

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 346

JC 780 163

TITLE Academic Program Review: Guidelines and Procedures.

INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Delhi. Agricultural and Technical Coll.

PUB DATE Sep 77

NOTE 53p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Community-Colleges; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Accountability; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; Instructional Programs; *Junior Colleges; Manuals; *Models; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

The Academic Program Review system at the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi consists of two phases: preparation of a self-study report by specialized faculty providing instruction in the particular program, and review of the report and program operation by a visiting panel of experts in the field of academic discipline. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Division Dean, and the program faculty then meet to review the findings and recommendations of the external panel and to determine the follow-up actions and responsibilities. Each program is reviewed every five years. This manual provides an Academic Program Review Instrument, an outline for faculty use in preparing the self-study, in seven sections: Program Identity (mission, goals, objectives, priorities); Students (enrollment and entry characteristics); Faculty and Staff (characteristics, activities, development); Resources and Facilities (support, staff, services, supplies, equipment, external and institutional funding, space); Administration (program and course development, student and staff evaluation, program performance); Accomplishments (impact, philosophy, objectives); and Recommendations. The manual also includes a guide to resources for completing the instrument, a guide for the external review panel with questions designed to evaluate each of the review instrument sections, and a sample self-study report. (TR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED152346

AGRICUL

ACAI

GUIDELI

780163

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

State University ATC

Delhi, New York

THIS MATERIAL IS BEING MADE
AVAILABLE THROUGH ERIC AND
IS PART OF THE ERIC SYSTEM

GRAM

CEDES

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RE
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED F
FOR ORGANIZATION OR
POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN
NOT NECESSARILY RE
AL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

- I. Schedule for the Review of Academic Programs 1976 - 1981
- II. Academic Program Review Procedures, Guidelines, Instrument, and Resources
- III. Miscellaneous Recommendations on Content, Format, and Style
- IV. Academic Program Review External Review Panel Guide

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION

In October 1975, the Board of Trustees of State University asked the then Chancellor, Dr. Ernest Boyer, "to develop and disseminate guidelines for a rigorous and periodical review of authorized academic programs." The following June the University's Commission on Purposes and Priorities concluded that academic program review was a "matter of highest priority" within the University.

On March 1, 1977, Dr. Loren Baritz, Vice Chancellor for Academic Policy, requested formal procedures for the review of undergraduate programs from the presidents of all SUNY units. He suggested that four interrelated criteria should be applied to the review of each program: quality, need, efficiency, and the interrelationships among programs. Within broad guidelines, specific details for review procedures were left to local campus prerogative. Each institution's procedures and a five year timetable for the review of its undergraduate programs were requested by May 1, 1977. Implementation was to begin no later than September 1, 1977.

At approximately the same time of the State University Board of Trustees' action, the New York State Education Department began to formulate its revised procedures for the re-registration of academic programs. In August 1976, its Division of Academic Program Review produced new guidelines for the assessment of undergraduate programs. These guidelines are provided to each institution whose programs must be re-registered by the Department and stress that "each institution should have an assessment system which identifies program strengths and weaknesses and which provides for appropriate and timely corrective action."

In November 1976, the Office of Academic Affairs of Delhi College initiated the first round of academic program reviews. Five approved programs, one

from each division, were selected and provided the review instrument procedures which had been developed over the previous academic year. The purpose of this initial round of reviews was not only to review the five programs but, also, to test and refine the College's review system. The College is presently reviewing eight additional programs.

The College's Academic Program Review system is based upon an accreditation model. Simply, a self-study of each program is produced by the faculty responsible for instruction within the program. An external panel of individuals knowledgeable in the career field or academic discipline reviews the self-study and visits the campus. Their summary report and the faculty's self-study then provide the basis for a meeting between the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Division Dean, and the program faculty. The purpose of this meeting is to review all findings and recommendations and to determine follow-up actions and responsibilities within a specific time frame. Since each program will be reviewed in depth only every five years, annual faculty review is necessary. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for the coordination of follow-up activities which, in some cases, are scheduled over a period of years.

The results of Academic Program Review provide program faculty a framework to use to improve the existing program and plan the program's future.

Administratively, the results provide information which can be used in the development of the institution's budget and priorities, in identifying needs to be addressed through external funding, to assist in meeting the requirements for the re-registration and re-accreditation of individual programs, and to provide institutional documentation for Middle States Accreditation.



STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
DELHI, NEW YORK, 13753

Vice President for
Academic Affairs

March 20, 1978

Schedule for the Review
of Academic Programs

1976 - 1977

Licensed Practical Nursing (Certificate)
General Agriculture (A.A.S.)
Building Construction (A.A.S.)
Humanities
Accounting (A.A.S.)

1977 - 1978

Drafting I and Drafting II (Certificate and A.O.S.)
Automotive Mechanics I & II (Certificate and A.O.S.)
Business Administration (A.A.S.)
Medical Laboratory Technology (A.A.S.)
Social Sciences
Civil Technology (A.A.S.)
Biology
Marketing (A.A.S.)

