follow-up reminder to Department Chair about the due date for the Assessment Report and Updated Assessment Plan and the SSDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair, faculty, Dean, &amp; Provost</td>
<td>Department chair, faculty, Dean, &amp; Provost examine (a) most recent external report and/or reaccreditation report and (b) current issues in the department and relevant changes in the discipline to determine whether there are special issues that should be addressed and to inform the structure of the upcoming Self-Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary writer, Department Chair, faculty, secretary, &amp; Director of Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
<td>Department Chair, secretary, and faculty gather data/documents that are listed in the SUNY Potsdam Guidelines for Academic Program Review under: <a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/academicassessment/cycle">Appendix C: A Quick Guide to Sources</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary writer and faculty</td>
<td>Primary writer and faculty begin the research/writing process for the Self-Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First week of semester of SSDD</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator and Department Chair</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator sends follow-up reminder to Department Chair about the due date for the Assessment Report and Updated Assessment Plan and the SSDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 weeks prior to SSDD</td>
<td>Primary writer, Department Chair, and faculty</td>
<td>Primary writer distributes draft of completed Self-Study to faculty/staff in the department for review and feedback. Two weeks are allotted for feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week prior to SSDD</td>
<td>Primary writer, Department Chair and faculty</td>
<td>Department Chair and faculty return all feedback on Self-Study draft to primary writer. Primary writer makes appropriate edits in Self-Study document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSDD – last day of final exam week</td>
<td>Primary writer, Dean, Provost, &amp; Department Chair</td>
<td>Primary writer delivers electronic copy of Self-Study to Provost, Dean, Associate Dean, secretary to the Dean, Department Chair, and department secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days after SSDD</td>
<td>Provost, Dean, Department Chair, and primary writer</td>
<td>The Provost and/or Dean request of the Department Chair and primary writer, any required revisions of the Self-Study before it is released to the reviewers. If revisions are not requested within 30 days, it will be assumed that revisions are unnecessary. If revisions are necessary, the primary writer will make changes as soon as possible and resubmit them to the Dean and/or Provost for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary writer, Department Chair, faculty, Dean, and review team members</td>
<td>After consultation with faculty, Department Chair submits a list of potential reviewers to the Dean. Submitted names will include internal/on-campus reviewers and external reviewers. The Department Chair may need to submit names more than once, depending on the Dean’s approval or lack thereof. After approval, the Department Chair obtains commitments from the review team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair, department secretary, and Arts &amp; Sciences secretary</td>
<td>Department secretary and Dean’s secretary consult on potential dates for the site visit based on availability of the Dean, Provost, and other college representatives selected by the Provost, all of whom should be available during the site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 days after SSDD</td>
<td>Primary writer, Department Chair and faculty, and Dean</td>
<td>Dean approves of final review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 days after SSDD</td>
<td>Department Chair, Arts &amp; Sciences secretary, and review team members</td>
<td>Department Chair invites reviewers. In consultation with the Arts &amp; Sciences secretary, dates for the site visit are set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Site Visit**

| Review team members have committed | Department Chair, department secretary, and Arts & Sciences secretary | Dean’s secretary sets up “charge” and “exit” meetings. Dept. secretary sends letters to stakeholders to participate and sets up all other meetings; also Dept. secretary arranges travel, hotel and meals. Refer |
to SUNY Potsdam Guidelines for Academic Program Review for recommended meetings and participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 month prior to site visit</td>
<td>Department Chair and Review Team</td>
<td>Department Chair emails electronic document of Self-Study to review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During site visit</td>
<td>Provost, Dean, Department Chair, faculty, students, and Review Team</td>
<td>All participate in site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month after site visit</td>
<td>Review Team and Dean</td>
<td>Review team leader delivers Site Visit Report to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon receipt of Site Visit Report</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean forwards copies of Site Visit Report to Provost and Department Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks after receipt of Site Visit Report</td>
<td>Department Chair, faculty, and department secretary</td>
<td>Department Chair and faculty discuss the Site Visit Report and determine the department’s issues and priorities to be addressed, based on the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month after receipt of Site Visit Report</td>
<td>Dean &amp; Department Chair</td>
<td>Dean &amp; Department Chair meet to discuss issues and priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 months after receipt of Site Visit Report | Provost, Dean, Associate Dean, & Department Chair, and faculty             | (a) Department Chair, Dean, Associate Dean, and Provost create an Action Plan—a description of planned actions in pursuit of improvement and an appropriate time frame and commitment of resources.  
(b) Department Chair shares the Action Plan with the faculty. Members of the academic program begin to develop and implement the Action Plan. |

**Mid-Cycle Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester prior to Mid-Cycle Review</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator, Associate Dean, &amp; Department Chair.</td>
<td>Academic Assessment Coordinator reminds Department Chair of next Assessment Report, Updated Assessment Plan, and Mid-Cycle Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st week of semester</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic Assessment Coordinator, and Department Chair</td>
<td>Associate Dean informs Department Chair of upcoming Mid-Cycle Review and sets up date for review/discussion. Associate Dean and Department Chair define a due date for the updated Assessment Report and updated Assessment Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester of the Mid-Cycle Review</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Dean, and Department Chair</td>
<td>Mid-Cycle Review meeting is held to discuss the updated Assessment Report, updated Assessment Plan, and the progress still needed to fulfill the Action Plan based on site-visit recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- *Department Chair* may also be known as the *Program Coordinator*, as appropriate to the program under review.  
- *Faculty* refers to the faculty and staff of the program under review.  
- *Dean and Associate Dean* refer to the administrators of the school in which the program under review is housed.