



Program Review Handbook

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Self-Study Report Guidelines	4
Section I – Department Description	4
Section II – Program Description	5
Section III – Program Mission, Goals, and Learning Outcomes	6
Section IV – Assessment	7
Section V – Undergraduate and Graduate Students	7
Section VI – Faculty and Staff	8
Section VII – Support, Resources, and Facilities	10
Section VIII – Conclusion.....	11
List of Appendices to Include in the Self-Study Report	11
Site Visit Guidelines	12
Overview.....	12
The Charge.....	12
Selection and Composition of the Review Team.....	13
Site Visit Arrangements	13
Site Visit Report	14
Action Plan Guidelines	15
Appendices	17
Appendix 1: Program Review Timeline	17
Appendix 2: Information Sources	19
Appendix 3: Guide for Reviewers	21
Appendix 4: Action Plan Template	25
Appendix 5: Annual Meeting Notes Template	26

Introduction

This handbook is intended for programs that are not accredited by an external disciplinary accreditor. Non-externally accredited programs participate in a **Program Review** process on a 7-year cycle, as per [SUNY](#) and [Middle States](#) requirements [Standard 3.8].

Program Review consists of 3 parts: a **Self-Study Report**, a **site visit** (either virtual or in person) by an external review team, and an **Action Plan**. The Program Review process is intended to foster academic excellence and to assist the College in planning and allocating resources. This Handbook is designed to help you complete all 3 parts of the Program Review process.

Please note that a **department** and a **program** are not identical entities. A **department** houses and administers a program(s), while a **program** is an academic course of study that leads to a degree or a transcriptable certificate. Some aspects of the Self-Study Report are **department** specific, and some are **program** specific.

Programs must adhere to the Program Review [schedule](#) established by each Dean and the Campus Assessment Committee (CAC). Occasionally, under extraordinary circumstances, a program may need to request an extension of their Program Review due dates.¹ This process begins with a written appeal to the Dean no later than 6 months before the original due date and includes a description of the circumstances and a clear proposal for a reasonable new due date. If the Dean determines that an extension is warranted, he or she moves the request, in writing, to the Provost. If the Provost grants the extension, he or she notifies, in writing, the Dean, the CAC Chair, and the Department Chair. The CAC Chair adjusts the Program Review schedule and archives the request documents.

¹ Please note that extensions create gaps in the Program Review process that can potentially jeopardize our campus accreditation. As such, extensions will be granted only for emergencies. Programs that are granted extensions must work with the CAC to get back on track with their Program Review.

Self-Study Report Guidelines

This section is designed to help you create your Self-Study Report, which is the first part of the Program Review process. The Self-Study Report informs both your faculty and the external review team about important aspects and overall health of your department and program(s).

Process Overview

To ensure broad faculty and staff involvement, the Department Chair will inform program faculty and staff of the upcoming review and solicit input from them regarding the overall review of the program as well as any identified review priorities. The Chair—and/or an appointed designee—will be responsible for collecting pertinent information and documents and writing the Self-Study Report.

Upon completion of the Self-Study Report draft, the Department Chair will give program faculty and staff at least 3 weeks to read the draft and provide input. Although the Self-Study Report is meant to represent a diversity of views, anyone wishing to provide a minority view on materials or conclusions may add one as a signed statement at the end of the appendices.

Then, the Department Chair will provide copies of the Self-Study Report draft to the Provost and the Dean, who will have 30 days to review the draft Report before releasing it to the review team. The Provost or Dean may require revision of the draft Report; if revisions are not requested within 30 days, it will be assumed that revisions are unnecessary. See Appendix 1 of this Program Review Handbook for a detailed timeline of the Program Review process.

Report Content and Organization

The Self-Study Report comprises 2 parts: (1) a narrative organized into 8 sections, and (2) appendices with relevant data. You must download and use the Program Review Self-Study Template available [here](#). For a list of data sources, see Appendix 2 of this Program Review Handbook.

The narrative must follow the outline below and 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. The Report should not exceed 20 pages in length, excluding attached appendices, although up to 15 additional pages will be allowed if the Report includes more than 1 program.