1978 - 1979

Electrical Construction and Maintenance (Certificate)
Electrical Instrumentation and Control (Certificate)
Masonry (Certificate)
Hotel, Restaurant and Food Service (A.A.S.)
Engineering Science (A.S.)
Mathematics
Physical Sciences
Health and Physical Education
Veterinary Technology (A.A.S.)
College Skills

1979 - 1980

Carpentry I and Carpentry II (Certificate and A.O.S.)
Plumbing, Heating and Pipefitting (Certificate)
Secretarial Sciences (A.A.S.)
Secretarial Studies (Certificate)
Architectural Technology (A.A.S.)
Plant Sciences (A.A.S.)
Liberal Arts Program (A.A.)

1980 - 1981

Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (Certificate)
Welding (Certificate)
Individual Studies (Certificate and A.A.S.)
Animal Husbandry - Horse (A.A.S.)
Animal Husbandry - Dairy Production (A.A.S.)
Parks and Recreation Management (A.A.S.)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
PROCEDURES, GUIDELINES, INSTRUMENT, AND RESOURCES

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

State University
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Delhi, New York

1977

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW:
PROCEDURE AND PROCESS (1)

INTRODUCTION

Since 1960 Delhi has been transformed from a single purpose institution into a comprehensive residential two-year college with a strong polytechnic programmatic emphasis. The student body has increased from 350 to 2,700, the number of professional staff has grown and a completely new campus built. Also, during this period, the College received accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities, its programs were approved by the New York State Education Department and, where appropriate, individual programs were accredited by specialized agencies.

In the past, the College has utilized a number of formal and informal means to assess and review the quality of program and instruction. To continue the commitment to high program and instructional quality, it is both desirable and necessary that a more formal procedure and process for academic program review be pursued.

The key to meaningful academic program review is faculty commitment and participation. Academic program review carried out by faculty members responsible for instruction in an option, for example, will insure the continuing effectiveness of the instructional program as well as permit sound planning and decision-making by providing the discrete types of data prerequisite in demonstrating how effectively the College is achieving its mission. In other words,

(1) The following document is a summary developed from detailed working papers which are available in the Office of Academic Affairs.

the college must have a structured, on-going process which reviews and assesses programs and provides a mechanism to insure its ability to be accountable to the University, the State Education Department, and others.

Program review must be a cooperative venture. Faculty will have the active cooperation and assistance of all college functions so that required data, information, and other assistance will be available. The program faculty's self-study response resulting from academic program review should contain three elements:

- a. description - to communicate what the program has done and is doing,
- b. diagnosis - to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and degree of effectiveness in all program components, and,
- c. prescription - to offer recommendations and improvement measures where indicated.

It is understood that differences in programs are likely to elicit variations in responses.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

The following guidelines and procedures will be utilized in reviewing academic offerings:

1. All options, major sequences, and service offerings will be evaluated within the next five years and, thereafter, at least once in each succeeding five year period.
2. The Office of Academic Affairs and the Curriculum Committee, in consultation with appropriate instructional units, will establish a sequence and schedule of program review for each instructional division. A new program will not be evaluated until it has been in existence for at least three years. In developing an appropriate schedule, priority

will be assigned to programs appearing to be significantly overenrolled or underenrolled in relation to resources committed.

3. The responsibility for reviewing an academic program continues to be the responsibility of the specialized faculty providing instruction in that program. Each review will follow the accreditation model procedure which requires a self-study to be submitted to an external review panel which will visit the campus to review the program in operation and report its findings to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The membership of the review panel shall be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs after consulting with the appropriate instructional unit. A review panel shall consist of at least two individuals, one of whom shall be from outside the University, e.g., from industry or an educational agency.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will develop the charge to the review panel in consultation with the appropriate instructional unit.

4. A program review sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee, consisting of two administrators, two faculty members, and a student, shall serve as a liaison between the Committee and the instructional unit for the purpose of monitoring the progress of the review.

Generally, the review process should be conducted in two phases during the academic year. Instructional unit personnel will consider and complete the review instrument by February 1. The second phase will involve the review panel which shall meet on campus for a period of one to two days, for the purpose of interviews and consultations. This phase should be completed no later than the end of the spring semester.

5. The review panel will submit its report within 30 days of its campus visitation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who will review the findings with the instructional unit and with the appropriate Division Chairman. Based upon review panel findings, an appropriate action plan setting forth priorities and objectives to be achieved within a specified time period will be devised by instructional unit personnel and submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
6. Funding to support the procedure will be provided in the budget allocation of each instructional unit to cover the travel, honoraria and related expenses normally associated with academic review.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW INSTRUMENT

I. PROGRAM IDENTITY - MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

A. Purpose or Responsibility - (Describe in relation to)

1. Societal needs.
2. College mission and emphasis.
3. Student and/or employer needs.

B. Statement of Philosophy - (Describe and explain briefly)

1. The beliefs that govern the development and operation of the program (i.e., the premises which guide the discipline or career).
2. Any changes necessary in order to maintain program relevance in terms of conditions such as career or general educational development and student characteristics.

C. Objectives - (Identify)

1. As stated in original program justifications, former and current Campus Master Plans and/or accreditation reports.
2. Other specific program objectives.

