



Academic Program Review Process

June 2018 (updated December 2020)
Address questions to Office of Institutional Effectiveness
OIE@siena.edu

Contents

Introduction	3
Program Review Elements	4
Executive Summary	4
I. Program History and Context.....	4
II. Program Curriculum.....	5
III. Program Faculty.....	6
IV. Student Engagement and Assessment	7
V. Student Retention and Success.....	9
VI. Future Plans.....	9
VII. Response to External Reviewer.....	10
Timeline of the Program Review Process	11
External Reviewer Guidelines	12
Compensation	13
Program Review Coordinator Role and Responsibilities	14
Program Review for Stand-alone Minors	16
Additional Data Sources to Consider.....	17
Guidelines for Conducting Focus Groups for Program Curriculum	18

Introduction

Program reviews, conducted once every **five years**, provide information that helps to enhance academic excellence as well as to improve the quality of the student learning experience. Ideally, the program review process is linked to the department's annual plans, annual reports, assessment of student learning outcomes, and other evaluations that take place on a continuous basis and are reviewed as an integral part of regional accreditation.

The program review is an iterative opportunity to self-evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the program under review and, as a result improve its operations and outcomes. This includes adherence to the program mission and the centrality to the school and Siena missions, stakeholder feedback, performance in relation to efficiency of delivery and instructional cost goals, and identification of resources- actual and necessitated as determined in the review. The process also enables department members, internal reviewers, and external reviewers to monitor program quality, to identify problems that may need corrective action, and to modify departmental offerings accordingly. The program reviews should be conducted within the context of Siena's academic values, the College's history, Siena's internal strengths and weaknesses, and the institutional need to respond to internal and external challenges and opportunities.

The program reviews scheduled within an academic year, are ***submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by June 30th*** each year. Following this submission, a meeting will be held between the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs: Institutional Effectiveness, Department Chair and the Dean of the School. During this meeting follow up and action steps to be taken for the program within the next two years will be discussed.

Program Review Elements

Executive Summary

1. Description of the program: Briefly describe the program history, its mission, and the student characteristics of those enrolled in the program.
2. Overall: After analysis of the information on this program, please indicate if the program should continue as is, or if modifications are necessary for the program.
3. Describe the strengths of the program.
4. Describe the opportunities to enhance the program along with a suggested timeframe for changes to be implemented.

I. Program History and Context

In this section please provide a brief introduction of the history of the program (including the last time this program was reviewed) with particular attention to how the program supports the mission of both the Department and the College. The following elements need to be addressed in this section:

1a) Program history: Briefly discuss the history, when (year) the program started, and the degrees and majors currently offered.

1b) Congruence with Mission: Discuss how the program supports the Departmental and College mission.

1c) Program Uniqueness: What are the distinctive characteristics of this program? How does this program compare to others regionally? Nationally?

1d) Progress to date: Provide a description of the changes made to the program since the last review (and the mid-point review).

1e) Minor(s) or Certificate(s): If there are any minor(s) or certificate(s) that your department is responsible for, please address the program review elements for the minor and certificate separately within the same report.

II. Program Curriculum

In this section, in-depth curricular aspects are reviewed. Please provide information on the curricular structure for both the degree program and minor/certificates (if any), identify curricular maps, and review course enrollment patterns for the past five years. The following elements need to be addressed in this section:

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 learnt. Which changes (if any) made were most useful?

2b) Program learning outcomes: State the end of program learning outcomes.

2c) Curriculum map: Provide a curriculum map identifying the alignment between the courses and the program learning outcomes.

2d) Curriculum rigor: Identify if there are disciplinary standards related to this program and compare the program curriculum to the disciplinary standards. Is the curriculum and the courses applicable (right things in the right order), relevant (to current situation) and value added (assisting students in reaching their goals)? To address the aspect of curriculum rigor, the program may compare the Siena program to other similar programs regionally or nationally, or with those that are considered exemplary. Has this program pioneered new approaches to teaching and learning that could serve as a model for emulation?

The program may choose to conduct a focus group with alumni (or their employers). This will help the program align the curriculum with perceptions of employer needs. Refer to page 18 for sample focus group questions.

2e) Courses: List the courses for this program and identify course enrollments for the past five years. Include FYSM courses taught by department faculty.

2f) Diversity: Explain how diversity issues are represented in the curriculum. How well does the program meet the needs of diverse student groups?