Section I – Department Description²

- A. Include your latest Department Profile page and briefly reflect on the data, including 5-year trends in enrollment and student/faculty ratios, and credit hour production.
- B. Describe advising, special student support services, and orientation/retention activities that your department provides.
 1. What are the procedures for advising students in your department? How many department faculty are directly involved in advising students? Do college personnel who are not department faculty members engage in advising students in this department? If so, who, and what is the rationale for that practice? [Middle States S4.1c]

² See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

2. How effective is academic advising for students in this department? Provide evidence of its effectiveness. [Middle States S4.6]
 3. What special student recruiting and retention efforts is your department involved in, and can you determine the results of these efforts? If so, describe those results. [Middle States S5.3]
 4. Describe how your department engages students in high-impact practices, including applied learning, service learning, and research.
 5. Describe your department's contributions to campus health and wellness efforts.
 6. Describe how your department helps students utilize campus job placement resources, and how you determine the results of these efforts. [Middle States S5.2b]
- C. In Appendix A of your Self-Study Report, provide relevant bylaws and department strategic plans. Describe any changes you made to these bylaws and/or strategic plans since the last Self-Study Report, and the process for making those changes.
- D. In Appendix B of your Self-Study Report, list the major professional activities sponsored by your department since your last Self-Study Report (e.g., special colloquia, conferences, seminars, workshops).

Section II – Program Description^{3,4}

- A. Provide a link to your program's [catalog](#) description. This is a good time to check that description to ensure it meets the following requirements: [Middle States S3.3]
1. reflects your most current changes
 2. specifies the degree requirements for your program
 3. describes the curriculum sequence and prerequisite patterns
- B. Briefly describe recent or proposed changes to your program, including but not limited to, new tracks or different modalities (e.g., on-line, hybrid), and information about the process for making these changes, including the stakeholders you consulted and the assessment data motivating these changes. [Middle States S5.3]
- C. Describe the distinctiveness of your program (include comparisons with other SUNY programs as appropriate).
- D. In Appendix C of your Self-Study Report, provide a copy of your program curriculum map. In a brief narrative, describe the congruence between course and program goals and explain the balance between your program's curricular breadth and depth, informed by the curricular map and any specific disciplinary standards.

³ Program specific; repeat this section as needed for each program in your department.

⁴ See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

E. In Appendix D of your Self-Study Report, use the chart below to identify all program-specific courses (requirements and electives within the program) taught since your last Self-Study Report.

Courses taught that contribute to your program						
Course	Semester & year ^a	Major only ^b	GenEd designator ^c	Service ^d	Distribution requirement ^e	DEI attribute ^f

- ^a List all semesters & years taught.
- ^b Indicate with an X if the course is only open to students in the major.
- ^c If a General Education course, identify the designator.
- ^d List those programs outside your program that require the course as part of their curriculum.
- ^e List those programs outside your program for which the course fulfills a distribution requirement.
- ^f Indicate with an X if the course has the DEI attribute.

F. In Appendix E of your Self-Study Report, use the chart below to identify all courses taught by your department’s faculty since your last Self-Study Report that are not requirements or electives for your program(s) (i.e., courses that are only General Education courses or requirements for another program).

Extra-departmental courses taught by departmental faculty				
Course	Semester & year ^a	GenEd course ^b	Service ^c	DEI attribute ^d

- ^a List all semesters & years taught.
- ^b Include WAYS and General Education designator courses (identify the designator).
- ^c List those programs outside your program that require the course as part of their curriculum.
- ^d Indicate with an X if the course has the DEI attribute.

Section III – Program Mission, Goals, and Learning Outcomes^{5,6}

- A. State the overarching mission of your program. You can copy this from your program’s webpage. If this webpage does not include your program’s mission statement, you should put it there now.
 1. If your program does not have its own mission and instead has adopted the department’s mission, describe how your program aligns with the department’s mission and goals.
 2. Provide the date when you last reviewed your mission. Describe the process for assessing and updating the mission, including the stakeholders you consulted.

- B. List the goals and objectives associated with your mission. If you have listed your program’s goals and objectives on your program’s website, provide a link to that website (this is a good time to ensure the accuracy of your posted goals and objectives).

⁵ Program specific; repeat this section as needed for each program in your department.

⁶ See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

- C. List your Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs). You may copy these from your program’s webpage or from your current Assessment Plan (this is a good time to ensure the text is identical in both places).
- D. Describe the methods used to ensure comparable learning outcomes among multiple sections of a course (e.g., common syllabi, common assignments and examinations, peer observations).

Section IV – Assessment^{7,8}

- A. How does your program communicate its PSLOs to its students? Provide specific examples, including when these communications occur, and the format(s) used. Who is responsible for these communications?
- B. Briefly summarize how you have used assessment data to improve student learning in your program. Provide supporting examples. You can mine your annual PSLO Assessment Reports for this information. [Middle States S5.3]
- C. Briefly describe how you assess the assessment process—how your program engages in the “assessment loop.” What process do you use to review PSLOs, and who engages in that process? When and how do you assess the effectiveness of your performance criteria? [Middle States S5.5]
- D. In Appendix F of your Self-Study Report, provide your current PSLO Assessment Plan and most recent PSLO Assessment Report.

