FREDONIA
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

State University of New York at Fredonia
Guide for Academic Program Review

DRAFT - Updated November 6, 2018

Sample Statement:

Fredonia faculty and administration collaboratively developed this academic program review guide. The guide was reviewed and _____ by the the Academic Affairs Committee and the University Senate and aligns with the SUNY policy on assessment.

Academic Affairs Committee Approval Date:

University Senate Approval Date:

President Approval Date:

Purpose

The State University of New York at Fredonia is committed to providing excellence in education. To this end, the Faculty, both as individual educators and corporately as members of departments/schools, is continually evaluating academic programs as part of an ongoing review of their effectiveness in delivering the best educational opportunities for our students. As an integral part of this process, each department/school takes the opportunity every five years to reflect on the current state of its programs. In cooperation with Administration, and with the aid of external colleagues, the department/school assesses the strengths and challenges of its programs, and engages in long-term planning for the future. The department will formulate an action plan designed to improve student learning and other areas in need of improvement. The department will work with academic leadership to ensure alignment with the institution's priorities, planning and resource allocation. A summary report of the findings and actions of academic program reviews will be presented annually to the University Senate by the Provost.

Alignment with Accreditation

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) regards assessment of institutional goals as central to accreditation expectations.

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Assessment may be characterized as the third element of a four-step planning-assessment cycle:

1. *Defining clearly articulated institutional and unit-level goals;*

2. *Implementing strategies to achieve those goals;*

3. *Assessing achievement of those goals; and*

4. *Using the results of those assessments to improve programs and services and inform planning and resource allocation decisions.*

--2014 Standards of Accreditation, MSCHE

The Academic Program Review process explicitly addresses each one of the four components of the above planning-assessment model of decision-making.

MSCHE also recognizes the central importance of the Design, Delivery, and Assessment of Student Learning

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience
Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning may be characterized as the third element of a four-step teaching-learning-assessment cycle that parallels the planning-assessment cycle described above:

1. *Developing clearly articulated learning outcomes: the knowledge, skills and competencies that students are expected to exhibit upon successful completion of*

2

*the course, academic program, co-curricular program, general education
requirement, or other specific set of experiences;*

2. *Offering courses, programs, and experiences that provide purposeful
   opportunities for students to achieve those learning outcomes;*

3. *Assessing student achievement of those learning outcomes; and*

4. *Using the results of those assessments to improve teaching and learning and
   inform planning and resource allocation decisions.*

The Academic Program Review process explicitly examines and assesses student
achievement of articulated learning outcomes specific to a given major in addition to
enrollment (recruitment and retention) goals and financial sustainability. The purpose of
the academic program review is to use the results to identify areas of strength and areas
of challenge, to formulate a joint plan of action to enable improvements to student
learning, and to allocate or reallocate resources based on these planned actions. After
implementation, the actions should be assessed again to determine impact and whether or
not the action plan will need to be revised before the next program review.

Relationship of Academic Program Review and Specialized Accreditations

A number of academic programs are accredited by program-specific accreditation bodies
(e.g. CAEP, CSWE, AACSB, NASM etc.). Assessment of student learning and
institutional effectiveness is a common theme in all accreditation efforts. Ideally, the
Academic Program Review process and any program-specific accreditation review
should not result in any extra burden on departments/programs and any such efforts
should be coordinated to reduce redundancy in data gathering, analysis, etc.

- If a department with program-specific accreditation is not required to
  complete a self-study by the outside accrediting body (e.g., ACS:
  Chemistry), that department and program is required to complete the
  academic program review process outlined in this document.

- If a department is required to do a periodic self-study by their accrediting
  body, they will be asked to submit a two-page report to the appropriate
  academic dean within one month of the on-site evaluation that addresses
  the following: evaluator's recommendations, department response to
  recommendations, specific goals for addressing issues raised, and action
  plans for reaching stated goals.

Relationship to Fredonia's Comprehensive Assessment Plan

Fredonia's Comprehensive Assessment Plan outlines the rationale, strategies and
procedures for ensuring institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement.
Specifically, the plan describes ways and means for:

1. Identifying, collecting, and analyzing aggregated outcome measures of student
   achievement of learning goals (Assessment of Student Learning) and outcome
   measures of activities performed by non-academic units in providing services to

3

the university community (non-academic assessment), each contributing to the fulfillment of Fredonia's Mission;

2. Utilizing assessment data to inform programs so that they can modify curriculum and co-curricular activities to improve student learning or institutional effectiveness;

3. Reporting the results of the analysis to appropriate decision-makers in all the areas of this university;

4. Using this information for essential decisions about academic programs, teaching, student services, university services and resource allocation and planning.