2g) Reflection: Overall, after reviewing the various aspects of the curriculum listed above, what are the key findings? What are the strengths and opportunities to improve the curriculum?

III. Program Faculty

This section of the review analyzes the faculty (full time and part-time) resources available to the program. Please address the following:

3a) Faculty Profile over a five-year period

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

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

3b) Student/faculty ratio over a five-year period

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

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

3c) Average class size over a five-year period

Class size	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Average lecture class size					
Average lab size (if applicable)					

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

3d) Faculty Utilization: Please address the mix of contingent and full-time faculty. Identify which group of faculty is producing most research and scholarly work, and the faculty load of teaching faculty.

Faculty Utilization	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of full time faculty					
Number of visiting FT 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)

3e) Faculty Diversity: How diverse is the full-time faculty and how does the diversity compare to Siena's and national norms?

3f) Full time Faculty Management: Describe full-time faculty support for college programs (e.g., core curriculum, honors program), interdisciplinary programs, or programs in other departments. How are full time faculty mentored and supported as teachers? How is teaching performance of full-time faculty reviewed, and how does the department respond to problems that are identified?

3g) Part-time Faculty Contribution and Evaluation: How do the part-time faculty members contribute (may also include non-teaching) to the program? How are the part-time faculty evaluated?

3h) Reflection: Please list any other aspects (faculty accomplishments and recognitions, faculty research etc.) that are not covered in the areas above. Overall, after reviewing the various aspects of the faculty, what are the key findings? What are the strengths and opportunities to improve in this area?

IV. Student Engagement and Assessment

Student Learning Opportunities:

4a) Community Engagement: Are there any community engagement activities between high schools, business communities, and community organizations with the department? How does the College 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 refer to teaching and learning practices that have been 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 (Association of American Colleges & Universities).

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

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

4c) Library Services: How well does the Library meet the needs of the program? Describe the adequacy of the Library's holdings (e.g. databases, journals, books, and audiovisual materials). How do the collaborative information literacy instruction and reference/research assistance programs support the program being reviewed?

Student Satisfaction:

4d) Course Satisfaction: How satisfied are students with courses being offered? Provide summarized course evaluations. How has the department responded to issues raised to course satisfaction concerns via quantitative and qualitative assessments?

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:

4e) Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment: What changes have the faculty made in the program, as a result of an analysis of the assessment of student 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)
PO # 1				
PO # 2				
PO # 3				

4f) Reflection: Overall, after reviewing the various aspects of the student learning, what are the key findings? What are the strengths and opportunities to improve continuous quality improvement efforts in the area of teaching and learning?

V. Student Retention and Success

This section of the review analyzes the area of student retention and success. Please address the following:

5a) Student Outcomes: Please provide the number of enrollments and graduates over the last five years, and address how this information compares with Siena's and national norms?

Measures		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Student enrollment	Full time (M\F)					
	Part time (M\F)					
	FTE					
Degrees conferred (number & percentage)						
Retention rate						
Graduation rate (4 year)						
Average length of time to degree						
Job placement rate (if available)						
Number of students pursuing graduate studies						

(Note: Data will be provided by OIE)

5b) Alumni satisfaction: Describe graduating students' and alumni satisfaction with program (if available)

5c) 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 program in the last 5 sections, please provide a narrative on what continuous quality improvement efforts are planned for this program for the future? How is 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 an internal analysis of the data as well as any social political changes in the educational landscape. Please present the specific

changes that you plan to implement, along with the timeline and resources needed for the same in the table:

Proposed changes to the program for the future	Timeframe	Resources (if needed)	Measures (if applicable, list current & target value)

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

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

¹ Note that for Minors, external reviews are not required. In the Future Plans section (VI), please address aspects such as low enrollments (if applicable) and the hidden costs of offering the minor. If the enrollment in the minor is substantial or if there is discussion of converting a minor into a major etc. the Minor director may discuss with the Dean and VPAA the potential value of engaging an external reviewer for the program review process.