Section V – Undergraduate and Graduate Students^{7,8}

- A. Enrollment Trends
 - 1. Reflect on the demographic composition of your students. Does this composition reflect that of the campus? If not, what strategies is the program using, or planning to use, to address any inequities?
 - 2. What is your program’s enrollment trend over the past 5 years?
 - 3. What factors contribute to changes in enrollment (if applicable)?
 - 4. How are your program faculty addressing these changes (if applicable)?
 - 5. Reflect on any changes of the first-year retention rates in your program.
 - 6. How is your program identifying and addressing courses with a high number of withdrawals and grades less than 2.0?
 - 7. What process does your program use to identify and track low-enrolled courses? What are you doing to address consistently low-enrolled courses?
 - 8. Reflect on how well you prepare graduates in a manner consistent with your mission for successful careers, meaningful lives, and further education. [Middle States S5.2b]

⁷ Program specific; repeat this section as needed for each program in your department.

⁸ See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

B. Characteristics of students

1. In Appendix G of your Self-Study Report, provide available 5-year trend data (unless otherwise requested) concerning the academic profile of undergraduate majors and minors (or graduate students if you are writing a Self-Study Report for a graduate program), including: [Middle States S5.3]
 - Trend Undergraduate Enrollment by First Major
 - Trend Undergraduate Enrollment by All Majors
 - Trend Graduate Enrollment by Major (if applicable)
 - Trend Enrollment by Minor
 - First year retention rate for majors
 - Persistence rate for majors
 - Gender and ethnicity
 - Average cumulative GPA of majors
 - Average High School GPA of majors
 - Average GPA of students transferring into your program
 - 3-year course summaries that include the number of students earning grades less than 2.0 and Withdrawals
 - as appropriate, other relevant student characteristics (e.g., age composition if the program supports a significant non-traditional population)
2. In Appendix H of your Self-Study Report, provide information on students that graduated over the past 5 years, including: [Middle States S5.2b]
 - Trend Degrees Granted by Major
 - a representative list of the positions and places of employment
 - as appropriate, a list of students accepted into graduate school, including the institution and program
 - other achievements, including awards, publications, or exemplary community service, if available

Section VI – Faculty and Staff^{9,10}

A. Faculty characteristics, effectiveness, engagement, recruitment, and retention

1. What procedures do you use to evaluate the quality and rigor of instruction? [Middle States S3.2a]
2. What procedures do you use to evaluate scholarly/creative and professional activities?
3. How do your program faculty incorporate strategies for a range of learners, including non-traditional students and those from diverse backgrounds?

⁹ Program or department specific; repeat this section as needed for each program in your department, unless the faculty are nearly identical for each program, in which case you can just complete this section once for the entire department.

¹⁰ See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

4. Describe your program faculty's efforts in the following:
 - Summer session offerings
 - Winterim offerings
 - Honors courses
 - off-campus courses (e.g., Riverview Correctional Fac., Jefferson Comm. College)
 - on-line courses
 - tutorials
 - study abroad or faculty-led courses
 - supervised student research
 - supervised internships
 - College in High School liaison relationships
5. What role, if any, do faculty members other than the Chair or program coordinator have in determining program objectives or policy? How do they participate in governance, planning, and budgeting?
6. What efforts are made to support and sustain new faculty as they advance toward continuing appointment? [Middle States S3.2d]
7. What efforts are made to support and sustain adjunct faculty (if your program uses adjuncts)? What proportion of the faculty are full-time compared to adjunct? [Middle States S3.2d]
8. What effort is your program making to increase the diversity of its faculty (e.g., gender, race, age, ethnicity)?
9. What role, if any, do faculty members have in campus leadership positions?
10. In Appendix I of your Self-Study Report, provide updated faculty CVs that are in a clear format and include the following: [Middle States S3.2b]
 - faculty member's rank and tenure status
 - educational and employment background
 - courses taught (past 5 years)
 - disciplinary area
 - service to the College and community
 - professional affiliations and activities
 - awards and honors
 - publications, presentations or performances, and descriptions of current scholarly projects
 - external funding, including applications submitted but not awarded
11. In Appendix J of your Self-Study Report, complete the full-time faculty composition chart below for each program in this self-study. (Note: get this information from Human Resources; do not ask faculty, and do not include individuals' names.)

Full-time faculty composition			
Rank	Gender/ Gender Identity	Race	Years at Potsdam ^a

^a Include only the number of years at SUNY Potsdam in a full-time faculty position.