D. Curriculum - (List or describe)

1. Course sequences with typical program layout.
2. Course descriptions in Appendix.
3. The essential types of competencies and areas of knowledge acquired by students completing program (include in Appendix):
4. Teaching strategies used to cover the major areas of knowledge or develop competencies enumerated above (e.g. field experience,

- modular curriculum laboratory work).
5. The extent to which the curriculum is designed to reflect the needs of the student clientele.
 6. Any licensure or certification criteria or employment entry tests for which students are prepared.

II. STUDENTS

A. Program Enrollment - (List or explain)

1. Five year enrollment history by gender.
2. Any notable enrollment trends or shifts.
3. Ratio of applications to acceptances for each of past three years and implications for admissions criteria and program development.
4. Proposed enrollment levels for next five years.

B. Entry Level Characteristics - (Describe)

1. Kinds of students enrolled over past five years; such as their qualifications, origin, gender, goals.
2. The extent to which admissions standards are defined so that only those students who have a reasonable chance of completing a program are admitted (e.g., areas of knowledge, attitudes, competencies, abilities, prior work experience required of entering students).
3. Kinds of remediation or diagnostic procedures provided for any students who might experience difficulty (e.g., tutoring, academic counseling, remedial work).

III. FACULTY AND STAFF

A. Characteristics - (List or describe)

1. Primary faculty and technical assistants involved for each of past five years; enumerating rank; earned degrees, employment experience, length of service at Delhi, age, tenure status. Also list any

other supportive faculty who bring important qualities and roundedness to the program. (Provide tabular listing here; depending on number of faculty involved, include vita summaries here or full vitae in Appendix.)

2. Extent to which faculty are trained and/or experienced in the fields they are currently teaching; together with evidence such as professional reputation.

B. Activities - (Describe)

1. Extent to which faculty show evidence of professional activity and performance; giving particular attention to the following:
 - a. Involvement in defining program and course objectives.
 - b. Involvement in student advisement and evidence of concern for student development such as academic counseling, student club advisement.
 - c. Development of grant proposals, consulting work, committee assignments, college governance activities and other opportunities to broaden and strengthen professional knowledge and skills. Describe accomplishments that can be related to these opportunities.
2. Level and kind of faculty contributions to other campus disciplines or programs.

C. Staff Development - (Describe or explain)

1. Participation in formal workshops, courses, or other profession-related training each year over past five years (use form provided).
2. Any special procedures used to improve effectiveness of teaching faculty. Accomplishments that can be related to how these special techniques were used to improve instruction.

3. How staff development efforts relate to program purpose, philosophy, and objectives.
4. Faculty turnover and appointments and any resulting consequences for program development for each of last five years.
5. Future staffing needs in relation to current and anticipated program objectives. Include the number and qualifications.

IV. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

A. Support Staff and Services - (Identify or describe)

1. FTE support staff assigned to the program by position.
2. Adequacy of support services such as computer services; library and learning resources; counseling and placement.
3. Curricular support from other disciplines and programs and explain adequacy.

B. Supplies and Equipment - (Describe)

1. Levels and kinds of divisional budget or in-kind support over each of past three years. Address adequacy of supportive discipline areas.
2. Adequacy of present supplies and equipment levels and any future changes which may be indicated.

C. External Funding or Support - (Describe)

1. Source, amount, and purpose of any outside funding or in-kind support each year over past three years.

D. Facilities and Space - (Describe)

1. Specialized facilities and any significant additions made within past five years.
2. How the above are related to the curricular requirements of the program.

3. Adequacy of classroom, laboratory, or clinical facilities and proposed future facilities plans or requirements.

E. Institutional Support - (Describe).

1. Adequacy of overall institutional commitment in providing resources needed to ensure quality and success.

V. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A. Program and Course Development - (Describe)

1. Procedures for program planning and revision. Indicate roles played by faculty and students and frequency with which course content is updated and evaluated.
2. The involvement and/or articulation of this program in relation to others. Include:
 - a. College.
 - b. Region.
 - c. State.
3. Program policies that are currently under study or that need revision. Also, indicate the kinds of studies undertaken to determine the continued social relevance and quality of the program.

B. Staff Evaluation - (Describe)

1. Process used to evaluate teaching; include procedures for student evaluation and use made of the results.
2. Methods used to improve teaching and evidence of changes that have resulted.

C. Student Evaluation - (Describe)

1. Process or procedures used to evaluate student outcomes on the course and program level.

D. Program Performance - (Describe or appraise)

1. Program and associated program workload information for each of the last three years such as: student/faculty ratio; FTE faculty; FTE students; weekly faculty contact hours; student credit hours per FTE faculty; faculty salary and support costs per weekly faculty contact hour, student credit hour, and FTE student.
2. Average class/lab section size in relation to levels appropriate to program teaching strategies, staffing capability, and available facilities during past three years.
3. Attempts to modify and/or improve program during past three years. Include any innovations made in the curriculum since program's last review.
4. Courses that have been added or discontinued and reasons for action taken since program's last review. Also, indicate which, if any, are presently being planned or are endangered.