Timeline of the Program Review Process

Time period	Activity	Responsible Person
May	OIE Informs Department of upcoming program reviews	AVP IE
July - August	OIE provides 5 year data to Department for relevant sections of the program review	AVP IE
August	Department identifies an external reviewer. External Reviewer to be approved by the Dean	Department Chair Dean
July - December	Department prepares the program review document to send to the external reviewer	Department Chair Dean
December - January	Draft reviewed by the Dean Draft report sent to VPAA prior to External Reviewer visit Department Chair sends the program review to the External Reviewer	Dean Department Chair
February	External Reviewer visits the College and meets with program stakeholders ²	Department Chair Dean External Reviewer
March	External Reviewer submits report to the Department Chair	External Reviewer
April - June	Department reviews external reviewer comments and determines course of action for the program	Department Chair
June	Department submits program review report* to Academic Affairs	Department Chair Dean
October	VPAA and AVP-IE meeting with Department Chair and Dean to determine changes planned for the program	Academic Affairs (VP AA, AVP-IE School (Dean, Department Chair)
2 year Follow- up	VPAA and AVP-IE meeting with Department Chair and Dean for a status check on the program changes that had been planned. Discussion at the 2 year follow up will focus on whether the future plans presented in the program review is underway, or if there is any support needed to implement the same.	Academic Affairs (VP AA, AVP-IE School (Dean, Department Chair)

*Maximum page limit for program report is 40 pages (excluding appendices)

² For Minors, please see footnote on external reviewers on page 10.

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. Avoided if possible is an external reviewer from a competitor or local school.
- Address potential conflict of interests with reviewers such as close collaborators or friends of faculty member or employment at competitor institution.

II. Responsibilities

- Notify external reviewer of report type and timeline expectations.
- External reviewer will provide a report that include findings, recommendations, and suggestions on how to act on those recommendations.

III. Reviewer Responsibilities

- Before the site visit, the external reviewer will receive:
 - Written Review Plan (Schedule & Framework)
 - A draft internal review document (after seen by the Dean)
 - Abbreviated CV's for each faculty member
 - Review of library resources
 - Other supplementary reports or reviews as deemed necessary
 - Department expectations of external review and site visit
- 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
- Provide feedback and recommendations to the department based on review of the draft program review report, relevant materials, campus visit, and discussions with appropriate constituents
- 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 and VPAA.
(Need to actually review these and make sure potential reviewers are appropriate.)

Compensation

Time	Compensation	Notes
Program Review Coordinator*		
Fall	1 course (3 credit) Release	
Spring	\$500	1. At end of fall semester AND 2. Submission of Written Review Plan
Summer	\$500	1. At the conclusion of Program Review AND 2. Final Written Report AND 3. Written response to VPAA, Dean, and External Reviewer Recommendations
External Reviewer (per person)		
Stipend	\$500	1. Submitted report including recommendations AND 2. Carried-out responsibilities professionally as indicated by Program Review Coordinator
Travel Expenses	Covered	

*Program Review Coordinator receives compensation after all materials have been submitted and accepted to designated offices.

Program Review Coordinator Role and Responsibilities

The Program Review Coordinator role may be fulfilled by the Department Chair or by a faculty member appointed to serve this specific role. The Program Review Coordinator will engage in a variety of activities throughout the process. In some instances the activity is completed by the Program Review Coordinator themselves, whereas in other instances the activity may have to be completed by other individuals. For activities completed by other individuals, it is the responsibility of the Program Review Coordinator to ensure that the designated work is completed.

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 the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) on receipt of the various data elements regarding any clarifications on the data received. Please let OIE know of any other data needs for the program by early fall.
3. Identify an external reviewer (refer to page 12 on Academic Program Review Process for External Reviewer guidelines) and receive 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 process.
5. Compile a draft program review report to send to the external reviewer. Prior to sending the draft report to the external reviewer, the draft report has to be reviewed by the Dean.
6. Co-ordinate with Department stakeholders, and other personnel to host the reviewer and make necessary arrangements for the External Reviewer to meet with Department faculty, Dean, VPAA and other relevant stakeholders as deemed necessary. The Program Review Coordinator will distribute the draft report to appropriate stakeholders prior to the external reviewer visit.
7. Work with Academic Affairs office (Kathleen Roberts) to arrange for travel, hotel and meals for the External Reviewer as well as for meeting meals with Department faculty.
8. Ensure that the External Reviewer submits a program review report in a timely manner.
9. Notify Academic Affairs office (Kathleen Roberts) that the report has been received so that the honorarium can be sent to the External Reviewer.
10. Arrange to have departmental faculty conversations to follow up on the actions proposed by the External Reviewer to determine action items for the program for the future.
11. Seek input and review from the Department Chair and Dean, and finalize the Program Review report.
12. Submit the Program Review report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (copy AVPAA-IE) by June 30, 2019.
13. Follow the timeline of the program review process (refer to page 11 in this document) unless exceptions have been granted.

