



# Academic Program Review Process

Effective Spring 2026  
Address questions to Office of Institutional Effectiveness  
[OIE@siena.edu](mailto:OIE@siena.edu)  
*Updated March 2026*

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PROGRAM REVIEW ELEMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>I. PROGRAM HISTORY AND CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. PROGRAM CURRICULA .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. PROGRAM FACULTY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. STUDENT SATISFACTION AND ENGAGEMENT BEYOND THE CURRICULUM .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>V. STUDENT RETENTION AND SUCCESS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>VI. FUTURE PLANS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>VII. RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>TIMELINE OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWER GUIDELINES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>POTENTIAL EXTERNAL REVIEWERS- CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>COMPENSATION .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>PROGRAM REVIEW COORDINATOR ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>PROGRAM REVIEW FOR STAND-ALONE MINORS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL DATA SOURCES TO CONSIDER .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## Introduction

Program reviews at Siena University are conducted every 6-7 years. Much can change within a discipline, higher education, and the workforce within this timeframe. With this in mind, program review serves as a periodic reflection on the past, present, and future of a program, and provides an opportunity to revisit and affirm the program's shared vision. This, then, informs the work of faculty, staff, and administrators for the coming years.

The program review process is iterative. It is an evidence-based evaluation of the status of a program and how it arrived to this point. After a careful reflection on the state of the program, faculty and administrators work together to set goals for the program's future, identify benchmarks to measure progress, and establish a plan to achieve those goals. The measurement of this work and achievement of goals becomes part of the evidence discussed in the next program review. Program reviews are an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a program, and, as a result, improve its operations and outcomes. The process enables the program to monitor quality, identify issues potentially needing corrective action, and modify program offerings accordingly. Program reviews should be conducted within the context of Siena's academic values, strengths and weaknesses, and internal and external challenges or opportunities.

Program reviews are scheduled within an academic year and are **submitted by June 1st** each year (see the timeline enclosed for submission details). During the second or third week of June, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Institutional Effectiveness (AVPAA-IE), Dean, Department Chair\*, and the Program Review Coordinator (if different from Department Chair) will meet. The report findings, external reviewer's feedback, the program's plans for the future, and specific follow up actions will be discussed in this meeting.

Requests to change the timing of a scheduled review should be made to the AVPAA-IE and SVPAA via email. If a request is granted, note that it does not change the scheduled timing of any subsequent reviews for the program. New degree programs will undergo their initial program review 5 years after they begin, and every 6-7 years thereafter.

Note: Programs holding specialized accreditations do not participate in academic program review.

*\*Note: for the purposes of this document, Program Directors of interdisciplinary programs should follow instructions that say "Department Chair."*

# Program Review Elements

## Organization of the Program Review Document

1. **Program Description and Data Analyses:** The program history, mission, program learning goals, and curricular offerings. Other key elements include the faculty and student engagement. Strengths and weaknesses of the program are explored.
2. **External Review and Response:** The external reviewer(s) feedback to the review is presented and should be followed by a thoughtful response to the reviewer's comments, in particular any questions they raised or recommendations they made.
3. **Planning the Next Steps:** After a thorough analysis of the program's current state, the program will outline the goals they aim to achieve before the next program review. These should be based on the evidence presented and grounded in an understanding of the resources available at Siena. The program will identify benchmarks to measure progress towards these goals.

### I. Program History and Context

In this section, units provide a brief introduction of the history of the program, including the last time this program was reviewed. Any significant changes within the program since the last review should be highlighted. Address each of the following elements:

**1a) Program History:** Briefly discuss the history, when (year) the program started, and any significant changes to the program since then. Note the addition or elimination of majors, minors, concentrations and tracks, as applicable.

**1b) Congruence with Mission and Learning Goals:** Articulate how the program supports the School and University's missions and learning goals. In addition, programs can describe the alignment of their work with the School or University's strategic plan, if desired. Discuss any changes to the program's mission or mission statement over time, provide context for the changes.