VI. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Program Impact - (Present or describe)

1. Record of graduates by gender for each of the past five years.
2. Record of student attrition/retention (including withdrawals) for each of past three years. Also, explain any causitive factors and possible implications for future program development.
3. Record of graduate outcomes for each of the past three years.
Include:
 - a. Employment and/or transfer.
 - b. Applicable certification/licensing exams.
 - c. Student value added and/or intellectual growth, if available.*

4. Evidence of program responsiveness to societal needs.
 5. Outreach public service contributions of faculty, staff, and/or students to community.
- B. Program Philosophy, Purpose, Objectives - (Appraise)
1. Program effectiveness in attaining stated objectives.
 2. Implications for future program development or emphasis of present program effectiveness.
- C. Institutional Emphasis and Development - (Appraise or describe)
1. Program effectiveness in helping attain stated college purposes and objectives.
 2. Implications for future college development and emphasis of present program effectiveness.
 3. When this program should next be evaluated or reviewed for any purpose.

VII. SUMMARY: PROGRAM RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Program Results - (Provide)

1. Summary statement of overall program quality, efficiency, and effectiveness based upon findings and conclusions contained in this review.

B. Program Recommendations - (Provide)

1. Recommendations which would lead to further improvement in program quality, efficiency, and effectiveness based on findings and conclusions contained in this review.
2. Any known or anticipated factors which may impede or prevent action on the stated recommendations.
3. How the results of official program review will be made known to constituencies such as faculty, students, and advisory committee members.

4. Procedures by which responsibility will be assigned and timetable developed to implement any indicated recommendations.

RESOURCE MANUAL

Responses to the Academic Program Review Instrument require a variety of activities including data gathering, consultation, deliberation and analysis, and report writing. Because so much of what is required in the review instrument presently exists in one form or another, in one office or another, and for one purpose or another, the task of Academic Program Review could potentially be quite cumbersome for many programs, particularly those with only a few faculty to conduct the review. To address the obvious need for assistance, the following resources will be available:

- a) a sub-committee of the Curriculum Committee will monitor the progress of the program self-study and, when necessary, will react to the need for clarification or revision;
- b) the Division Chairman will supervise the activities of the program faculty in completing the instrument and will be generally available for assistance;
- c) the Office of Academic Affairs will provide procedural guidance and technical assistance; and
- d) a central work location containing various resource documents and materials will be established for use by all program faculty.

In addition, this manual has been designed to provide more direct, specific assistance by identifying sources of data or information, e.g., an appropriate administrative office or document, and by indicating in many instances the nature of the required responses, e.g., faculty analysis and/or judgment, a

table, an appendix. However, resource offices or documents cited here are not meant to be the only ones used in the review; rather, they are examples recommended for reference and assistance.

Each academic program faculty involved in this review is likely to approach the task in a slightly different way. It is strongly recommended that all academic programs proceed in the following manner:

- a) devise a timetable with regularly scheduled meetings,
- b) assign tasks with deadlines in order to distribute and accomplish the review workload in an equitable manner, and
- d) complete the instrument sections in the order they appear so that the necessary data (and information will be available and evident in faculty analytical and judgmental responses and for each succeeding step in the review process.

Where faculty wish assistance in analyzing data, contact should be made with either Dr. Mark Peel, Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs, or Mr. Ron Brach, Director of Research and Planning.

1. PROGRAM IDENTITY -- MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

A.

1. Consult local, regional, and national reports and studies, e.g., Appalachian, regional occupational education plans.
2. Examine College's mission statement in campus and SUNY Master Plans.
3. Consult appropriate manpower studies or clientele surveys. The latest, most authoritative information which indicates the need and opportunities for students trained in the discipline/career is desirable.

B.

1. Refer to or update existing statement.
2. Faculty analysis.

C.

1. Consult 1976 and previous Delhi Master Plans and/or most recent accreditation reports.
2. Include other objectives which may have been established since master planning or reaccreditation.

D.

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Consult College catalog, include any changes made since it was printed.
3. Self-explanatory.
4. Self-explanatory.
5. Faculty analysis.
6. Self-explanatory.

II. STUDENTS

A.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data.
2. Faculty analysis.
3. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data. Faculty analysis for implications.
4. Faculty analysis. Consult Office of Research and Planning.

B.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning; consult Division files and Counseling Center.

2. Faculty analysis.
3. Self-explanatory.

III. FACULTY AND STAFF

A.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning, Division Office, and Office of Academic Affairs for data. Only current vitae for Appendix.
2. Survey program faculty. Comparisons with similar institutions desirable.

B.

1. Consult Professional Performance and Growth Plans.
2. Contact Office of Research and Planning for workload distribution data. Other contributions may be more informal.

C.

1. Consult Professional Performance and Growth Plans, previous professional development plans, and faculty themselves.
2. Consult above plans, e.g., Dean's Grants, SUNY Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.
3. Faculty analysis.
4. Refer to III. A. 1. and faculty analysis.
5. Faculty analysis.

IV. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

A.

1. Consult Office of Research and Planning. Item refers to non-academic support positions.
2. Faculty analysis.
3. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data. Faculty analysis and judgment of adequacy.

B.

1. Division Office records should show budget expenditures for the program. When applicable, contact Grants Office and Division Office for in-kind support. Contact Office of Research and Planning for supportive discipline costs.
2. Faculty analysis and judgment.