14. Keep the Department Chair informed throughout the process if the Program Review Coordinator is not the Department Chair.
15. 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 time lines is to be presented in the review.

The Program Review Coordinator will be compensated as per the guidelines specified on page 13 of this document.

Program Review for Stand-alone Minors

The program review for a stand-alone Minor should address:

- 1) Program Description: The program description should consist of the following elements:
 - What are the goals of the minor
 - What is the rationale for offering the minor
 - How does the minor enhance the academic stature of the College, School or Department?
- 2) Curricular Structure and Learning: The curricular structure should address the following:
 - What are the outcomes from the minor?
 - What are the courses required to complete the minor?
 - Present learning outcomes results based on minors (if sufficient number available)
- 3) Faculty
 - How many faculty support the program?
- 4) Student Satisfaction
 - Are the minors from the program satisfied?
 - How has the minor helped the students in their career?
- 5) Market Demand Analysis:
 - Describe the target market of students intended to be serviced by the minor
 - What is the enrollment in the minor for the last five years?
 - How many degrees have been awarded in the minor for the last five years?
 - Reflection: Is the enrollment trend reflecting the anticipated numbers for the minor? Does anything need to be changed, if so what is the change? If the minor needs to be changed, what should the change be?
- 6) Future Plans:
 - Based on an analysis of the minor, please provide a narrative on what continuous quality improvement efforts are planned for the future? How is the data gathered during this program review informing changes for the minor? Please present the specific changes that you plan to implement, along with the timeline and resources needed for the same in the table:

Proposed changes to the program for the future	Timeframe	Resources (if needed)	Measures (if applicable, list current & target value)

Additional Data Sources to Consider

Data	Source / Contact
Enrollment Data:	
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 (includes Avg. Section Size)	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile
Study Abroad Participation by Major	Fact Book
Course Enrollments	Registrar or OIE/Dept. Data Profile
Course - Average Grade / Withdrawal data	OIE
Student diversity - by Major	Registrar or OIE
Faculty:	
Credits by Part-Time Faculty	Fact Book
Faculty Diversity by Primary Department	OIE
Library:	
Library Data	Department's Library Liaison
Acquisitions	Department's Library Liaison
Strength of collections	Department's Library Liaison
Usage statistics	Department's Library Liaison
Library instruction	Department's Library Liaison
Student Recruitment:	
Applications, Accepts, Confirms by Major	Dept. Data Profile/Admissions
Pre-Enrollment Academic Data	Dept. Data Profile/Admissions
Retention \ Graduation Rates:	
Degrees Conferred by Major (includes Certificates)	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile
Graduates by Minor	Fact Book/Dept. Data Profile
Survey Data:	
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	OIE
Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (NLSSI)	OIE
Career Status Survey - job/ graduate school	Career Center

Guidelines for Conducting Focus Groups for Program Curriculum

The focus group is a discussion-based methodology used to gather information on a specific topic more deeply than a survey methodology. The group discussion is guided by a facilitator and there is also a note-taker. The number of participants may range from 6-12 people (maximum). The goal of the focus group is to have a structured discussion on a specific topic where participants feel comfortable to self-disclose about their experience. A focus group that is conducted well leads to a dialogue, and the discussion takes on a life of its own, with each participant commenting and responding to others, adding a certain degree of richness to the conversation.

Focus groups are typically conducted in a collegial atmosphere where the room is set up with the group sitting around in a circle. With the rise in technology, there are now focus groups that mix onsite participants with participants who join remote. In such cases, the facilitator has to be skilled to ensure that the remote participants are equally engaged in the conversation as the onsite participants.

Focus groups typically discuss no more than 5-10 questions in total. Furthermore, the number of questions will depend upon the number of participants in the group. Questions may be prioritized, with some kept as backups in case there is extra time. One may consider sending the questions to participants ahead of time, before the focus group session, so that participants have had the time to think about the items. This will lead to a richer conversation.

Focus groups use open-ended questions. Some sample questions to get at the perspectives on the curriculum from alumni and employers are presented below:

Sample questions for Undergraduate or Graduate Alumni on Curriculum:

Program Purpose

- Why did you choose the program?
- What were you expecting of the program?
- Describe your most significant learning experience(s) from this program.
- How did you hope it would prepare you for your future?