- B. In Appendix K of your Self-Study Report, provide your program’s faculty handbook. If the faculty handbook does not include a description of how faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure, then add that description to this section. [Middle States S3.2e]
1. Describe any changes made to the faculty handbook since the last self-study, and the process used for making those changes.
- C. In Appendix L of your Self-Study Report, list your program’s other professional and support staff and briefly describe their roles and responsibilities.
1. Is the secretarial, clerical, and technical support staff adequate to the needs of your program and its faculty?
- D. In Appendix M of your Self-Study Report, summarize personnel changes (faculty and staff) since your last program self-study.

Section VII – Support, Resources, and Facilities^{11,12}

- A. List all external and internal grants (e.g., LoCAL) applied for since your last self-study, including the funding source, amount requested and received, and Principal Investigator.
1. How do these funds support students’ experiences in your program?
 2. How does this work align with your program’s mission and goals?
- B. Briefly describe how your program has engaged with the College Foundation in support of your program’s mission and goals.
1. List the funds received and how you used them.
 2. Describe how the funds directly supported students’ experiences in the program and/or program innovation and improvement.
- C. Describe the program’s efforts related to student recruitment.
1. Besides the campus-wide recruitment events organized through the Office of Admissions, what innovative strategies has the program employed to attract new students into the program?
 2. How has the program used other stakeholders, including alumni and/or advisory boards, to support recruitment efforts?

¹¹ Program or department specific; repeat this section as needed for each program in your department, unless the support, resources, and facilities are nearly identical for each program, in which case you can just complete this section once for the entire department.

¹² See Appendix 2 (Information Sources) of this Program Review Handbook.

- D. Describe program facilities on and off campus (offices, internet capacity, class labs, research labs, graduate assistantships, and fellowships, etc.).
- E. Describe the amount and types of resources and facilities needed to accommodate present and anticipated program changes/developments and/or enrollment growth.
- F. In Appendix N of your Self-Study Report, describe the nature, extent, and adequacy of library holdings and access to digital equivalents in the program's field (this information should be requested from the Library(ies)).

Section VIII – Conclusion¹³

- A. Summarize the strengths, weaknesses, and major achievements of your program(s).
- B. Comment on any discrepancies between the “ideal” and the “current,” as they were conceived and as they actually are operating, with consideration of any current fiscal realities or other external constraints on the program(s).
- C. Include a prioritized list of goals for your department to work towards over the next 7 years. Specify any necessary resources to realize each goal.

List of Appendices to Include in the Self-Study Report

- A. Your department's bylaws and/or strategic plans
- B. Major professional activities sponsored by your department
- C. Curriculum map
- D. Chart of program-specific courses
- E. Chart of extra-departmental courses taught by departmental faculty
- F. Current PSLO Assessment Plan and the most recent PSLO Assessment Report
- G. Academic profile of undergraduate majors and minors (or graduate, if applicable)
- H. Information on students that graduated over the past 5 years
- I. Updated CVs of full-time faculty
- J. Chart of full-time faculty composition
- K. Program's faculty handbook
- L. Roles and responsibilities of program support staff
- M. Summary of personnel changes since last program self-study
- N. The nature, extent, and adequacy of library holdings and access to digital equivalents in the program's field

¹³ Department specific (i.e., include all programs within the department).

Site Visit Guidelines

This section is designed to help you arrange your site visit, which is the second part of the Program Review process. The site visit is performed by an external review team who evaluates important aspects and overall health of your program(s).

Overview

Site visits will generally be virtual, although some programs may request an on-site visit if the physical facilities and/or live performances are important aspects of the program.

The external team will comprise 1 external reviewer and 1 internal (SUNY Potsdam) reviewer (see below for more information on the selection of the reviewers).

Assistant Deans (or their designees) must request funding for the review team, in writing, to the Provost (cc'ing the Department Chair) no later than 18 months before the scheduled site visit. Site visit schedules are included in the posted Program Review [schedules](#).

The Charge

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, either in-person or virtually:

- Assess the accuracy of the Self-Study Report
- Meet with faculty and students separately¹⁴
 - to understand their perspectives on the program, particularly in relation to strengths, opportunities, and challenges
 - to understand how the program supports students' post-graduation success
 - to understand how assessment is used to improve student learning and program quality
 - to identify future priorities as they align with the strategic missions of the School and College
- Assess the facilities, particularly those that are program-specific
- 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 College

In this work, the review team will start with the findings and questions provided in the Self-Study Report. The review team may also request information from the College before the visit.

