

# **Periodic Program Review (PPR) Guidelines**

**Office of Academic Affairs**



**Revised January 2024**

## Table of Contents

	Pages
<b>Periodic Program Reviews at LaGuardia</b>	2
Long-term PPR Cycle	
Benefits of the PPR & Responsibilities of the PPR Team	3
<b>PPR Timeline &amp; Calendar</b>	4
The PPR Calendar	5
<b>The PPR Report Outline</b>	6
<b>Section I. Introduction</b>	6
Program Overview   Mission Statement & Program Learning Outcomes Successes & Accomplishments   Closing the Loop	
<b>Section II. Analysis of Data &amp; Key Performance Indicators</b>	6
Enrollment   Demographics   Cohort Analysis   Transfer Change of Major   Course Pass & Completion Rates	
<b>Section III. Program Priorities &amp; Assessments</b>	7
Program Priorities   Student Inputs   Other Assessments	
<b>Section IV. Assessment</b>	7
Institutional Assessment   Programmatic Assessment	
<b>Section V. Faculty &amp; Professional Development</b>	9
<b>Section VI. Curriculum Review</b>	9
Comprehensive Curriculum Map   Degree Map Individual Course Review   Field Scan	
<b>Section VII. Student Success</b>	10
Program Transfer & Articulation   Advisement First Year Seminar   Student Support   Resources	
<b>Section VIII. External Review</b>	10
Appendix A: Creating a Year 1 Program Review Plan	13
Appendix B: Guidelines for Programs with External Accreditation	14
Appendix C: Formatting & Standards	16

## Periodic Program Reviews at LaGuardia

Five Core Values anchor LaGuardia's Mission to educate our students through graduation: diversity, responsibility, innovation, opportunity, and learning. These Core Values anchor why we conduct Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs). Importantly, Opportunity anchors the heart of the mission of the City University of New York (CUNY). Providing LaGuardia students with opportunities for personal and professional transformation goes beyond the individual efforts of faculty in their classrooms. Through program reviews, faculty meet to assess and design academic programs using evidence of student learning. PPRs are opportunities for faculty to analyze, reflect, and study their program learning goals, pedagogy, and curriculum; they afford chances to improve how programs might become more effective, and to design more opportunities for students to achieve their education, career, and life goals.

Program review addresses a student's whole learning experience, including a curriculum that incorporates disciplinary knowledge and the higher-cognitive skills necessary for transfer, employment, and life-long learning. Our associate degrees reflect students' mastery of programmatic knowledge and skills, but also the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities that anchor every LaGuardia degree, irrespective of one's major or career trajectory. All our majors provide students with the skills they will need to adapt to rapidly changing industries, economies, and social realities in the present and future.

Program reviews are also part of a larger assessment process required of all institutions of higher education by regional accreditors such as ours, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). Every academic program at the college is required to study itself in order to make evidence-based actions to improve student learning and success. As with the College's assessment model, faculty lead and drive the program review process.

Our accreditation cycle asks every program to examine what it does, to collect data on its practices, and to take evidence-based actions to improve. During program reviews, programs institute a multi-year cycle of analysis, implementation, and reflection. PPRs involve four active years: two years of planning and report writing followed by two years of implementing an Action Plan. PPR cycles are defined as the years between the submission of a Report in a Report Year and the submission of a Report in the next Report Year, as illustrated here:

### Long-term PPR Cycle

PPR cycles are defined as the years between the submission of a Report in a Report Year and the submission of a Report in the next Report Year:

Year 1 - Planning Year

Year 2 - Report Year

Year 3 - Implementation Year

Year 4 - Implementation Year

Year 5 - Break Year

Year 6 - Break Year

Year 7 - Update Year

Year 1 - Planning Year

Year 2 - Report Year

## **Benefits of the PPR**

Faculty who lead program reviews are positioned to analyze and influence the course of the program; this responsibility makes their leadership consequential and could be shaped as an opportunity for collaboration across the program and department, and an opportunity to narrate the successes and challenges of the program to leadership in Academic Affairs. PPR leaders envision the future of the program and chart its future at the College and in the larger LaGuardia community.