C.

1. Contact Grants Office.

D.

1. Contact Division Office, Plant Facilities Office.
2. Self-explanatory.
3. Contact Office of Research and Planning for standards and utilization data. Faculty analysis and judgment of adequacy.

E.

1. Faculty analysis and judgment.

V. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A.

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Faculty analysis and judgment.
3. Self-explanatory.

B.

1. Contact Division Office, Office of Academic Affairs.
2. Self-explanatory.

C.

1. Self-explanatory.

D.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning.
2. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data. Faculty analysis and judgment for appropriate levels.
3. Consult program, division, and Curriculum Committee records.
4. Same as above. Faculty analysis and judgment.

VI. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning.
2. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data. Faculty analysis and judgment for factors and implications.
3. Contact Office of Research and Planning for (a). Consult Program and division records for (b). Faculty analysis and judgment for (c).
4. Faculty analysis and judgment.
5. Consult Professional Performance and Growth Plans.

B.

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Faculty analysis and judgment.

C.

1. Consult Delhi Master Plan.
2. Faculty analysis and judgment.
3. Self-explanatory.

VII. SUMMARY: PROGRAM RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A.

1. Faculty analysis and judgment.

B-

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Self-explanatory.
3. Self-explanatory.
4. Self-explanatory.

Academic Affairs

COMPREHENSIVE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW (INVENTORY)

Purpose: Accreditation
Institutional Planning and Research
Program and Curriculum Development
Faculty and Professional Performance and Development

Users: Middle States Association
Program Accrediting Agencies
State Education Department
SUNY Central
Delhi Agricultural and Technical College
Academic Affairs
Divisions
Faculty and Non-Teaching Professionals

Components: Academic Programs
Academic Support Programs
Faculty
Non-Teaching Professionals

Products: Professional Performance and Growth Plans
Faculty Evaluation by Chairmen
Faculty Evaluation of Chairmen
Student Evaluation of Faculty
Annual Reports of Non-Teaching Professionals
NTP Evaluation by Supervisors
NTP Evaluation of Supervisors
Follow-up Employment Studies
Affirmative Action Self-Evaluation

Related Products: College Master Plan
Self-Evaluation for Middle States
State Education Department Program Reapproval
Affirmative Action Plan

STATE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Delhi, New York

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Miscellaneous Recommendations on Content, Format and Style

These recommendations are intended to assist program faculties in developing the Academic Program Review self-study document. They are based upon program review experience to date which has clearly established the need for consistency within and among APR self-study documents. Because of its importance, the self-study document must be readable and understandable for a wide range of people, including those who may not be familiar with the particular discipline or the College's internal organization and operating procedures. To this end, the recommendations which follow are intended to promote consistency for all the College's Academic Program Review self-studies.

1. The document should be a flowing narrative organized according to the instrument outline. Use only the major section headings, e.g., I. PROGRAM IDENTITY - MISSION GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES, and the sub-section headings, e.g., A. Purpose and Responsibility. The items listed numerically under each sub-section heading should be treated in the response to that sub-section, but they should not be identified separately by headings. In other words, you should exercise your own judgment using as much flexibility as you need in responding to each item.
2. The appendix material should consist of information requested and other information which you feel necessary to supplement the narrative or complete your document. Typically, such information is of secondary importance which the reader can reference. It also is material which, by its nature, would disrupt the continuity of the narrative if placed in the text. The ideal review document presents the reader with a narrative which describes the program from A to Z without requiring the reader to do his or her own research in documents supplied in the appendix.

3. Data are requested at various points in the APR instrument. It is sometimes important for the data to be presented in tabular form for immediate reference or for inclusion in the appendix. It is extremely important to remember that all data should be analyzed as a part of the self-study review process. In this way, program faculty will be able to identify significant aspects of the program for the reader. For example, if your program is a degree program, yet it also performs a service function for other options, the program's workload data will include a breakdown of faculty workload for each option on campus. The significance of the program's service function will be indicated by that breakdown. You cannot assume that the reader will identify or understand the significance of the data alone. In sum, where data are requested, you will have to decide what needs to be said in the narrative concerning that data even though the table will appear in the text.
4. When preparing both data and narrative in completing the APR instrument, there will be a natural tendency to respond to instrument items with lists, for example, a list of objectives, a list of planned changes in the program, a list of present or desired admissions standards, etc. Though this may be helpful in producing the first draft, it does not make a readable document. Various forms of listings can and should be used in response to the instrument items. Overreliance on lists, however, will make the document very choppy and, perhaps, unreadable or confusing.
5. The APR self-study document is a planning document. However, assessment of program objectives, activities, and accomplishments is an essential part of the planning process. Information that is requested is intended to be useful for the program faculty and the College's administration in planning

the program's future. Avoid "filler" for the sake of creating an impressive document; quality is more important than quantity.