¹⁴ The meeting with faculty should have no members of the administration present and the meeting with students should have no faculty present. The review team can also request a separate meeting with only untenured faculty.

Selection and Composition of the Review Team

The review team shall consist of 2 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.¹⁵

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 week 4 of the semester before 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 week 6 of the semester before the site visit.

When choosing review team members, consider the following:

- To ensure fairness and impartiality, 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 conflicts of interest, the department and the Dean will vet potential reviewers.
- Please consider external reviewers who work at a fellow SUNY institution because they offer the benefit of proximity and are 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 for site visits, whether virtual or in person:

1. The initial meeting should include the review team, the Dean, and/or other campus staff so the review team may formally receive its charge.
2. Other meetings include:
 - Students
 - Program faculty (tenured, untenured, and adjuncts, as available)
 - Group or individual meetings, as appropriate
 - Department Chair/Program Coordinator
 - Stakeholders, as appropriate, such as:
 - Director of Graduate Studies
 - Director of Honors Program
 - Computing & Technology Services
 - Director of General Education

¹⁵ If more than 1 program housed within a single department is under review, please try to choose external members of the review team who represent the different programs (should resources allow).

- 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
3. The review team will be given time to begin preparing an initial draft or outline of their report. The team can then use the report draft as the basis for their initial evaluation to be given at the exit interview.
 4. The review team ends the site visit with an exit interview with the Provost, Dean, Chair/program coordinator, and other college representatives selected by the Provost.

In those rare instances when an in-person visit is implemented, the following should also be considered:

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

Site Visit Report

The review team submits a final written report to the Dean, normally within 4 weeks of the team's visit. The external reviewer chairs the team and assumes responsibility for preparing the written report. This report is a crucial element of the College's evaluation of the program and must be objective, accurate, and specific. The review team should use the Self-Study Report, the Guide for Reviewers (Appendix 3 of this Program Review Handbook), and the charge given to them (received both in writing with the Self-Study Report 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.

Action Plan Guidelines

This section is designed to help you create an Action Plan, which is the third part of the Program Review process. The Action Plan is based on the findings in the Site Visit Report and focuses on important aspects and overall health of your program(s).

Overview

The Action Plan includes a description of planned actions in pursuit of improvement, who is responsible for each action, an appropriate time frame, suggested resources, and a plan to evaluate the efficacy of the actions.

Process

1. Setting Goals

Upon receiving the Site Visit Report, the Dean will forward copies to the Provost and the Department Chair/program coordinator. As appropriate, findings from the Report will be incorporated into programmatic planning (e.g., curriculum improvements, integration with campus DEI priorities, strategies to enhance student recruitment/retention) and School and College planning (e.g., faculty and administrative support). To this end, the Dean and Assistant Dean meet with the Department Chair/program coordinator soon after the receipt of the Report to discuss goals, priorities, and any necessary resources.

2. Action Plan

This consultation process will result in the creation of an Action Plan by the Department Chair, Dean, and Assistant Dean (Appendix 4 of this Program Review Handbook; a template is available [here](#)). This Action Plan should be completed within 2 months of receiving the Site Visit Report. When developing the Action Plan, Department Chairs/program coordinators are encouraged to consult program faculty and staff to ensure a collaborative and transparent planning process. The Action Plan includes a description of planned actions in pursuit of a limited and realistic number of high-priority goals, an appropriate time frame, who is responsible for each action, suggested resources, and a plan to evaluate if the improvements are effective. Requests related to resources should include how program faculty and staff can be involved in identifying and securing new sources of funding (e.g., external grants, Foundation) and must reflect the current fiscal realities of the College.

The Dean and Department Chair present the proposed Action Plan to the Provost, who shares it with President's Council division heads as appropriate (potentially including Business Affairs; College Advancement; Communications; and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion). They review the proposed Action Plan for alignment with College goals and programmatic and financial sustainability, and provide suggested changes if needed. If changes are warranted, the Department Chair will complete a final Action Plan, which will be submitted to the Dean and Provost and shared with the department/program faculty.

3. Annual Review of Progress

When Department Chairs meet annually with their Dean, they will discuss the program's progress with the Action Plan, identify areas where faculty and staff can improve in terms of meeting stated goals, and

ways the Dean's office can support implementation of the Action Plan. The Dean's office will document these meetings using the Annual Meeting Notes template (Appendix 5 of this Program Review Handbook; a template is available [here](#)) and will send copies to the Department Chair and Provost. The Provost will respond to each recommendation made by the Dean and return the updated Annual Meeting Notes to the Dean and Department Chair.