PPRs offer additional opportunities for the program:

- Creating an action plan helps faculty leads align the program's goals and objectives to the College's and department's priorities.
- Evaluating graduation, transfer, and employment pathways can enhance the curriculum and help identify new and existing practices that encourage student success.
- Collaborating on the goals and outcomes for student learning in a larger organizational structure improves student success while deepening PPR team members' knowledge of LaGuardia and CUNY policies and practices.
- Engaging in dialogue with college leaders allows faculty teams to share program accomplishments and articulate evidence-based needs. During PPRs, Academic Affairs leaders offer their perspectives and identify a program's contributions toward the College Mission and Strategic Plan.
- Receiving feedback and suggestions from an external reviewer enables the program to gain a perspective beyond LaGuardia that can help shape its future.

## **Responsibilities of the PPR Team**

Throughout the process, program teams meet with representatives from LaGuardia's Assessment Leadership team. They will also meet with the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and departmental leadership. A site visit by an External Reviewer who is not affiliated with CUNY is required for programs without an outside accrediting body (for exceptions to this policy, please see Section VIII below). Finally, team members will meet with Academic Affairs leadership to present the final report.

The time and energy faculty invest in program reviews affirm the College's eligibility for accreditation, upon which our institutional legitimacy rests. Program review reports are included as key documents during our Self-Studies with our Middle States accreditor. These documents are crucial evidence of the College's adherence to Standard V of the Middle States [Standards of Affiliation and Requirements of Affiliation](#). PPRs are also mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees and are crucial to LaGuardia's good standing in the City University of New York. As prescribed by the 1994 Board of Trustees resolution, each program must complete PPR reports within the established assessment cycle and submit them to Academic Affairs.

Failure to complete the PPR report in the agreed upon time frame or not meeting LaGuardia's PPR standards may lead to pausing program enrollment and/or working with the department chairperson to review the program director's role until an acceptable PPR is submitted.

## PPR Timeline & Calendar

The active PPR process spans four years: Year 1, Planning Year; Year 2, Report Year; and Years 3 and 4, Implementation Years. At the beginning of the Fall semester in Year 1, the department Chair identifies the program review team for the PPR, which will likely include the Program Director.

- I. Planning Year (Year 1), program review teams will:
  - Attend an orientation meeting in October to review the PPR process and procedures.
  - Plan how to assess the program in collaboration with Institutional Research (IR).
  - Draft and revise the Program Review Plan.
  - At the end of Fall Semester, PPR leads, and department chairs meet with Academic Affairs (AA) leadership to explain their process, and to consider feedback on their Program Review Plan.
  - In the Spring semester, PPR teams begin to collect data and conduct assessments.
- II. Report Year (Year 2), program review teams will:
  - In Fall I, analyze collected data and conduct additional assessments needed to write the Report.
  - In Fall II, programs submit a draft Report to receive feedback.
  - Organize an External Review (see more details in Section VII).
  - At the end of Year 2, programs submit their finalized Report with an Action Plan that uses data-points to make recommendations and suggest actions.
  - After the report is submitted, teams and department chairs meet with the Provost to discuss the planned actions and any resources/collaborations that are needed.
- III. Implementation Years (Years 3 and 4)
  - Implement the actions outlined in the Action Plan.
  - At the end of each year, programs submit a closing the loop report about their progress to Academic Affairs, stating which Actions occurred that year, and provide updated data about the Actions the program took.

After the four active years of a PPR, there are two break years (Years 5 and 6) followed by an update year (Year 7)). At the end of the update year, programs submit PPR update to AA and plan for the upcoming PPR cycle.

## The PPR Calendar

	<b><u>Planning Year (Year 1)</u></b>	<b><u>Report Year (Year 2)</u></b>
✓ October	Meeting 1: Intro to PPR	Meeting 1: Check-in meeting with PPR Reps & OIRA
✓ November	Program drafts PPR Plan	Program starts to draft PPR report
✓ January	Submit PPR plan draft	Identify External Reviewer Conduct program Benchmark Readings for PLO assessment
✓ February	Submit final PPR Plan Meeting 2: AA, Chair & PPR Reps	Submit draft of PPR Report by first week
✓ March	Meeting 3: Institutional Research (IR)	Revise semi-final draft of PPR for External Reviewer
✓ April	Collect data & plan/conduct assessments	External Review site visit
✓ May		Revise PPR Report for Department Chair
✓ June		Meeting 2: Provost, Associate Provosts, Department Chair & PPR Reps Submit PPR Report with Department Chair signature
	<b><u>Implementation (Years 3 &amp; 4)</u></b>	
✓ Fall I	Academic Affairs sends PPR Acknowledgement Memo	
✓ Fall II	AA Implementation Year Meeting	
✓ June-September	Submit implementation report to Academic Affairs	
	<b><u>Break Years (Years 5 &amp; 6) &amp; Update Year (Year 7)</u></b>	
✓ Break Years	Continue assessing Program Learning Outcomes and submit Annual PLO Assessment Report.	
✓ Update Year	At the end of the Spring semester, submit PPR update to AA and plan for next PPR cycle.	