**1c) Program Uniqueness:** What are the distinctive characteristics of this program? What sets a Siena graduate apart from graduates of similar programs at peer institutions? How does this program compare to others regionally or nationally?

**1d) Progress to Date:** Summarize the goals set by the program after the last program review and the subsequent changes made to the program(s) to accomplish these goals. Summarize the results of these efforts, foreshadowing their discussion later in this document.

## II. Program Curricula

This section focuses on the curricular structure for the degree program(s) including learning goals, curriculum maps, and learning outcomes assessment. Review course enrollment patterns for the past seven years. Tracks should be discussed within this section. After your discussion of the degree(s) for 2a-2e, please address questions 2a-d for the minors, concentrations, and certificates associated with the program.

**2a) Curricular Structure:** Identify and describe the structure, breadth, and depth of the curricular offerings. Describe the changes that have occurred since the last review and the lessons learned. Which changes (if any) were most useful?

**2b) Program Learning Goals:** Present the learning goals (for each major, minor, concentration, track, and certificate, as applicable). Briefly describe each program and how the curriculum is designed to prepare students to achieve these goals. If any have been revised recently, briefly describe the motivation for the revision.

**2c) Curriculum Map(s):** Provide curriculum maps identifying the alignment between the courses and the learning outcomes. Discuss any observations gained from reviewing or updating the maps (i.e. gaps, over- or under-emphasis). Describe what curricular changes might address these.

**2d) Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment:** Describe the changes the program has made since the last review based on the assessment of student learning outcomes (i.e. curricular reorganizations, course redesigns, sunsetting or development of courses, etc.). Note: Your answer should specifically address program level learning outcomes.

Program Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Frequency or Last Assessed	Results	Use of Results (Identify changes made as a result of student learning assessments)
PLO # 1				
PLO # 2				
PLO # 3				
PLO # 4				
PLO # 5				

**2e) Curricular rigor:** Identify any external disciplinary educational standards related to this program, if applicable. Compare the program's learning goals and curriculum to these. Discuss any deviations. For example, nationally recognized disciplinary bodies or disciplinary accreditors (even though we ourselves are not accredited) may be helpful reference points. The program may also choose to benchmark themselves against similar or aspirant programs and include their findings here. Discuss your curriculum. Are Siena students receiving sufficient, scaffolded

learning to achieve the program learning goals in the current curricular structure? Does every course in the curriculum support at least one program level learning goal?

**2f) Courses:** List the courses for the unit’s program(s) and identify course enrollments for the past seven years. Describe how the unit’s course offerings contribute to Siena’s academic offerings outside of the unit. For example, courses delivered in support of the Core, or other units’ majors, minors, concentrations, or certificates.

**2g) Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion:** In keeping with our Franciscan mission, discuss how the program’s curricula incorporate substantive discussions of diversity, equity, and belonging. How do curricula address the historical or current marginalization or exclusion of different groups, and systemic barriers to equity in the discipline? How are the voices, scholarship, and intellectual or creative contributions of historically marginalized groups integrated into the curricula?

**2h) Reflection:** Summarize the key findings from your analysis of the curriculum/a. What are the strengths of the program, and where do you see opportunities to improve the curriculum/a?

### III. Program Faculty

This section of the review analyzes the faculty (full time and part-time) resources available to the program. Please address 3a-3j below (interdisciplinary programs please skip ahead to question 3l-3o):

**3a) Faculty Profile:** Please share your observations of the apparent trends over this period.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
# of FT Faculty							
Faculty FTE total							
Faculty FTE teaching							
Faculty FTE research							
Faculty FTE admin/other							
FTE Workload							
Tenured							
Tenure-track							
Highest degree							
Faculty Rank							
Professor							
Associate							
Assistant							
Instructor							

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

**3b) Faculty Utilization:** Please discuss the mix of contingent and full-time faculty.

Faculty Utilization	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Number of tenured and tenure-track faculty							
Number of FT unit faculty							
Number of adjunct faculty							
Number of administrative faculty							
Number of other faculty							
Total number of instructional faculty							
Faculty on sabbatical (not included above)							

*(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)*

**3c) Student/Faculty Ratio:** Please share your observation of the apparent trend over this seven-year period.

Ratio	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Student to faculty ratio overall							

*(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)*

**3d) Average class size** over a seven-year period. Please share your observations on the sizes or numbers of sections.

Class size	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Number of lecture sections							
Average lecture class size							
Number of lab sections (if applicable)							
Average lab class size (if applicable)							

*(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)*

**3e) Full-time Faculty Contribution:** Describe how full-time program faculty support university programs (e.g., the core curriculum, honors program, First Year Seminar), interdisciplinary programs, or programs in other departments.