At an annual state-of-the-school meeting, the Dean and Provost will discuss the Action Plan and its feasibility. The Dean and Provost will move forward, as appropriate, with program development support, budget allocation requests, and human/financial resources.

Action Plans are complete once the relevant changes are implemented and evaluated. At this point, the Chair may propose a new Action Plan to address additional goals identified during the program review process.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Program Review Timeline

When	Personnel Involved	Action
18 months before Self-Study	Assistant Dean or designee, Provost, Department Chair	Assistant Dean or designee requests, in writing, funding for review team from the Provost and cc's the Department Chair.
1 year before Self-Study Due Date (SSDD): The Self-Study must be submitted to the Dean and Provost no later than the last day of final exams in the semester it is due.	Assistant Dean, Department Chair	Assistant Dean notifies Department Chair of upcoming SSDD and reviews program review process.
	Department Chair, primary writer	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.
6 months before SSDD	Department Chair, faculty, Dean, Provost	Department Chair, faculty, Dean, and Provost examine (a) the Site Visit Report from the prior Program Review, and (b) current issues in the department and relevant changes in the discipline to determine whether any special issues should be addressed and to inform the structure of the upcoming Self-Study.
	Department Chair, faculty, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Human Resources	Department Chair and faculty gather data/documents listed in the <i>SUNY Potsdam Program Review Handbook</i> (Appendix 2: Information Sources).
	Primary writer, faculty	Primary writer and faculty begin the research/writing process for the Self-Study.
Week 1 of SSDD semester	ALO, Department Chair	ALO sends follow-up reminder to Department Chair about the SSDD.
Week 4 of SSDD semester	Department Chair, faculty, Dean, Provost	After consulting with faculty, the Department Chair submits a list of potential reviewers to the Dean, including external and internal reviewers. The Department Chair may need to submit names more than once, depending on the Dean's and Provost's approval or lack thereof. A final decision is made by week 6 of the SSDD semester.
Week 6 of SSDD semester	Dean's secretary	Dean's secretary consults 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.
Week 7 of SSDD semester	Department Chair, Dean's secretary, review team members	Department Chair invites reviewers. In consultation with the Dean's secretary, dates for the site visit are set.
3 weeks before SSDD	Primary writer, Department Chair, faculty	Primary writer distributes draft of completed Self-Study to department faculty/staff for review and feedback. Two weeks are allotted for feedback.
1 week before SSDD	Primary writer, Department Chair, faculty	Department Chair and faculty return all feedback on Self-Study draft to primary writer. Primary writer makes appropriate edits to Self-Study.

SSDD – last day of final exam week	Primary writer, Dean, Assistant Dean, Provost, Department Chair, ALO	Primary writer delivers Self-Study to Provost, Dean, Assistant Dean, Department Chair. Provost shares Self-Study with ALO (who confirms to Provost adherence to MSCHE Standards).
30 days after SSDD	Primary writer, Dean, Assistant Dean, Provost, Department Chair, ALO	Provost and Dean request revisions to the Self-Study from the Department Chair and primary writer before being released to reviewers. If no revisions are requested within 30 days, revisions are assumed to be unnecessary. If revisions are necessary, the primary writer makes changes as soon as possible and resubmits them to the Provost and/or Dean for approval. Once approved, the primary writer delivers the final Self-Study to the Provost, Dean, Assistant Dean, Department Chair, and ALO (for archiving).
Site Visit		
Review team members have committed	Dean's secretary	Dean's secretary sets up "charge" and "exit" meetings. Dean's secretary sends letters to stakeholders to participate and sets up all other meetings; refer to <i>SUNY Potsdam Program Review Handbook</i> (Site Visit Guidelines section) for recommended meetings and participants. Also, Dean's secretary arranges travel, hotel, and meals (for in-person visits).
At least 1 month before site visit	Department Chair, review team	Department Chair delivers Self-Study to review team.
Semester following SSDD, no earlier than week 6 of semester	Provost, Dean, Department Chair, faculty, students, review team	Site visit.
1 month after site visit	Review team, Dean	Review team leader delivers Site Visit Report to the Dean.
Upon receipt of Site Visit Report	Dean, Provost, Department Chair	Dean forwards Site Visit Report to Provost and Department Chair.
2 weeks after receipt of Site Visit Report	Department Chair, faculty	Department Chair and faculty discuss the Site Visit Report and determine the department's issues and priorities to be addressed, based on the Report.
Action Plan		
1 month after receipt of Site Visit Report	Dean, Department Chair	Dean and Department Chair meet to discuss issues and priorities.
2 months after receipt of Site Visit Report	Department Chair, Dean, Assistant Dean, faculty, Provost, President's Council division heads of Business Affairs, College Advancement, Communications, and DEI	(a) Department Chair, Dean, and Assistant Dean draft an Action Plan—a description of planned actions in pursuit of improvement with an appropriate time frame and commitment of resources. (b) Action Plan draft is shared with Provost, who in turn shares it with President's Council division heads as appropriate (e.g., Business Affairs; College Advancement; Communications; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) to review for alignment with College goals and programmatic and financial sustainability. (c) Department Chair revises Action Plan as appropriate, and program faculty members begin implementing the Plan.