**Please note** that with the exception of the Report Year, programs will continue to conduct annual assessments of Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) during the PPR cycle.

## PPR Report Narrative Guidelines

The following outline defines the Sections of the PPR Report. Faculty should consult this Outline when they draft and revise the Report during Year 2. It contains prompts, questions, and suggestions to guide its composition. For formatting, style, and approval details, see Appendix D.

### Abstract

Please include a summary (1-2 paragraphs) of the program's PPR process. Briefly summarize program priorities and assessments, key findings, and future actions.

### Section I. Introduction

In this section of the report, please compose the following:

- a. **Program Overview:** Please provide an overview of the program and degree. Please briefly narrate the recent history and status of the program, including details about its size (faculty, staff, and students), its age (in years), and its relation to the academic department.
- b. **Mission Statement and Program Learning Outcomes:** State the program Mission and the Program Learning Outcomes. Clarify the alignment between the program mission and LaGuardia's Mission and, if applicable, the mission of the academic department. Programs should also consider any connections to the College's Strategic Plan Priorities.
- c. **Successes and Accomplishments:** Indicate any recent successes and accomplishments of the program. Describe special achievements (exhibits/funding/professional associations/contributions to the NYC), and/or external recognition for the program, faculty, or for recent graduates.
- d. **Closing the Loop:** Summarize the actions that were implemented as part of the previous PPR's action plan, the results of these actions, accomplishments, and where applicable, address any outstanding issues.

### Section II. Analysis of Data & Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

All programs use this section of the Report to communicate and analyze data about their program, sometimes called Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). This Section communicates, visualizes, and analyzes data about the program and its students, such as demographics, enrollment, retention, and graduation.

This section requires both the presentation of data and data analysis. To analyze or interpret data, the report should offer explanations for trends that appear in the data, and it should offer claims that interpret the data.

To analyze the data, report writers will filter program data through the dashboards on the LaGuardia Institutional Research (IR) website: <https://www.laguardia.edu/about/institutional-research-and-effectiveness/> . Some of the key data, or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will come from this source.

The "Degree Seeking Student Dashboard" on the Institutional Research (IR) website allows teams to apply filters to sort programmatic information. Programs can retrieve student data there and download tables and charts to include in the PPR report. Some standard program data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) in the spring of the Planning Year. This data reflects previous Fall semesters for any enrollment or cohort studies.

PPR team must address the following in their report using tables/charts to represent the data:

- a. **Enrollment** per Fall and Spring semesters and five-year trends, including New Students (first-time, full-time) and freshman transfers, as well as full and part-time students, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender.
- b. **Demographics** per Fall semester, including age breakdown and median, race and ethnicity, and gender.
- c. **Cohort Analysis**, including Retention (per Fall semester for both full-time and part-time students), and Graduation (3- & 6-year rates) disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender.
- d. **Transfer**, provide data that shows the percentage of students who transfer and where they transfer. In addition to transfer after graduation, provide data and analysis that shows at what rates students either transfer early, and transfer from other programs and colleges. Analyze where students transfer by evaluating trends in the data.
- e. **Change of Major** information.
- f. **Course Grades, Pass, and Completion Rates** for program courses. Provide analysis about any major trends, including for DFWI rates (% of students who receive a D, an F, an Incomplete, or withdraw from the course).

Through discussions with Institutional Research (IR), programs will also be able to customize their data. PPR teams will have an opportunity to request additional information during conversations with Institutional Research (IR). Data requests will be discussed at a Year 1 meeting with OIRA. At that meeting, the team can develop ways to customize data according to its needs. OIRA will also provide the college-wide averages for KPIs related to graduation, retention, and transfer.