**3f) Part-time Faculty Contribution:** How do part-time faculty members contribute to the program (may also include non-teaching contributions)?

**3g) Faculty Development in Teaching:** How are tenured and tenure-track faculty supported as teachers? Describe participation by program faculty in professional development to improve their teaching, including development opportunities related to specific topics, i.e. universal design for learning, etc. Describe how the program integrates evidence from the scholarship of teaching and learning into classroom teaching.

**3h) Faculty Support in Research:** How are tenured and tenure-track faculty supported as scholars? Describe how faculty utilize on-campus resources to support or advance their scholarly activities (i.e. equipment, studio space, library resources, grant support, etc.)

**3i) Faculty Retention:** How does the program support faculty, from onboarding through promotion to full professor? Describe any mentoring efforts within the program, and how both the efficacy of and satisfaction with this system are measured.

**3j) Faculty Diversity:** In alignment with our Franciscan mission, describe the program's efforts to recruit faculty who add diversity to the community. How does the program intentionally support and retain diverse faculty once they have been hired?

**3k) Reflection:** Please list any other aspects (faculty accomplishments and recognitions, faculty research etc.) that are not covered in the areas above. Summarize the key findings related to the faculty. What are the strengths and opportunities to improve in this area?

**3l) *Interdisciplinary programs only:*** Please list the core courses in the program, the faculty who teach them, and the home department of those faculty. Data Source: Argos

**3m) *Interdisciplinary programs only:*** Please provide a concise summary of the composition of elective or auxiliary courses for the major, which departments provide the majority of these courses? Data Source: Argos

**3n) *Interdisciplinary programs only:*** Please provide an evaluation of challenges and successes of the curricular organization and/or partnerships with the departments that contribute most to the program. Are there areas for improvement that you have identified? Are there strategies that have been highly effective that you recommend?

**3o) *Interdisciplinary programs only:*** Please provide your reflection on the delivery of the program in the context of 3l-3n.

#### IV. Student Satisfaction and Engagement beyond the Curriculum

This section provides an opportunity to discuss learning opportunities beyond the discipline and student satisfaction data.

##### Engagement beyond the Curriculum

**4a) Community Engagement:** Does the program regularly hold or participate in community engagement activities with high schools, business communities, or other community

organizations? How does the University support such community engagement activities for the students in this program?

**4b) High Impact Practices:** Identify the high impact practices that are incorporated into this program and its courses. High Impact practices are defined teaching and learning practices shown to be beneficial for college students for student engagement and retention. High Impact practices may include experiences such as First Year Seminars, Writing Intensive Courses, Undergraduate Research, ePortfolios, Emphasis on Diversity/Global Learning, Service Learning, Community-Based Learning, Internships, Capstone Courses and Projects (AAC&U).

	Internship	Clinical Experience	Independent Study/ Research	Practicum	Total
Duplicated (H)					
Unduplicated (U)					

*(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)*

**4c) Experiential Learning:** Please discuss any types of experiential learning incorporated in the program that were not already addressed in 4b (i.e. research, community engaged learning, and non-credit internships).

**4d) Study Abroad:** Please discuss the frequency of students in the program participating in study abroad (if applicable). If the program offers any travel courses related to the major, please describe how this course has been received. Data Source: Fact Book

**4e) Library Resources:** Please describe how the program examines and evaluates its library resources. How does the program determine what should be added, continued, or discontinued? Describe the evidence used for making these decisions.