The Academic Program Review process explicitly addresses each one of these steps, and is an integrated component of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan.

Timeline

Spring	Each Spring, the Office of the Provost will notify the Dean of the Academic Programs that are slated for review in the following academic year. The Dean's Office will notify the academic departments. The Office of the Provost will convene the Departments Chairs and Deans to review the process.
Fall	The Department (or faculty responsible for the program) prepares a self-study document using the format outlined in this document. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment and others involved with academic program assessment will provide and help interpret summative assessment data.
October	After consultation with the department, the Department shall forward the names of at least three external reviewers to the Dean for approval. Upon approval, the Department shall contact no more than two reviewers to complete external evaluations using these guidelines. A stipend of $500 and travel expenses will be provided for each external reviewer will be provided by the Provost's Office.
December	The Department submits a draft of the program self-study to the Dean and Associate Provost for Curriculum, Assessment, and Academic Support.
January	The Dean and Associate Provost provide feedback on the draft.
February	The Department sends the final draft of the self-study to the external reviewers with copies to the Dean and Associate Provost.
End of February	On-site visit by external reviewers

End of March	The external reviewers submit their final report to the Department and Dean. The Department may choose to send a response to the external reviewers' reports to the Dean and Associate Provost as an addendum to their self-study.
April - Early May	The Office of the Provost convenes the Academic Program Review Board. The Department will present the findings of its self-study to the board. The Program Review Board is made up of the Provost's Council (which includes University Senate Chair) and representatives from Information Technology Services, Finance and Administration, IRPA, and Facilities Planning.
Mid May - Early June	The Provost will send a memorandum to the Department and the Dean summarizing the findings, action items, and timeline for follow-up based on the Department's Self-Study, the External Reviewer Reports, and input from the Academic Program Review Board.

Fredonia Academic Program Review
Self-Study Components

1. Department
  1.1   Departmental snapshot/summary.
  1.2   Mission Statement.
  1.3   Goals

2. Program
  2.1   Learning Outcomes
  2.2   Description, Curriculum and Distinguishing Characteristics
  2.3   Review of Courses, Assigned Credit Hours, and Curriculum Offerings
  2.4   Rationale for Program Design

3. Assessment
  3.1   Assessment Plan and Process
  3.2   Recent Assessment Results
  3.3   Program Changes and Improvements
  3.4   Evidence of Effective Change

4. Faculty and Staff
  4.1   Faculty Profile
  4.2   Teaching
  4.3   Advising
  4.4   Scholarly and Creative Contributions
  4.5   External Fundraising

The final self-study document should be available in an electronic format and correspondence throughout the process will occur via email.

1. Department

1.1 Departmental snapshot/summary: This is an opportunity to provide a brief description of your department, setting the context for your self-study. This is particularly

useful for your external reviewer, who may or may not have an awareness of what distinguishes your program.

1.2 Mission Vision and Values: Present and review the department mission statement. In a sentence, what is the mission of the department? How does this mission align with the Fredonia's mission? In a sentence, what is the vision for the future of this unit? How does this vision align with the vision for the Fredonia? In a sentence, what are the most fundamental values of the unit? How do these values align with the institution's values?

1.3 Goals: List the department's goals for this self-study and the academic programs under review?

2. Program

2.1 Learning Outcomes: List the approved learning outcomes for the program(s) under review.

2.2 Description, Curriculum, and Distinguishing Characteristics:
    a. Provide an overview of each academic program under review
    b. Provide the catalog listing for each academic program under review
    c. Describe the congruence between course learning outcomes and program learning outcomes and national and/or accreditation standards and expectations in the discipline or profession.
    d. Provide a curriculum map to demonstrate alignment of program outcomes, course learning outcomes, and assessment.
    e. Explain the balance between breadth and depth in each academic program.
    f. Describe distinguishing features of the program (e.g., uniqueness of the major, specific opportunities for students including applied learning, professional accreditation, etc).

2.3 Review Required and Elective Course enrollment, Assigned Course Credit Hours, and Curriculum Offerings: Do the courses and their scheduled times adhere to the academic credit hour definition? Are there any hidden prerequisites in the program design? Are the courses being offered at an acceptable frequency to allow timely degree completion? Are there courses that should be eliminated/added to the curriculum?