### **Section III. Program Priorities & Assessments**

In this section of the report, programs address the priorities that were investigated for this PPR, including methods of assessment, data collected, and findings. As a requirement of the PPR, PPR teams must gather input from students about the program either through surveys or focus groups. PPR teams can request support from the PPR coordinators for conducting these student surveys/focus groups. PPR teams can also use surveys or focus groups to gather feedback from faculty in the program.

- a. **Program Priorities**: Indicate the priorities that the program addressed as part of the PPR plan and how these program priorities connect to the strategic priorities of the college and department. Discuss how the priorities were investigated or assessed, the data collected, and the findings.
- b. **Student Input**: Discuss the main findings from student surveys/focus groups (please provide the survey/focus group questions in the appendix).
- c. **Other Assessments**: Discuss findings from any other assessments conducted by the program, for example, surveys/focus groups with faculty or advisors, evaluating pedagogical practices, faculty and staff communications, and/or revising materials and resources.

## Section IV. Assessment

### A. Institutional Assessment - General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities

In this section, programs analyze the program's engagement with the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. This includes the presentation of all available deposit and scoring data from courses designated for depositing. PPR report writers should use outcomes data to support their claims about the program's relative strengths and weaknesses in relation to General Education. An analysis of Benchmark Reading data informs a robust sense of how students in each program are developing their learning for General Education.

Please also include a copy of the program's Gen Ed Deposit Map. This map identifies key courses in in at least three places—early, middle, and late—to address each Core Competency and Communication Ability. These key courses are identified on the Gen Ed Deposit Map as places where assignments have been developed to target a particular Core Competency and Communication Ability to support learning and longitudinal growth. Each course identified in the Deposit Map utilizes the Assessment section of Digication to upload or "deposit" student work or "artifacts." These artifacts, in turn, are scored in the annual Benchmark Reading process for College-wide assessment.

This section should answer the following questions:

- 1) How does the program's mission speak to the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities?
- 2) How do you interpret any data you received for the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities taught in the program? Please provide data in table form, if possible.
- 3) What Competencies and Abilities can be considered as strengths for the program, and which could be strengthened? How do you explain those strengths and challenges?
- 4) How will the results of this assessment be used to strengthen the program? (You may refer readers to your Action Plan in Section VII.)

Participation in Benchmark Readings: We ask members of the PPR Team to participate in the College's annual Benchmark Reading during the Planning Year. These faculty will score artifacts deposited by students in their majors and others. The purpose of participation is to learn how faculty in other disciplines are incorporating the Competencies and Abilities, as well as to produce data that will support writing the PPR Report.

### B. Programmatic Assessment - Program Learning Outcomes

This section communicates what and how students learn via Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), which are often based on a synthesis of existing performance objectives for key courses and assignments in the program. Direct evidence of each PLO must be assessed systematically through quantitative or qualitative measures.

The program review requires programs to review, justify, and articulate their PLOs, and to explain whether they remain appropriate or require revision. This section summarizes and analyzes cumulative data on student performance toward the PLOs, including data analyzed in prior annual PLO assessments. Use data from any prior and current PLO annual assessments to make claims about student learning in the program. Data from previous annual assessments of the PLOs should be discussed here, along with summaries and discussions of any actions or revisions to assignments that occurred as a result.

Please provide the PLO assessment map identifying where each of your PLOs are taught and are assessed in the curriculum.

This section should evaluate the overall strengths and challenges of the program's PLOs and mission, and address the following questions:

- a. Does the program mission sufficiently reflect the current and future orientation of the program?
- b. Do the Program Learning Outcomes remain appropriate for the curriculum?
- c. Is the current curriculum sequence where PLOs are introduced, reinforced, and mastered working effectively, and showing longitudinal growth in learning?

Using analyzed data from annual PLO assessments and program benchmark readings, summarize the findings and actions the program has taken to improve student learning:

- 1) Which PLOs are strengths for the program, and which could be improved?
- 2) What actions did the program undertake (such as revising curriculum, assignments, rubrics) to improve or sustain program learning outcomes?

### **Section V. Faculty and Professional Development**

In this section of the report, please address the following:

- a. Describe the program's priorities for faculty professional development. How does the program continuously improve its pedagogy?
- b. Include any specific examples of campus event programming organized and/or led by program faculty over the last few years (e.g., discussion panels, guest speakers, etc.).
- c. What support/resources does the program provide for part-time faculty?
- d. How does the program support diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts for faculty and students?
- e. Indicate any research/scholarly activities undertaken by faculty in the program (include recent publications/presentations).
- f. Summarize any external and internal grants awarded to the program since the last PPR. Include any CTL seminars that faculty have participated in over the past 5 years.