**4f) Library Instruction and Information Literacy:** Describe how the program integrates library instruction at the 100, 200, 300, and 400 level (and/or graduate level, as applicable). Describe how your program intentionally cultivates information literacy, either expanding upon the curriculum offered by the library, or separately. How is information literacy assessed within the program?

### Student Satisfaction

**4g) Course Satisfaction:** How satisfied are students with the courses being offered? Provide summarized course evaluation data. How has the department responded to issues raised to course satisfaction concerns identified in its assessments?

**4g) Reflection:** After reviewing the various aspects of the student engagement and satisfaction, what are the key findings? What are the strengths and opportunities to improve?

## V. Student Retention and Success

Please address the following:

**5a) Student Outcomes:** Please provide the number of enrollments and graduates over the last seven years. Discuss how this information compares with Siena's and national norms.

Measures		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Student enrollment	Full time (M\F)							
	Part time (M\F)							
	FTE							
Degrees conferred (number & percentage)								
Retention rate in the major								
Retention rate in the school								
Retention rate at Siena								
Graduation rate in the major (4 year)								
Graduation rate in the school (4 year)								
Average length of time to degree								

*(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)*

**5b) Student Experience:** Describe how the program cultivates an inclusive and welcoming environment for all students in its programs. Include a discussion of any disciplinary-specific student clubs or events where faculty and students come together, and how the faculty prioritize inclusivity and belonging efforts in these organizations.

**5c) Accessibility:** How does the program support students from varied backgrounds (including students with disabilities), to enable equal access and participation in the learning experience.

**5d) First Destination:** Please review and discuss the outcomes of the program's graduates one-year post-graduation. *(Note: Data will be provided by OIE, as available. Programs wishing to conduct focus groups can contact OIE for guidance.)*

**5e) Reflection:** Please summarize the data related to this area of student retention and success and determine next steps towards continuous quality improvement efforts.

## VI. Future Plans

Based on an analysis of the data presented and interpreted above, please provide a narrative on what continuous quality improvement efforts are planned for this program for the future? How are the data gathered during this program review informing changes for the program? Address the departmental priorities for the next five years and changes that may be needed

based on shifts in the greater educational landscape. Please present the specific changes that you plan to implement, the anticipated timeframe for completing the work, resources needed, the benchmarks for progress, and the outcome you intend to achieve in the table:

Proposed Changes to the Program	Timeframe	Resources (if needed)	Benchmarks and Target Outcome

Note: The report is sent to the external reviewer with the analysis from section I - VI, following which section VII will be written.<sup>1</sup>

### VII. Response to External Reviewer

Please summarize in a table format, the suggestions, recommendations put forth by the External Reviewer. Please place a check mark to indicate if the suggestions put forth by the external reviewer is under consideration, is planned or implemented.

Suggestions from External reviewer	Under consideration	Planned (indicate time frame for initiation)	Implemented (indicate time when started)	Comments

---

## Timeline of the Program Review Process

Time period	Activity	Responsible Person
January	Programs consult the program review schedule on the OIE website as part of their planning for the upcoming fall semester.	Department Chairs
May or June	OIE reminds programs of the upcoming program review. Programs identify a Program Review Coordinator.	AVPAA-IE Department Chair <sup>#</sup>
July - August	OIE provides programs with seven years of data for the identified sections	AVPAA-IE Director of IR
August	Programs identify potential external reviewers and submit the list to their Dean, with the required information (see p. 16).  Programs contact Isabella McClave ( <a href="mailto:imcclave@siena.edu">imcclave@siena.edu</a> ) in Academic Affairs for instructions on logistics related to the external review.	Department Chair Dean
July - December	Programs prepares their program review self-study document.	Department Chair
Late December – early January	Dean reviews the self-study draft; once approved by the Dean, the Department Chair sends the self-study to the SVPA (cc to the Dean); and under separate cover, the Department Chair sends the program review to the External Reviewer.	Dean Department Chair
February	The External Reviewer visits Siena and meets with program stakeholders.	Department Chair Dean External Reviewer
March	External Reviewer submits report to the Department Chair within three weeks of their visit, not later than March 31.	External Reviewer
April	Department reviews external reviewer comments and determines a proposed course of action for the program.	Department Chair
May	Department finalizes the program review report.	Department Chair
June 1 (or before)	Department submits the final program review report* via email to the AVPAA-IE, SVPA, and Academic Affairs at <a href="mailto:academicaffairs@siena.edu">academicaffairs@siena.edu</a> , <a href="mailto:mmadden@siena.edu">mmadden@siena.edu</a> , <a href="mailto:asavage@siena.edu">asavage@siena.edu</a>	Department Chair Dean