Program Strengths

- What are the key strength(s) of the program? (probe: What did you like about the program?)
- What made this program unique?
- Did the program strengths fit with your career opportunities?
- What current strengths should the program build upon?

Opportunities for Improvement

- What key improvements could be made to the program and why? (Probe: If they are recent graduates from the program if they have any suggestions to remove or add any courses or aspects to the curriculum)
- What emerging or new areas could the program focus on that would strengthen its value for students in this program?
- What skills did you have to develop that were not targeted in this program when you were a student?

Final Reflection

- What is the most important thing you would like to tell the program faculty as they work to enhance the program?
- Are there any aspects of your undergraduate learning experience that have benefited you in your work?
- What skills have you learned in the first year in your position that you could have learned at university, but did not?

Sample Questions for Employers on the Program:

In case a program would like to conduct a focus group with employers of our graduates, these are potential questions that can be asked:

General

- How many Siena College graduates work at your organization? (Probe from which programs if there are alumni from multiple programs).
- What key characteristics, motivations, knowledge, or skills do you look for when hiring?

Program Strengths

- Based on your experience with graduates of the program employed at your organization, what are some key strengths that they possess?
- Do graduates of the program add value to your organization? If so how?

Areas for Improvement

- Based on your experience with graduates of the program employed in your organization, what are some key areas for improvement?
- What gaps, if any, do you see in the program's preparation of students?
- What two key changes would you propose if you were to improve the program to better prepare Siena College graduates for employment in your organization.

Overall

- What advice would you give to recent graduates or soon to be graduates of the program?

Best Practices for Conducting Focus Groups

1. At the beginning of the focus group session, explain the purpose of the focus group.

Thank you for coming today. We have invited you to provide feedback about your experience as a student (or other role) in the _____ program (or module). We value your honest feedback and plan to use the feedback for _____. You are welcome to build on each other's thoughts and ideas.

2. Confidentiality will lead to more open and honest feedback from participants. Consider how you will protect confidentiality of the participants when inviting participants and scheduling sessions.

The information that you share today will be kept anonymous. We ask that you help protect anonymity and confidentiality by agreeing not to share what we hear today with people outside the room. We are taking notes of key ideas and themes during this conversation. Identifying information will not be included in notes that are shared outside of this room. Do you have any questions?

3. Make a statement at the beginning of the focus group session to explain what will happen with any transcripts, recording, and notes that result from the focus group.

The transcriber should be someone who will not be able to identify participants. If you will be audio recording, make a statement at the beginning of the session explaining the following:

We are audio-recording this session. The recording may be transcribed and will be used to obtain details about our conversation today. The transcripts, and not the direct recordings, may be used to help make decisions about program improvement and may also be used in internal self-study documents. No identifying information will be included in the transcripts. Does anyone have any questions or concerns about audio recording?

If there are concerns, one may decide not to record the session.

4. Keep the conversation on track and help participants “dig deeper”.

One may even consider recording key points on the board or flip chart paper to help capture discussion and to compare to transcripts and notes later. Be prepared to help participants move through some common challenges. Common challenges as well as some tips and suggested prompts are listed in the table below:

Challenges	Tips for addressing the challenge	Suggested Prompts
Feedback focuses on a theme not related to the question posed.	Make a judgement on whether to allow the conversation to progress. If, for example, a theme is recurring many times that it looks like the participants agree upon the theme, one may want to gather additional information on the	This point has been raised multiple times. Has this been experienced by the others in the room? What I'm hearing is _____. Does this capture your experience?

	theme before moving the conversation back to the set focus group questions.	
A participant is hijacking the conversation.	State that you have recorded that feedback and remind the group of the topic that is currently being discussed.	Thank you for that input. I have recorded that idea. The question that we are now focused on is _____. Does anyone have additional input that we have not discussed yet?
Some participants are quiet.	Ask directly if there are other participants who would like to share their input on the question.	We have not heard from you yet. Do you have anything that you would like to add?
Participants responses are general or vague.	Ask follow up probes to help draw out concrete examples or ideas.	Tell me more about what you said. Can you clarify what you mean?

Reference: Adapted and taken from: Conducting Focus Groups for Curriculum Review and Improvement. (2019). Center for Teaching and Learning, Western University.