Appendix 2: Information Sources

Section in Handbook	Information	Source
I.A.	Department Profile Trends	Academic Department Profile page
I.C.	Department bylaws and strategic plans (if available)	Departmental files or Department Chair
I.D.	Departmental sponsored activities	Departmental files; faculty; Department Chair
II.D.	Curriculum map	Departmental files or Department Chair
II.E. II.F.	Course offerings	Banner data (use BearPAWS; see page 20 below)
III.A. III.B.	Program Mission Statement, goals, and objectives	Program webpage (on SUNY Potsdam website ; if not posted on web, then check departmental files or query Department Chair)
III.C.	PSLOs	Program webpage
IV.D.	Assessment Plan and Report	Submitted Assessment Plans & Reports
V.B.1.	Trend Enrollments by Major and Minor	The most recent year for each of these from the Student Fact Book page
V.B.1.	First year retention rate, Persistence rate, Gender and ethnicity, Avg cumulative GPA, Avg High School GPA, Avg transfer GPA, Less than 2.0 and Withdrawal rates	Submit a data request with at least 6 weeks' notice to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (insteff@track.potsdam.edu) for all pieces of data, and for additional data if needed
V.B.2.	Trend Degrees Granted by Major	The most recent year of the Student Fact Book page
V.B.2.	Alumni employment, graduate school placement, and achievements	Submit a data request with at least 6 weeks' notice to the Advancement Office (advservices@potsdam.edu) for pertinent information about recent program alumni; Career Services (collects information for the First Destination Survey and may be able to produce a department report, depending on staffing); faculty
VI.A.4.	Special teaching efforts	Faculty
VI.A.10.	Curriculum Vitae	Faculty
VI.A.10.	Courses taught	Banner data (use BearPAWS; see page 20 below)
VI.A.11.	Faculty composition information	Human Resources (do not ask faculty for this information)
VI.B.	Faculty Handbook	Departmental files or Department Chair
VI.D.	Personnel changes	Human Resources; Department Chair
VII.A.	Grants	Faculty
VII.B.	College Foundation	Department Chair

Use BearPAWS to get course offerings/enrollments:

1. Login to BearPAWS and click on the “Admin & Staff Reports” tab.
2. Towards the bottom, click the “Subject Enrollment” report option, pick a term, and click submit.
3. On the Subject Enrollment Setup page (see figure below):
 - select “Download Report into Excel”
 - enter the subject area needed
 - click “Begin Subject Enrollment Report/Download”

The screenshot shows the BearPAWS interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with tabs: Faculty Services, Admin & Staff Reports (selected), College Life & Auxiliary Services, Personal Information, and Main Menu. Below the navigation bar is a search field with a 'Go' button. The main heading is 'Subject Enrollment Setup'. Underneath, there is a 'Fall 2023' term selector with a 'Change Term' button. A section titled 'Select a format for the output:' contains two radio buttons: 'View/Print Report from Browser' (unselected) and 'Download Report into Excel' (selected). Below this is a section titled 'Enter 10 subjects:' with a grid of input boxes. The first box contains 'PSYC' and the others are empty. A section titled 'Select output options:' contains two checked checkboxes: 'Display Course Title' and 'Display Instructor'. At the bottom, there is a button labeled 'Begin Subject Enrollment Report/Download'.

4. Once the download is complete, there may be either:
 - a prompt for what to do with the file (if so, open the file; if asked whether you want to open the file even though the extension does not match, click “yes”), or
 - a report downloaded at the bottom of the screen or in your Downloads folder (if so, click on that document to open it; if asked whether you want to open the file even though the extension does not match, click “yes”)

Appendix 3: Guide for Reviewers

The Site Visit Report written by the review team should answer the questions below that are relevant to this specific site visit as well as the specific review charge shared with you.

Overall

- What are the major strengths of the program?
- In what areas is the program weak?
- Does the program have a distinctive identity?
- What are its unique and innovative elements?
- What are the major opportunities?
- What challenges does it face in the immediate future and over the next 5 to 10 years?
- How do the activities of the program contribute to the overall goals and strategic plan of the institution?