June	SVPAA and AVPAA-IE meet with Department Chair and Dean to discuss the findings of the review and develop an action plan for the program	SVPAA, AVPAA-IE Dean, Department Chair
2-year Follow-up	SVPAA and AVPAA-IE meet with Department Chair and Dean for a status check on progress towards the program changes from the action plan discussed in the program review meeting.	SVPAA, AVPAA-IE Dean, Department Chair

#While the Department Chair is not necessarily be the author of the program review, they should be in regular contact with the author and ensure the project progresses on schedule.

\*Maximum page limit for program report is 60 pages (excluding appendices)

## External Reviewer Guidelines

### I. Qualifications

- Independent and experienced professional recognized for contributions related to the field being reviewed.
- Experience in review of academic programs is preferred.
- Current employment in peer or aspirant institution preferred. If possible, avoid external reviewers from competitor or local schools.
- Disclose and address potential conflict of interests between program faculty and possible reviewers (for example, collaborations, friendships, or employment at competitor institutions). Provide this information to the Dean as they review the list of possible reviewers, as per the Conflict of Interest Disclosure format on p. 16.

### II. Responsibilities

- The Department will notify the external reviewer of expectations, including the campus visit, the type of report they are to produce, and timelines and due dates.
- External reviewer will provide a report that include findings, recommendations, and suggestions on how to act on those recommendations.

### III. Reviewer Responsibilities

- Standard practice at Siena is to use one external reviewer. Please consult your Dean with any questions.
- Before the site visit, the external reviewer will receive:
  - A draft self-study document which has been approved by the Dean
  - A preliminary schedule for the visit
  - Abbreviated CVs for each faculty member
  - Department expectations of external review and site visit, including what they should address in their written response, and reiterating the due date by which you'd like to receive their feedback.
- The external reviewer is required to make a campus visit. During that visit the external reviewer should:
  - Interview appropriate constituent groups (e.g. students, faculty, staff, center/ institute directors or coordinators)
  - Meet with Dean and VPAA
  - Tour the facilities and campus
  - Take note of available technologies and/ or department capabilities
  - If needed, request additional materials to help inform review
  - Participate in an Exit interview with the Dean
- After the campus visit, the external reviewer will provide written feedback and recommendations to the department based on review of the draft program review report, relevant materials, campus visit, and discussions with appropriate constituents. A three-week window between the visit and delivery of the final report is a reasonable time period.
- After the site visit, the department is responsible for reporting to Academic Affairs when the external reviewer's comments have been received and they

have fulfilled their duties. Reviewers will not receive their stipend until they have completed their work.

- The department will respond to the external reviewer indicating how the external reviewer's recommendations will be used.

**IV. Other Parameters/Considerations**

- An external reviewer should not be engaged prior to approval of the Dean (or SVPAA in the case reviews under "Academic Affairs").

## Potential External Reviewers- Conflict of Interest Disclosure

For each potential reviewer you have identified, please provide the information below in your submission to the Dean. We recommend identifying 2-3 candidates to start.

Name

Current rank and institution

Area(s) of specialization

Any distinguished honors or achievements of note related to their area of expertise

Provide a brief rationale (2-3 sentences) as to why this individual's feedback will be valuable to your program.