6. Avoid abbreviations. The reader cannot be expected to know what abbreviations stand for and he should not have to search the document to find their meaning.
7. Minimize cross-referencing. The APR instrument is constructed to develop information in a sequential manner. Cross-referencing, though it stresses the interrelatedness of many aspects of the program, detracts from the document's readability and lessens the importance and impact of the presentation of information.
8. All quoted material and information taken from reports, publications, etc., should be appropriately footnoted. Footnotes should follow acceptable form and style.
9. A table of contents should be developed and should correspond with the major section and sub-section headings of the APR instrument. It should also include a list of appendices and a list of tables. See example attached.
10. Sample chart formats for faculty development information are attached and should be used where appropriate.
11. Avoid use of the term "department." Although some official data which will be provided will use the term "department," the College's instructional programs are organized into curriculum areas with curriculum coordinators. The terms "program" and "curriculum" are appropriate and synonymous.
12. Information involving students, faculty, and staff, such as minutes from program faculty meetings, should omit specific names. The major exception to this is the section on faculty which requires identification of the program faculty and inclusion of their vitae.

13. Evidence to support points which will eventually be recommendations should be identified and developed at appropriate points in the narrative. The response to item VII. B. - Recommendations should be a brief statement of the recommendation.
14. All drafts and the final document should be double spaced.
15. Format for final draft document:

OUTSIDE COVER, TITLE PAGE (see attached example), TABLE OF CONTENTS, LIST OF TABLES (if tables are used), BODY OF INSTRUMENT, APPENDICES.

Margins - leave a margin of at least one inch on each of the four sides of the sheet. The left margin is better at one and one-quarter inches to allow for binding. On the first page of every major division of the document leave two inches at the top above the heading.

Pagination - assign a number to every page except the blank sheet following the title page (if one is inserted).

Number the preliminary pages with small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.) centered at the bottom of the page on the fifth space above the edge. The numbering begins with "ii"; the title page counts as i but is not paginated.

Number the remaining parts, including text, illustrations, appendix, and bibliography with Arabic numerals, centered at the bottom of the page on the fifth space above the edge.

Tables - all tables should be labeled appropriately.

TABLE I'

CLASS SECTION SIZE DISTRIBUTION
Fall 1975
LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSING PROGRAM

Sub-headings (spaced appropriately and underlined).

Data listed under headings.

The source of all tables and data should be identified. On tables, use the following form - for example:

Source: Office of Research and Planning, SUNY - Delhi.

State University
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Delhi, New York

PROGRAM EVALUATION

ACCOUNTING
1976-1977

PROGRAM FACULTY:

Lloyd Baldwin, Curriculum Coordinator
Charles Hunter,
Farley Sheldon

JUNE 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Accounting Program Review

	Page
I. Program Identity - Mission, Goals, Objectives and Priorities	
A. Purpose or Responsibility	1
B. Statement of Philosophy	4
C. Objectives	5
D. Curriculum	6
II. Students	
A. Program Enrollment	13
B. Entry Level Characteristics	15
III. Faculty and Staff	
A. Characteristics	20
B. Activities	22
C. Staff Development	23
IV. Resources and Facilities	
A. Support Staff and Services	29
B. Supplies and Equipment	32
C. External Funding or Support	32
D. Facilities and Space	32
E. Institutional Support	32

V.	Program Administration	
A.	Program and Course Development	33
B.	Staff Evaluation	38
C.	Student Evaluation	39
D.	Program Performance	41
VI.	Program Accomplishments	
A.	Program Impact	44
B.	Program Philosophy, Purpose and Objectives	47
C.	Institutional Emphasis and Development	49
VII.	Summary: Program Results and Recommendations	51

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
I. Five Year Enrollment by Gender	13
II. Program Applications, Acceptances and Enrollees for Fall 1975 and Fall 1976	14
III. Mean Regents Scholarship Examination Scores	18
IV. Staff Development	23
V. Curricular Support from Campus Disciplines and Departments	31
VI. Departmental Workload and Cost Information	41
VII. Class Section Size Distribution	42
VIII. Enrollment and Graduates 1972-1976	44
IX. Attrition for the Past Three Academic Years	44

APPENDICES

A. Course Information

- A - 1 Principles of Accounting I
- A - 2 Principles of Accounting II
- A - 3 Cost Accounting I
- A - 4 Intermediate Accounting I
- A - 5 Intermediate Accounting II
- A - 6 Federal Income Tax
- A - 7 Microeconomics
- A - 8 Macroeconomics
- A - 9 Principles of Data Processing
- A - 10 Principles of Finance
- A - 11 Business Law
- A - 12 Statistics

B. Supportive Faculty Resumes

- B - 1 Assistant Professor John Ball
- B - 2 Professor Gail Hotelling
- B - 3 Assistant Professor Robert Hunt
- B - 4 Assistant Professor Lloyd Kenniston
- B - 5 Associate Professor Frederick Miede
- B - 6 Associate Professor Albert Van Horn

C. Primary Faculty Resumes

- C - 1 Professor Lloyd Baldwin
- C - 2 Associate Professor Charles Hunter
- C - 3 Associate Professor Farley Sheldon

D. Student Instructional Report

E. Instruction Evaluation for Classroom Visitation

The Accounting Program is an Associate in Applied Science degree curriculum offered within the polytechnic and career education mission of Delhi College.¹ The program is located in the College's Management Division which contains several allied curriculum areas in the Business and Management Technologies, an emphasis shared by all six State University Agricultural and Technical Colleges.²

Opportunities for accounting employment are varied and include private industry, public accounting service, and the various agencies of government. Recent graduates have accepted positions in general accounting, cost accounting, tax accounting, and specialized accounting for payroll.