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' current professional activities?
 - Are any areas of specialization inadequately represented relative to instructional needs?
 - Are there areas of faculty expertise that might be more fully utilized?
- Is the faculty adequately diverse (e.g., gender, race, age, ethnicity)?
- How effective is the instruction?
 - How does the program address courses with persistently high numbers of withdrawals and grades of less than 2.0?
 - How do students rate the teaching in the program?
 - To what extent are high impact practices, including student research and applied learning, incorporated into the program?
 - To what extent does the faculty utilize the professional development offered through the CCI and/or SUNY 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?
 - Is programmatic and/or departmental leadership effective?
 - Are burdens, responsibilities, rewards, and privileges equitably distributed?
 - Are junior faculty members' interests respected?
 - Are compensation levels, teaching loads, and working conditions equitable?
 - Does the program have difficulty retaining faculty, and is that a potential problem? If it is a problem, what do you believe is causing this difficulty in retention?
- Are junior faculty members adequately mentored in their career development? Is their academic progress reviewed periodically?
- How is the teaching of faculty members assessed (including adjunct and part-time members), 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?
 - What, if anything, is distinctive about them?
 - How well do they prepare students for graduate study?
 - How well do they prepare students for teaching in the schools?
 - 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?
 - Does the program use an appropriate mix of direct and indirect assessment procedures?
 - 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, and Inclusion?
 - How are the needs of diverse learners being met in the classroom?
 - How are the faculty enhancing access to a wide range of learners?
 - How does the curriculum reflect a diversity in and respect for varied perspectives, cultures, and backgrounds?
- What is the extent of the program's instructional responsibility in terms of service courses to the college? (Service courses are required by one program but housed in another department and reserved for students from that first program, e.g., General Education requirements, requirements for other programs.)
 - To what extent are undergraduate course offerings utilized by non-majors?
 - How effective are these service courses?

- How effectively do faculty utilize appropriate instructional technologies (e.g., BrightSpace, Open Educational Resources, video capture, online, hybrid)?
- How effective are the faculty and staff in supporting the institution's recruitment and retention goals?
 - What new initiatives/strategies are being used to recruit and retain students?
 - What are the data indicating related to enrollment trends over time, and how are the faculty responding to these trends?
 - How are faculty using data to inform program revision, new program development, and preparation of students for success beyond graduation?
- How do undergraduates, particularly majors, feel about the program?
 - How accessible are faculty outside the classroom?
 - How adequate is undergraduate advising?
 - Do undergraduates have opportunities to be 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?
 - What, if anything, is distinctive about it?
 - 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?
 - 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?
 - 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 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 program and faculty?

- To what extent does the faculty utilize the services and professional development offered by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs? Do faculty take 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's assessment plan and processes? Is data used effectively to inform teaching, learning, and program improvement?
- 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 energies and resources among individual research, collaborative research, advising, 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 4: Action Plan Template

Action Plan

Department:

Program:

Chair/program coordinator:

Date of approval by Provost:

Goal:		How will you evaluate the efficacy of the changes?		
		What criteria will be used to measure success?		
Action Steps Describe each step required for implementation and evaluation	When	Who	Necessary resources	Notes:
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal:		How will you evaluate the efficacy of the changes?		
		What criteria will be used to measure success?		
Action Steps Describe each step required for implementation and evaluation	When	Who	Necessary resources	Notes:
1.				
2.				
3.				

Annual Meeting Notes

Department name:
Faculty/Staff present:
Meeting date:

Annual Report Questions:

1. Discuss progress toward the department’s goals and Action Plan from the latest Program Review (as appropriate) for the past academic year.
2. List department goals for the next academic year. Provide specific examples of goals emerging from the Program Review process and the [Institutional Priorities](#).
3. List the department’s recruitment work from the past academic year. Provide goals and plans for the next academic year.
4. List five-ten departmental highlights relevant to continuous improvement in the past year.
5. Note progress regarding program student learning outcomes.
6. In what ways can the dean’s office serve your department and the School of Arts & Sciences in the year to come?

Annual Report Comment	Dean’s Questions and Suggestions	Department Response	Next Steps	Dean’s request(s) to the Provost	Provost’s Response

Prepared by:
 Date prepared:
 Date sent to Provost:
 Date returned by Provost:

Instructions:

1. Dean’s office sends a copy to the Department Chair and Provost at least five business days before the Dean’s summer state-of-the-school meeting with the Provost.
2. Provost’s office sends a copy to the Department Chair and Dean within 20 business days of the Dean’s summer meeting with the Provost.