2.4 Rationale for Program Design: Why is the program designed in this manner? What is the broad picture of curricular organization? How does new disciplinary knowledge get incorporated into the program?

3. Assessment

3.1 Assessment Plan and Process: Describe the plan and timeline for assessment of student learning. Include assessment methodologies for each of the learning outcomes (goals) mentioned in 2.1.

3.2 Recent Assessment Results: Report on results of systematic assessment since the last program review. Report summary data and any analysis used. Indicate areas of achievement and areas of concern. Include a summary of recommendations resulting from the previous program review and indicate what progress has been made on these recommendations.

3.3 Program Changes and Improvements: Report on program changes instituted, or planned, as a result of the assessment process since the last program review.

3.4 Evidence of Effective Change: For those changes already implemented, provide evidence of their effectiveness.

4. Faculty and Staff

4.1 Faculty Profile: Provide summary data on the faculty in your program. Include: highest degree earned, specialty areas, rank, whether tenured/tenure-track or non-tenure-track, gender, ethnicity, years of service.

4.2 Teaching: Report on the teaching loads and how they are determined. A good way to do this is to show the teaching schedules for several recent semesters, organized by instructor. Include information on course enrollments. Highlight faculty innovations in teaching. Describe the program's procedures for evaluating effectiveness in teaching. What is the average sch per faculty FTE?

4.3 Advising: Report on student advising procedures and distribution of responsibilities among the faculty. What is the quality of academic advising in this program and how is that assessed?

4.4 Scholarly and Creative Contributions: Summarize the recent scholarly and creative contributions of the program faculty. Since a report will be included in the appendices of the self-study for each faculty report, it is not necessary to provide an individual faculty account of accomplishments. Discuss the scholarly and creative contributions at the department level and how, if at all, those contributions are inform and support the academic programs under review.

4.5 External Fundraising: Report on external grants, external contracts, and solicitation of gifts that directly affect the program's effectiveness.

4.6 Service: Describe the faculty's service to the university, such as committee work, administrative work, public service, and other activities that contribute to the fulfillment of the program's mission in relation to the university and the community.

4.7 Recruitment, Retention, Evaluation, and Recognition: Describe the department's procedures for faculty recruitment and retention. Outline criteria used in evaluation of faculty, for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and processes for recognition of special effort and accomplishments. Include any policy and procedures documents in the appendix.

4.8 Support Staff: List the (instructional, secretarial) support staff and describe their responsibilities. Indicate the number of work-study students assigned to the program.

5. Student Success

5.1 Student Profile: for the last five years, review the number of majors, number of graduates, admission profiles for freshmen and transfers [number, mean HS average, Mean SAT, entering GPA (for transfers)], gender, ethnicity, etc.; compare to university-wide profile. Hyperlink relevant data provided by IRPA in this section and refer to it conduct the analysis for 5.2.

5.2 Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation Rates: For the last five years, analyze recruitment, retention, and student success trends into the program.

Recruitment: Describe the enrollment trends for your program. If the trends show a decline, what might actions might you take to reverse the decline? If so, how might the program be redesigned, reimagined, or replaced? If there is still a demand for this program, what could be done to make it more interesting and attractive to prospective students? What is the minimum number of students for each academic program (majors, minors, tracks, emphases, concentrations) to consistently run required courses with a minimum of twelve students? What is the optimum number of students for each academic program (majors, minors, tracks, emphases, concentrations) to graduate at least five students a year? Ten students? Which programs meet or exceed the minimum enrollment? Which programs are below the minimum enrollment? Which programs are below the optimum enrollment? What specific actions will the department take to address programs that do not meet the minimum or optimum enrollment? If the department does not choose to deactivate the program, what are the specific actions that it will take to ensure that the program meets the minimum by Fall 2018? What specific goals, strategies, and tactics in Fredonia's Strategic Enrollment Plan might the department focus on to address recruitment and retention? Regarding academic programs, is the program (faculty, resources, and curriculum) of sufficient size and scope to affirm that it can be conducted effectively, efficiently, and support critical mass? What are the benefits to the institution of offering this program? What is the relationship of this program to the success of other programs?

Retention: Are the retention rates in the department higher or lower than Fredonia's retention rate? What specific retention tactics in Fredonia's SEM plan might the department adapt to increase retention? What is the retention rate in your department? How does that compare to the institutional rate? What are the patterns of retention in your department over time? Are students changing programs within the department or leaving the department but staying at Fredonia? When does the attrition occur? What are some possible reasons for the attrition, and can they be addressed by your department? What is the relationship of student success data to the other program array variables?