Please answer each of the following:

Have they collaborated with any program faculty? Y / N

Have they published with any program faculty? Y / N

Did they train with any program faculty, i.e. peers in the same program or a mentor/mentee? Y / N

Does the individual have any personal connection to any program faculty (i.e. personal friendships or family connections)? Y / N

Is the individual employed by a competitor institution? Y / N

Is there any other connection that could be viewed as a conflict of interest? Y / N

If you answered "yes" to any of the questions about, please explain why this person should still be considered as a potential external reviewer.

## Compensation

Payment of the stipend is dependent upon all stipulations in the notes being met. Payments will be disbursed at the next pay date following confirmation of such. Compensation arrangements may vary depending on different circumstances. Questions may be directed to the AVPAA-IE.

Time	Compensation	Notes
Program Review Coordinator*		
Fall	1 course (3 credit) Release	
Spring	\$500	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At end of fall semester AND</li> <li>2. Submission of a complete draft document to the Dean, cc to <a href="mailto:academicaffairs@siena.edu">academicaffairs@siena.edu</a></li> </ol>
Summer	\$500	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the conclusion of Program Review AND</li> <li>2. Submission of the complete, final program review document containing:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the self-study,</li> <li>- the external reviewer's comments,</li> <li>- the program's response to the external reviewer, and</li> <li>- proposed future actions.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
External Reviewer (per person)		
Stipend	\$500	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submitted final written report including recommendations AND</li> <li>2. Carried-out responsibilities professionally as indicated by Program Review Coordinator</li> </ol>
Travel Expenses	Covered	

\*Program Review Coordinator receives compensation after all materials have been submitted to and accepted by designated offices (i.e. OIE, Academic Affairs, the Dean, the Provost).

## Program Review Coordinator Role and Responsibilities

The Program Review Coordinator role may either be the Department Chair or a program faculty member selected to serve in this role. The Program Review Coordinator engages in a variety of activities throughout the program review. In some instances, the Program Review Coordinator performs the activity themselves, and in others the activity is performed by other individuals. For activities completed by other individuals, it is the responsibility of the Program Review Coordinator, with the support of the Department Chair, to ensure that the designated work is completed in a timely manner.

The following are the responsibilities of the Program Review Coordinator:

1. Contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) with any questions regarding the program review report process/template.
2. Contact OIE on receipt of the various data elements with any clarifying questions. Make any other data requests to the relevant offices by September 15.
3. Identify possible external reviewers (refer to p. 14 for External Reviewer guidelines). Obtain approval from the Dean prior to contacting the external reviewer.
4. Work with the Department Chair to ensure that Department faculty contribute to the program review at every step of producing the report.
5. Work with the Department Chair to keep the program review progressing on schedule, as outlined on pp. 12-13.
6. Compile/produce a draft program review report by the end of the term, provide to the Dean for review, cc to [academicaffairs@siena.edu](mailto:academicaffairs@siena.edu).
7. Once approved by the Dean a) send to the external reviewer, and b) submit a copy to [mmadden@siena.edu](mailto:mmadden@siena.edu).
8. Coordinate with Department colleagues to plan the external reviewer's itinerary for the visit, including the meetings with the Department faculty, Dean, SVPAA, and other stakeholders as deemed necessary. The Program Review Coordinator will distribute the approved draft report to appropriate stakeholders prior to the external reviewer visit.
9. Starting in late summer/early fall, work with Academic Affairs office to arrange for travel, hotel and meals for the external reviewer, as well as for meeting meals with Department faculty. Review spending instructions with Academic Affairs.
10. Communicate expectations to the external reviewer, and ensure that the external reviewer submits the program review report in a timely manner (the due date is typically three weeks after the visit, but not later than March 31).
11. Notify Academic Affairs office when the report has been received so that the honorarium can be paid to the External Reviewer.
12. Schedule and lead the program conversations on the actions proposed by the External Reviewer, and develop action items for the program to undertake.
13. Seek input and review from the Department Chair and Dean, and finalize the Program Review report with the inclusion of the program's response to the external reviewer.