### **Section VI. Curriculum Review**

In this section of the Report, please provide the following:

- a. **Comprehensive Curriculum Map**: This is a map or list that provides a comprehensive picture of all the courses that are required to receive a degree in the major. Please describe any recent or planned curricular changes.
- b. **Degree Map**: This map provides the program-specific sequence in which courses are taken in the major over time. Programs that do not have a specific sequence might choose to reflect here on how non-sequence affects learning. What is the program's rationale for course sequencing or non-sequencing?
- c. **Individual Course Review**: Evaluate each course in the program. For each course:
  - 1) Review course proposals. Are the course descriptions accurate and relevant? Revise as needed. Please clarify if any revisions were made to any courses as a result of this review.

- 2) Collect a random sample of syllabi. Do they match course proposals? Do they meet course and institutional objectives? If not, can syllabi be revised to ensure greater congruence between what is intended and what is actually being taught?
- d. **Field Scan:** Please answer the following questions:
  - a. Does the curriculum show evidence of being responsive to changes in the disciplinary field? Provide basic evidence that the curriculum is current with academic, career, and/or industry expectations, and/or national practices in the discipline.
  - b. What are the program's strategies to prepare students for rewarding careers? How does the curriculum prepare students for both transfer and employment after the Associate Degree?

### Section VII. Student Success

In this section, address key indicators and evidence of student success, and the effectiveness of program activities initiatives that support them.

- a. **Program Transfer & Articulation Agreements:** In this section, answer the following questions:
  - 1) How does the program support and facilitate transfer?
  - 2) How does course design include consideration of transfer?
  - 3) What are the existing transfer or articulation agreements? Are any other articulation agreements planned?
  - 4) Identify, summarize, and analyze any other issues or concerns the program has regarding transfer.
- b. **Advisement:** In this section, answer the following questions:
  - 1) Apart from the College-wide Advising & Mentoring Model, briefly describe any program-specific advising practices.
  - 2) What are the most important findings you learned from reviewing New Student Survey, Progress Check and Graduation survey data?
  - 3) What were your previous advising/mentoring goals, and what progress did you make on reaching them?
  - 4) What are 1-2 advising/mentoring goals you'd like to focus on after this PPR report year?
- c. **First Year Seminar and Capstone:** Discuss the First Year Seminar and the Capstone course in the program and provide an example of a FYS and Capstone syllabus in the Appendix. Describe strengths and challenges related to FYS and Capstone. Provide and analyze any data related to FYS and Capstone.
- d. **Student Support:** In this section, address the following:
  - 1) Discuss the support provided for students in the program including tutoring or mentoring.
  - 2) What co-curricular or experiential learning opportunities (including internships) are available for students? Discuss student participation in these opportunities. Are there student clubs affiliated with the program?
  - 3) Discuss any collaborations with industry partners or disciplinary experts, career events organized by the program, or engagement with alumni.

- e. **Resources:** In the section, address the following:
- 1) Discuss the availability and use of resources to support the program, including, but not limited to the following: facilities (including labs, space, and equipment), library resources, student support services, and support from other College offices/services.
  - 2) Please provide the link for the program's website. Are there any updates needed?

### **Section VIII. External Review**

LaGuardia's Periodic Program Review (PPR) process is one of the College's key processes for program review as mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees and LaGuardia's accreditation agency, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). CUNY mandates that each program undertaking a PPR must host a site visit resulting in a written report from an external reviewer.

The external reviewer should preferably not be CUNY faculty outside LaGuardia. When non-CUNY reviewers are not possible, programs may ask for special permission to retain CUNY faculty. The Provost must approve CUNY program reviewers.

All programs must include an external review.

- If the program does not report to an external accrediting body, it must seek an external reviewer outside of LaGuardia Community College.
- Programs that report to an external accrediting body are not required to seek additional review. Please refer to Appendix B for instructions on how to include this information in the PPR Report.

#### Elements of an External Review

During an External Review, an outside evaluator will visit campus, read a revised Report draft, interact with faculty and students, observe classes, provide perspective on the program's curriculum and program review draft Report, and recommend actions for programs to take in the future. At the end of Year Two, programs submit their finalized Report with an Action Plan making evidence-based recommendations and actions that emerged from assessments and were informed by External Review.