5.3 Accomplishments: Indicate any recent special accomplishment of students (university-wide awards, fellowships, scholarships, etc.).

5.4 Graduate Placement: Provide data on placement of graduates over the past five years, including numbers in graduate school, professional programs, and employment.

5.5 Alumni Relations: Describe the ways in which the program encourages and supports alumni success and how it maintains relationships with its graduates.

6. Resources

6.1 Physical Plant: Describe the physical spaces used by the program (offices, classrooms, laboratories, studios, etc.) their attributes, and evaluate their adequacy in terms of the program's needs.

6.2 Equipment/Computers: Describe the major pieces of equipment used by faculty and students in the program. Evaluate the current state of equipment as it impacts the ability of the faculty to teach their courses, perform their research/creative endeavors, and other duties related to their positions. Assess future needs and outline strategies to acquire new or replacement equipment.

6.3 Informal Space: Describe and evaluate the amount and quality of informal space used by students and faculty. This includes reading rooms, study areas, commons areas, etc. Also, describe any significant off-campus facilities used by the program.

6.4 Virtual Space: Describe and evaluate virtual space resources and their utilization within the program. Include here online courses, extent of utilization of web-based course management resources, communications, etc.

6.5 Library: Provide data on library holdings related to the program: number of monographs in print and electronic form as aggregate, current periodicals print and electronic as aggregate, repository holdings. Assess the access students and faculty have to current and relevant information related to the discipline itself, and to teaching in the discipline. Evaluate adequacy of the periodicals and monographic holdings, the ease of access to relevant information, and other aspects of information technology and delivery

on campus (e.g. inter-library loan; electronic access to other library holdings, etc.). Comment on the role of library faculty as related to the program.. Comment on other means of support for faculty and student research in the discipline.

6.6 Budget: Provide data on budget by category (e.g., supplies, equipment, travel). Assess the adequacy of the budget for delivery of the program, and for support of faculty and student research, creative endeavors, etc.

6.7 Instructional Costs and Tuition Revenue: Analyze the instructional costs versus the tuition revenue for this program by considering the questions below.
Instructional Costs

1. What is the teaching load for full-time faculty in your department?
2. How do the instructional costs of your program compare to the benchmarks? Institutional averages? Institutional goals? College goals? Department goals?
3. If the costs are higher than the benchmark and goals, what specific actions, with an associated timeline, can you take within your department to decrease the costs?
4. How much of the cost of instruction is due to released time for administrative duties, excluding department chair?
5. What specific actions will the department take to reduce the direct instructional cost?
6. What is the balance between tenured and tenure track faculty and other faculty? Do tenured and tenure track faculty carry the primary responsibility for teaching? Without increasing full-time faculty, how might the department increase the student credit hours taught by full-time faculty?
7. What is the appropriate number of full-time faculty for the number of students enrolled in academic programs? What number of full-time faculty would be necessary if the academic programs were optimally enrolled?

Tuition Revenue

1. Are the student credit hours (SCH) generated by the department enough to cover the direct cost of instruction plus a margin to cover other expenses? What is the margin between cost per SCH and tuition revenue?
2. Is the trend in SCH production increasing or decreasing? How has the department adjusted staffing to respond to the increase or decrease? Where has the decrease come from? Majors, non-majors, or both?
3. Are there any curricular changes that the department might make to address the change in SCH? How might the department increase SCH production by contributing to the new Fredonia Foundations?

7. Summative Findings and Recommendations

7.1 Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities: Based on assessment findings, along with an evaluation of current and future enrollment trends, changes in the discipline and any

other relevant, data-supported factors, candidly evaluate the program's major strengths, opportunities, and challenges as they relate to the departmental and program mission.

7.2 Recommendations: As a consequence of an in-depth analysis of assessment findings, anticipated trends in the discipline and industry as it relates to the academic program(s) under review, and an evaluation of current resources, what are the department's recommendations for curricular and program improvement? Indicate a timeline for implementation and discuss any significant resource implications. If there are no curricular recommendations, please discuss.

Academic Program Review

External Reviewer Report Template

Thank you for agreeing to be part of Fredonia's ongoing assessment of academic programs. Please use the following template for your report.

I.   Program

1. Assess program purpose, structure, and requirements as well as formal mechanisms for program administration and monitoring.

2. Comment on any distinguishing characteristics of this program as they relate to the discipline. What are plans and expectations for continuing program development and self-assessment?

3. Is there evidence that the program has an effective assessment system and uses the results of assessment for program improvement?

4. Assess the breadth and depth of coverage in terms of faculty availability and expertise, regular course offerings and directed study, and available support from related programs. What evidence is there of program flexibility and innovation?

5. Discuss the relationship of this program to other programs of the institution. Consider interdisciplinary programs, service courses (e.g. general education, joint research projects, support programs, etc).

6. What evidence is there of need and demand for the program locally, in the state, and in the field at large? What is the extent of occupational demand for graduates? What evidence is there that it will continue? What is the viability of the program?

II.   Faculty

1. Assess the quality of the faculty, both individually and collectively, in terms of qualifications, teaching performance, research/scholarly/creative attainments, and service to the institution.

2. Considering the mission of the program, comment on the primary areas of interest and expertise of the faculty. Discuss areas of strength and critical deficiencies.

3. Assess the composition of faculty in terms of diversity (age, rank, race, gender, seniority).

4. Evaluate activity in generating external funds for research, creative endeavors, professional development, facilities, equipment, etc.

5. Discuss and comment on faculty workload (to include, but not be limited to teaching, advising, service, scholarship/creative endeavors, etc.) in relation to the mission of the institution and program.

6. Discuss the use of adjunct faculty within the program.

III. Students

1. Comment on the student profile (selectivity, diversity, geographic region served, etc.).

2 Assess plans and projections for student recruitment (freshman, internal/ external transfers), retention and graduation rates.

3. Comment on provisions for encouraging participation of persons from underrepresented groups.

4. Assess the system for monitoring students' progress and performance and for advising students regarding academic and career matters.

5. Comment on student accomplishment, student involvement and engagement within the program.

6. Discuss the relationship the program maintains with its alumni.

IV. Resources

1. What is the institution's commitment to the program as demonstrated by the operating budget, faculty salaries and research support, the number of faculty lines relative to student numbers and workload, support for faculty by non-academic personnel, and funds provided for faculty professional development and activities (colloquia, visiting lecturers, etc.).

2. Discuss the adequacy of physical resources and facilities, e.g., library, computer, and laboratory facilities, internship sites, and other support services for the program, including use of resources outside the University.

V.   <u>Comments and Recommendations</u>

1. Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program.

2. Include any further observations important to the evaluation of this program and provide any recommendations for the program.

The evaluator(s) should submit electronic copies of a draft report of their findings, within three weeks of the site visit, to the department chairperson. The department will review the draft report and communicate any factual errors that may be in the report back to the evaluator(s). The evaluator(s) will then submit a revised (if necessary) report to the department chair and the dean with a copy also sent to the Associate Provost for Curriculum, Assessment, and Academic Support. Specific contact information will be shared with the evaluator at the time of invitation.

External Reviewer Guidelines and Itinerary

It is the responsibility of the appropriate Department and Dean to arrange the travel, itinerary and accommodations for the external reviewer(s).

The external reviewer(s) should have the opportunity to interview the following individuals/groups:

- Chair/Coordinator of the program
- Dean, Assoc Provost as appropriate
- Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
- President of the University
- Faculty/Staff – Program faculty and staff as well as faculty providing important service/cognate courses for the program.
- Alumni
- Students

The first formal meeting should be an Entrance Interview with the Dean, where the Dean should provide the institutional vision for the program under review, and discuss the program in the context of the College and the University.

The reviewer(s) should have an opportunity to tour the facilities, including studios, laboratories, teaching spaces, theaters, recital halls, office spaces, etc., and also have the opportunity to interview, or have questions answered from relevant University officers not listed above, such as Library faculty, Research Office staff, Information Technology staff, Budget and Accounting staff, etc.

The department may schedule a meeting at the end of the review with faculty and the reviewer(s) for the purposes of sharing the initial results and observations. The last formal meeting should be an exit interview with the Dean and the Program Chair/Coordinator, where last minute questions can be addressed and initial impressions of the evaluators may be discussed.

Day 1   Travel day, evening social event with Program faculty/staff (optional).

Day 2   Formal Entrance Interview and other interviews with stakeholders and administrators (see above for list).

Day 3   Flexible time for other meetings, include time for evaluators to discuss findings with each other. Formal Exit Interview, followed by travel home.

Appendix A
Data Set Provided by Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

Data to be provided for the past five years
- Retention Dashboard by Program
- Enrollment Data by Program
- Academic Standings Data report by program
- DFWI Report for courses offered by department
- Withdrawal Data by Program
- Digital Measures Faculty Reports
- Library Holdings
- Course Schedule and Enrollment Files