14. Submit the Program Review report to the SVPAA Vice President of Academic Affairs and AVPAA-IE by **June 1**, by email, to: [academicaffairs@siena.edu](mailto:academicaffairs@siena.edu), [mmadden@siena.edu](mailto:mmadden@siena.edu), and [asavage@siena.edu](mailto:asavage@siena.edu).
15. Follow the timeline of the program review process (refer to p. 12 in this document) unless exceptions have been granted.
16. Keep the Department Chair informed throughout the process.
17. Create the program review report in a more analytic (rather than a descriptive style). Interpret the available data (both quantitative and qualitative sources) and create actionable steps for the future. The plans developed by the program and the suggestions from the external reviewer, are to be discussed and consolidated at the department level. Using the discussions, final actionable steps with tentative timelines are to be presented in the review.

The Program Review Coordinator will be compensated as per the guidelines specified on p. 17 of this document.

## Program Review for Stand-alone Minors

The program review for a stand-alone Minor (i.e. not part of a larger suite of programs being reviewed) should address the items below. Minors do not typically involve an external review, although occasionally an external reviewer may be requested. This is at the discretion of the Provost.

### 1) Program Description:

- When was the minor established? What was the rationale for developing the minor?
- Has the need for this minor changed (increased or decreased) over time?
- How does the minor enhance the academic stature of the University, School or Department?

### 2) Curricular Structure and Learning:

- What are the learning goals of the minor?
- How is the curriculum structured? (provide a curriculum map for reference)
- What are the courses required to complete the minor?
- Please discuss any courses specific to the minor, that are not regularly offered for another Siena program. How often are these courses offered, what have the enrollments been for these courses over the last seven years?
- What are the outcomes from the minor? Present assessment data; if enrollment is too low for assessment (n = 5 or fewer), note this.

### 3) Faculty

- How many faculty support the program?
- What proportion of these are full-time, part-time, or adjunct?
- What are the home departments for these faculty?

### 4) Market Demand Analysis:

- Describe the target market of students this minor is intended to serve.
- Present the enrollment in the minor for the last seven years? (data to be provided by OIE)
- How many students have earned the minor in the last seven years? (data to be provided by OIE)
- Is the realized enrollment trend reflecting the anticipated numbers for the minor?

### 5) Student Satisfaction

- Are the minors from the program satisfied? How are you measuring this? Provide summarized course evaluations.
- How has the department responded to issues raised to course satisfaction concerns?

### 6) Reflection and Future Plans:

- Based on this analysis, please describe what continuous quality improvement efforts are planned. Reference the evidence informing the proposed work. Present the changes, timeframe, resources needed, and benchmarks / target outcome in this table:

Proposed Changes to the Program	Timeframe	Resources (if needed)	Benchmarks and Target Outcome

## Additional Data Sources to Consider

Data accessible to Department Chairs	
Course rosters by CRN or Instructor	Argos
School Multi-Report <i>(includes Attributes needed, Course not taken, Graduates, Major, Degree Status, etc.)</i>	Argos
Course Count Report <i>(includes instructional method, cross-listed courses, etc.)</i>	Argos

*Note: To receive training on Argos, faculty should submit a helpdesk ticket to [helpdesk@siena.edu](mailto:helpdesk@siena.edu)*

Data	Source / Contact
<b>Enrollment Data:</b>	
Enrollment Data by Department - Major	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile
Enrollment Data by Department - Minor	Fact Book
Enrollment Data by Department - Certificate	Fact Book
Sections Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty <i>(includes Average Section Size)</i>	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile
Study Abroad Participation by Major	Fact Book
Course Enrollments	Registrar/Dept. Data Profile
Course - Average Grade	Registrar/Dept. Data Profile
Withdrawal data	Registrar
Student diversity - by Major	Registrar
<b>Faculty:</b>	
Credits by Part-Time Faculty	Fact Book
Faculty Diversity by Primary Department	OIE
<b>Student Recruitment:</b>	
Applications, Accepts, Confirms by Major	Dept. Data Profile/Admissions
<b>Retention / Graduation Rates:</b>	
Degrees Conferred by Major, Minor, Concentration, and Certificate	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile/Argos
<b>Survey Data:</b>	
First Destination Survey	OIE