The external reviewer is responsible for reading a revised draft of the Report and offering feedback and evaluations relating to curriculum, student learning, transfer, and employability. They should be prepared to discuss future recommendations and Actions with the PPR team.

Please contact an external reviewer during the Fall of your Report Year (Year 2). Invite them to an on-site visit with your program sometime between March and May of the Report Year and send them a revised draft of the program's PPR for review no less than two weeks prior to the visit. Request that they respond to the Report and make recommendations in writing no later than May 31 of the Report Year.

Please see Appendix B for further details about the external review.

**For this section in the report**, please offer details of the site visit. Provide a short bio of the external reviewer, dates and brief details of the site visit, including team meetings and observation of classes. The report from the external reviewer can be added as an appendix and referred to in this section.

**Section IX. Action Plan**

The final section of the program review consolidates the major priorities and inquiries of the PPR into an Action Plan. Programs will detail 3-5 recommended actions to implement in Years 3 and 4 of the program review. These actions will be implemented by program faculty in the two implementation years, and they should produce data that allows the program to measure their effectiveness.

The recommended actions should cite data points from prior sections of the report and should reflect feedback from Academic Affairs and the external reviewer from the review process. Recommendations for actions should derive from data-points and analysis generated by the PPR. It can be helpful to organize recommended actions into short, medium, and long-term priorities.

Department Chairs and program teams should develop recommendations into action steps together. They should communicate potential actions to the department prior to inclusion in the submitted Report. Programs with external accreditation may include action steps based on issues identified in annual reports or in the outside accreditation criteria.

Report format for recommended actions

The recommended actions should be organized into a table with the following headings.

Evidence (data points)	Recommendation	Action	Assessment Method/Data Collection	Expected outcome	Required Resources	College Strategic Plan alignment* (Goals and Objectives)

*\*To be completed by the Department Chair*

## **Appendix A: Creating a Year 1 Program Review Plan**

Program reviews should begin with the team, chair, and department brainstorming priorities that could be significant areas to address during the program review.

One purpose of the program review is to assess current program practices, and to analyze data so that the program can take evidence-based actions in the future.

Program priorities might address enrollment, advisement, curriculum, retention, graduation, transfer, student learning, student support, career planning, and/or any other aspect of the program (such as resources, like technology, space, materials, etc.).

Programs will draft a guide document that will help organize the program review. They will revise this document in preparation for the first-year AA meeting.

### **The Program Review Plan will contain:**

- Names of the faculty leaders of the review
- A brief analysis of data-points or trends in the program
- An outline of 3-5 priorities for the program review
- A description of assessments the leaders will conduct during the PPR, including methods of data collection
- Program PLOs, including any that will be assessed during Years 1 and 2 of the PPR.
- A brief summary of prior program review Action Plans and/or recommendations from the previous PPR (where one exists), and, where applicable, an explanation of any outstanding issues.

## Appendix B: External Review

The details below outline the elements of a site visit and outline the components of the External Reviewer's written report.

- a. The suggested activities for the site visit include:
  - 1-2 classroom visits
  - a meeting with the PPR Team, Department Chair, students, and other faculty and staff who can provide insight and feedback
  - access to program resources and materials, including syllabi, assignments, handbooks, and associated documents.
- b. Within 30 days of the site visit, the reviewer should submit a written report to the Program Director and/or PPR team that includes the following information:
  - an evaluation of the PPR Report in the context of the external reviewer's professional expertise
  - a summary of classes and meetings held with faculty, students, and/ or staff
  - examples of successes and accomplishments, as well as current or forthcoming challenges for the program
  - an evidence-based evaluation of the program Action Plan, including 3-5 recommendations on areas that need to be addressed and/or strengthened.

## **Appendix C: Guidelines for Programs with External Accreditation**

Program reports for external accreditation count as reports for the Periodic Program Review (PPR). All such programs are still responsible, however, for submitting any information normally expected for College PPR reports, such as evaluation and actions for the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities.

### **Programs with external accreditation must do the following:**

1. Complete the College PPR cycle, including meetings with the college liaisons for Periodic Program Reviews during their Planning Year and Report Year, and annual Implementation Year reports for Years 1 and 2
2. Meet with the Provost in their Report Year to discuss their action plan
3. Provide the College with a copy of their external report.