The program serves a statewide student clientele and labor demand. New York State Manpower Projections for 1970-1980³ indicate the following related labor trends:

-- white collar employment is increasing at a rate of 2 1/2 times that of all other employment;

--- professional services, a labor category which includes accounting and auditing services will experience a 22% increase from 1970 to 1980;

1 State University of New York, Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi, What's Ahead for Delhi: The College's Campus Plan for Educational Development 1976-1984 (Delhi, New York: 1976), p. 9.

2 The Role and Mission of State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Colleges, May 21, 1975.

3 New York State Department of Labor, Division of Research and Statistics, Manpower Projections New York State 1970-1980, Publication B-204 (New York, NY 1975), pp. 9-16.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW--ACCOUNTING

I. PROGRAM IDENTITY--MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

A. Purpose or Responsibility

There is no escaping the linkage of accounting and man's everyday participation in society as it is today. Accounting is the language of government, business, charity, education and of people. Its function is to measure and to communicate monetary values (dollars) and non-monetary units (quantities). Accounting is the ability to analyze these dollar and unit measurements and to present valid interpretations which will lead to appropriate decisions in all types of activities.

A student of business will be educationally short changed unless he acquires a knowledge of the ways in which accounting can help managers to operate effectively. Because accounting is so pervasive, an understanding of its usefulness and its limitations, also, is desirable whether the student eventually becomes a company president, a production manager, a public accountant, a sales manager, a controller, or a politician. The study of accounting for planning and control can be especially fruitful because it is viewed through the eyes of the managers who are subject to accounting measures of performance and who are often heavily dependent on accounting information for guidance in decision making.

State University
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
DELHI, NEW YORK

VOCATIONAL DIVISION

Faculty Characteristics

Name	Rank	Earned Degrees	Employment Experience	Initial Appt. at Delhi	Age	Tenure Status
	Instructor	Diploma R.N. 1960	Charge Nurse, O'Connor Hospital, Delhi; Per diem Staff R.N., St. Francis Hospital, Roslyn; Staff R.N., St. Vincent's Hospital, NYC; Private Duty, Nassau Hospital Mineola, Marcy Hospital, Rockville Center; Assistant Manager, Oxn Delicatessen, Maspeth.	9/1/73	5/17/40 36	Appt. to 8/31/79
	Assistant Professor	Diploma R.N. 1943 B.S. Health Sciences, Empire State College 1975	Head Nurse, O'Connor Hospital, Delhi; Staff Nurse, Chenango Memorial Hospital, Norwich; Office Nurse, Dr. Martin H. Jacobi, Norwich; Industrial Nurse, Bendix Corp., Sidney; Head Surgical Nurse, Wilson Memorial Hospital, Johnson City.	2/1/68	7/6/19 57	Continuing Appt.
(LPN Program Coordinator)	Associate Professor	B.S. Nursing, Russell Sage College 1952; M.S. in Educa- tion, SUCO 1976	School Nurse-Teacher, Cairo Central School, Cairo; Clinical Instructor-Nursing Arts, Albany Medical Center, Albany; Assistant Nursing Arts Instructor, General Hospital of Syracuse, Syracuse; Staff Nurse- Assistant Head Nurse, Trudeau Sanitarium, Trudeau; Staff Nurse, Albany Medical Center, Albany.	2/1/68	12/2/25 51	Continuing Appt.
	Assistant Professor	Diploma R.N. 1940; B.S. School Nurse Teacher, SUCO 1972	School Nurse-Teacher and Attendance Supervisor, Spencer Central School, Spencer; Camp Nurse, Ithaca College Camp, Danby; Set up and charged new Ithaca College Infirmary, Ithaca; Private Duty Nursing, York Hospital, York, PA; Private Duty Nursing, Union Memorial Hospital, Baltimore, MD; Cost Clerk, Hollander's Auto Store, York, PA.	9/1/73	3/12/19 57	Appt. to 8/31/79

Faculty Resumes - See Appendix Items A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4

C. Staff Development

1. Participation in formal workshops, courses, or other profession-related training each year over past five years.

LPM Faculty	Academic Year	Workshops	Courses	Other Professional Related Training
	1975-76		Summer 1975 - SUCO Lit 292 Contemporary Lit. 3 cr. hr. Ed 217 Techniques of Teaching, 3 cr. hr. Summer 1976 - SUCO Math 101 Introduction to Math Thought, 3 cr. hr. Hist 248 The U.S. Since World War II, 3 cr. hr.	Oct. 75 - "Leadership in Nursing", Delhi, 15 clock hours. Dec. 75 - "Death and Dying Teaching Day", Otsego BOCES "Respiratory Therapy" In-service Program, Margaretville Hospital
	1974-75	Jan. 1975 - "Designing Effective Instruction", 2 cr. hr. May 1975 - "Test Construction and Analysis", 2 cr. hr.		Fall 1974 - 3 hour Nursing Lectures at Hartwick College July 1975 - "Seminar on Surgery for Arthritis", Hartwick College 8 clock hours
	1973-74	Jan. 1974 - "Creative Use of Multi-Media, 1 cr. hr. "Faculty Counseling and Advising of Students", 1 cr. hr.		Fall 1973 - "Basics of Coronary Care - Coronary Nursing", O'Connor Hospital Sept. 1973 - "Advanced Respiratory Therapy Fundamentals", 20 hr., 1 cr. hr.
	1972-73	Began employment with the College as an instructor in September of 1973.		

presented in the following table.