At the end of their Report Year, programs will submit to the College a “Crosswalk Document” that lists to the pages/links where all PPR content can be found in their external report. In this Crosswalk or in an appendix, programs will submit any additional required information not otherwise included in the external report.

### **The Crosswalk Document**

The goal of the Crosswalk is to identify the manner in which the program has met LaGuardia's PPR guidelines and requirements.

The Crosswalk Document will provide a table that identifies where the external accreditation report addresses the areas required for College PPRs (see below).

### **Directions:**

1. Identify the name of your program and the accreditation body to which the report was submitted.
2. Provide information that demonstrates the way in which the self- study/accreditation documents address the PPR requirements. The writers may crosswalk one or more sections of the self-study/accreditation document to each PPR section.
3. Provide comments as the team sees fit to clarify the cross-walked sections.
4. For sections of the PPR that do not have a counterpart in your self- study/accreditation documents:
  - a. Comment/note that the program's accrediting body does not require this information
  - b. Provide a narrative response to demonstrate how the program meets the PPR requirement(s)

**Self-Study/Outside Accreditation Crosswalk Table**

Name of Program:

Name of Accreditation Body:

PPR Section	Guidelines Page	Included in External Report (Yes/No)	Self-Study Outside Accreditation Document*	Comments**
<b>I. Introduction</b> a. Program Overview b. Mission Statement & PLOs c. Successes & Accomplishments d. Closing the Loop	6			
<b>II. Data Analysis &amp; KPIs</b>	6			
<b>III. Program Priorities &amp; Assessments</b> a. Program Priorities b. Student Inputs c. Other Assessments	7			
<b>IV. Assessment</b> a. Institutional Assessment b. Programmatic Assessment	7			
<b>V. Faculty &amp; Professional Development</b>	9			
<b>VI. Curriculum Review</b> a. Comprehensive Curriculum Map b. Degree Map c. Individual Course Review d. Field Scan	9			
<b>VII. Student Success</b> a. Program Transfer & Articulation b. Advisement c. First Year Seminar d. Student Support e. Resources	10			
<b>VII. External Review</b>	11			
<b>IX. Action Plan</b>	12			

*\*(Please provide the section of the document – i.e.: name, page, etc. that addresses each PPR section)*

*\*\*Briefly add context or comment where necessary (for example, if the corresponding page/section of outside report doesn't clearly address PPR Guidelines, please explain or contextualize).*

Additional Narrative(s). Please copy below additional narrative information and/or data to supplement the Crosswalk.

## Appendix D: Formatting & Standards

There are “best practice” protocols for revising and completing Periodic Program Review Reports. Please use this checklist to facilitate an accessible, legible, and standardized final Report before you submit the report to Academic Affairs.

### Formatting

- Standard 1-inch margins and 12-point font used for the report. Headings and sub-headings may be in 14-point font. Single-spaced text is ok.
- All final submissions are PDF. Drafts may be submitted in Word or Google Doc.
- Page numbers are inserted.
- A title page with the program, department, and names of the PPR team members and a table of contents are included.
- Report is organized according to the Roman numeral/Arabic numeral outline provided in the PPR Guidelines.
- Data visualization (tables, graphs) is provided when appropriate.
- Report is free of surface errors, syntax issues, and tracked changes/comments.
- Appendixes are included to organize bulky data, such as course catalog descriptions.
- Citations are in the formal reference format utilized by the discipline/program/department.
- Report is written in the past tense to reflect assessments, findings, and actions that took place in the past. The Report is a record of what took place during the Planning (Year 1) and Report Years (Year 2). The Action Plan section of the Report might contain verbs in the future tense.

### Standards

- Reports need to be read in full by the Chair, and other key program faculty should have an opportunity to read it prior to its submission. The Chair’s signature indicates that they have read the contents and signifies their approval of the document.
- The Report Action Plan reflects the External Evaluator’s report.
- The Report references the External Review as appropriate.
- The Report is self-conscious about directing readers to other parts of the Report, where possible and appropriate (for example, the Introduction might refer to the Action Plan, or a data analysis might refer to curriculum materials; when you do so, be specific about referring to particular section – for example, Section II, b).
- Text in the Report is not directly copied from College materials; material revised from College materials should be cited where appropriate.