TABLE III

SUPPORT TO CAMPUS PROGRAMS
BY
LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSING DEPARTMENT

Fall 1975

<u>Program</u>	<u>Percent of Department Workload¹</u>	<u>FTE Students</u>
Licensed Practical Nursing	98.6	54.0
Special	.7	.7
	100.0	54.7

¹ Shows percent of Licensed Practical Nursing Department workload created by students in each program listed.

STATE UNIVERSITY
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Delhi, New York 13753

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL GUIDE

1977 - 78

This guide has been developed to assist you during your examination of Academic Program Review materials and on your campus visitation. You will notice that the document's sections correspond to those of the review instrument and the self-study. The suggested questions are a sampling of those for which you might seek answers. The rating checklist and comments areas for each section are intended for your use to record the findings and statements you will want to make in the External Review Panel report. You will not be asked to submit this document; it is only for your use.

Seldon H. Kruger
Vice President for Academic Affairs

GUIDE FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

I. Program Identity.

1. Are program purpose and philosophy clearly stated?
Are they compatible with the College's mission?
2. Are program objectives clearly and specifically stated?
3. Do courses and other education experiences reflect the program's objectives?
4. Do program materials, i.e., outlines, syllabi, information sheets, etc., indicate a sufficient breadth and depth to lead to proficiency in the field of study?
5. Are program and degree requirements clear, reasonable, and publicly stated?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Philosophy	_____	_____	_____
Objectives	_____	_____	_____
Design (sequences)	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

II. Students.

1. Does the program's enrollment history trends and applications data indicate sufficient evidence of program viability?
2. Are student characteristics evident from information supplied?
3. Are admissions criteria appropriate and adequate?
4. Do student records - secondary and post-secondary - reflect a sound admissions policy?
5. Do students have a sense of rapport with faculty?
6. Are there remedial and/or diagnostic services available for students in need? Are they adequate?
7. What is the state of student morale?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Enrollment	_____	_____	_____
Admissions Policy	_____	_____	_____
Remedial Services	_____	_____	_____
Interaction - morale	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

III. Faculty and Staff,

1. Are the numbers of faculty sufficient?
2. Are faculty and staff characteristics, i.e., level of training and experience, adequate and appropriate?
3. What is the extent and quality of faculty professional activity?
4. To what extent are faculty involved in advising and assisting students?
5. What is the level and kind of faculty contribution to other campus disciplines or programs?
6. Has faculty turnover affected the quality of the program?
7. Are future staffing needs sufficiently identified? Do they seem adequate to meet anticipated program objectives and needs?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Credentials	_____	_____	_____
Professional Activity	_____	_____	_____
Teaching - Advising	_____	_____	_____
Comments:			

IV. Resources and Facilities.

1. Is support staff, i.e., secretaries, adequate?
2. Are support services, including counseling and placement, library, instructional resources, and computer support, available and adequate?
3. Does the program receive curricular support from other disciplines or programs?
4. Is divisional budget support for supplies and equipment adequate?
5. Does the program have adequate facilities and space, both general and specialized (including classrooms)?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Instructional Space and Equipment	_____	_____	_____
Academic Support Services	_____	_____	_____
Program Financial Support	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

V. Program Administration.

1. Is there evidence of curriculum planning and revision, including established procedures?
2. Is there a system for staff evaluation and is it linked to improvement of program and instruction?
3. How satisfactory is the student assessment system?
4. Is the budgetary process adequate to meet program needs?
5. Is there evidence of effective program leadership?
6. Are program performance factors, including student-faculty ratios, faculty contact hours, class lab section sizes, and efforts to improve program, reasonable?
7. Are the organizational relationships between the program, the division, and the college's administration clear?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Organization	_____	_____	_____
Curriculum Revision Procedures	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

VI. Program Accomplishments.

1. Is evidence provided of program graduates or students serviced?
2. Is there any follow-up information available on graduates?
3. What has the program's attrition/retention experience been and what does it indicate?
4. Is there evidence that the program is meeting its objectives?

	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Needs Improvement</u>
Evidence of Performance	_____	_____	_____
Graduate Follow-up	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

VII. Summary, Program Results, and Recommendations.

1. Do the program recommendations reflect a useful analysis of program conditions, needs, and potential solutions?

- 1 - Superior--high quality with no significant weakness
- 2 - Strong--some shortcomings but no major deficiencies
- 3 - Weak--in need of some major improvements
- 4 - Inferior--several severe deficiencies

Rate the following using the scale above:

- A. Program Identity _____
- B. Students _____
- C. Faculty and Staff _____
- D. Resources and Facilities _____
- E. Program Administration _____
- F. Program Accomplishments _____

Comments: