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Section 4. Review of New and Existing Academic Programs

1. A review of existing academic programs shall be conducted by the universities, state college, and community colleges on at least a ten-year cycle to assure academic quality, and to determine if need, student demand, and available resources support their continuation pursuant to the following.
   a. The review of existing programs must include multiple criteria. Although criteria may vary slightly between campuses, as institutions have different missions and responsibilities, there should be comparable data from all programs. The review must include both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of program effectiveness, and peer review.
   b. Criteria to be utilized in the review of existing programs shall include the following: quality, need/demand for the program, relation to the institutional mission, cost, relationship to other programs in the System, student outcomes, and quality and adequacy of resources such as library materials, equipment, space, and nonacademic services.
   c. An annual report will be published by the institution on the results of existing program evaluations and a summary of that report will be forwarded to the Chancellor’s Office and presented to the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee annually. (B/R 9/09)

2. New programs at the universities, state college, and community colleges shall be reviewed following the third and fifth year of the program’s existence. The criteria for review shall be established by the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs and must include a report comparing originally projected enrollments and expenses to actual third and fifth year figures. (B/R 3/07)

3. Desert Research Institute - A five-year cycle will be used for the review of all DRI research programs. A report will be published on the results of program evaluation and a summary of that report will be forwarded to the Chancellor’s Office and presented to the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee. Additional reports or status reports on DRI research programs outside of the five-year cycle may be brought forward at any time at the discretion of the Institute. (B/R 9/09)

4. In addition to the review process established in this section, the Board or a President may initiate additional program reviews as deemed necessary. (B/R 3/07)
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is a research institution committed to rigorous educational programs and the highest standards of a liberal education. We produce accomplished graduates who are well prepared to enter the work force or to continue their education in graduate and professional programs. Our faculty, students, and staff enthusiastically confront the challenges of economic and cultural diversification, urban growth, social justice, and sustainability. Our commitment to our dynamic region and State centrally influences our research and educational programs, which improves our local communities. Our commitment to the national and international communities ensures that our research and educational programs engage both traditional and innovative areas of study and global concerns. UNLV’s distinctive identity and values permeate a unique institution that brings the best of the world to our region and, in turn, produces knowledge to improve the region and world around us.

UNLV is committed to and driven by these shared values that will guide our decision making:

- High expectations for student learning and success;
- Discovery through research, scholarship, and creative activity;
- Nurturing equity, diversity, and inclusiveness that promotes respect, support, and empowerment;
- Social, environmental, and economic sustainability;
- Strong, reciprocal, and interdependent relationships between UNLV and the region around us;
- An entrepreneurial, innovative, and unconventional spirit.

http://www.unlv.edu/about/mission.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check when complete</th>
<th>What happens</th>
<th>When it happens &amp; deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program/department Chair (referred to as Chair in remainder of this document) is notified by Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair that a program review is to take place in the upcoming academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair schedules a meeting for information on conducting the program review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customized program review self-study template is sent electronically to Chair responsible for conducting the program review by Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair/Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Academic Affairs Analyst).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair provides list of faculty email addresses to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA), Academic Affairs Analyst, for a program related survey. <strong>Note:</strong> full email addresses must be provided, not just names. List should indicate which faculty should be surveyed for undergrad, grad, doctoral programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair provides direction on which students should be surveyed for each program review to the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst. For example, in undergrad programs, you may wish to survey students with a particular major in junior or senior status. <strong>Note:</strong> it is important to provide exact direction so the correct students are surveyed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student lists are requested from the Registrar by the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst. Electronic surveys are sent to program faculty and students by the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>September and October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Program Review Committee internal reviewers assigned to that review summarize the survey results from faculty and students and submit them to: - the head of the unit being reviewed - the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair - the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>September, October, November Deadline: November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of the unit completes customized program review self-study template. Head of the unit completes an executive summary no longer than 3 pages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of the unit sends completed program review self-study and executive summary to: - the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee internal reviewers assigned to that review - the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chair - the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair submits a list of 5 potential external reviewers to the Office of the VPAA, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs, Dave James. Please provide an explanation as to why the individuals are appropriate reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of 5 potential reviewers needs to include full names and institutions. Here are some guidelines to assist you:
- It is preferred that reviewers be from institutions in the Western United States to minimize their travel costs.
- Reviewers should be from comparable or aspirational institutions.
- There should not be close personal or professional ties that would present a conflict of interest.
- Reviewers should not be from UNR or any other NSHE institution as that complicates the pay process.
- Reviewers should not have ever been paid as an employee of UNLV or NSHE.
- From the list of the 5 potential reviewers, the VPAA office will review the qualifications of each, select 2 individuals and ask you to make arrangements for their visit.

**Note important details:**
1) The Office of the VPAA will pay a flat $1,000 honorarium to cover travel costs, their time here, and the preparation/submission of the report. An IRS 1099 form will be sent to the external reviewers to document the payment.
2) The Office of the VPAA will complete the paperwork for paying the honorarium. The check will be mailed after the report is submitted. Please provide reviewer contact information to Kristene Fisher at kristene.fisher@UNLV.edu.
3) The reviewed program may add a supplementary honorarium amount, if it wishes to do so. Supply the account # and amount to Kristene Fisher so it can be included on the paperwork.
4) Reviewers may schedule their own travel and hotel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the VPAA returns potential external reviewers list to Chair with recommendations for invitations.</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chair invites external reviewers for campus visit. Chair (or designee) will work with the external reviewers to find dates that will work and set up a schedule for them to meet with, at a minimum: upload image of faculty Senate internal program reviewers 
- program chair/director
- program faculty
- students
- advising (if applicable)
- dean, department chair
- Dr. Michael Bowers, Senior VPAA (this should be the second to last meeting held; contact Kristene Fisher to get on calendar)
- Faculty Senate internal program reviewers to wrap up | January 30 |
| Chair sends external reviewers: 
- Completed self-study and executive summary 
- Internal reviewers summary of faculty and student surveys 
- External reviewers packet is included. **Note:** The IAP website for users outside of UNLV is: [https://ir.unlv.edu/IAP/Reports/Content/At+UNLV+-+Student+Profiles.aspx](https://ir.unlv.edu/IAP/Reports/Content/At+UNLV+-+Student+Profiles.aspx). It is included in the External Reviewer’s packet. | When external reviewer visit date is confirmed |
<p>| Each external reviewer sends their vita to Chair. | When visit date is confirmed |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair sends vita to the Office of the VPAA, Academic Affairs Analyst.</td>
<td>When received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers conduct their on-campus visit.</td>
<td>February and March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers submit a single report electronically to</td>
<td>Within 30 days of visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Bowers, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days of their visit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers are sent their check by the Office of the VPAA</td>
<td>Upon receipt of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External review is sent to Chair and internal reviewers by the</td>
<td>Upon receipt of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the VPAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair sends a thank you to each external reviewer.</td>
<td>Within 30 days of receipt of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external reviewers report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair submits response to external review to:</td>
<td>Within 30 days of external review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty Senate internal reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty Senate Program Review chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate internal reviewers submit a final summary.</td>
<td>Within 30 days of program response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department may submit a response to the Faculty Senate internal</td>
<td>Within 30 days of final summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewer’s final summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congratulations! The program review is complete!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Reviewers Schedule
BA and MA Programs in Political Science
(All meetings are in WRI-B224 unless indicated)

Wednesday, February 11
Arrive LAS 7:55 p.m. UA #1268 - Pick-up at airport by Dennis Pirages (staying at Pirages home)

Thursday, February 12

9:00 a.m. Transportation to campus, Dennis

9:30 Internal Review Committee consultants = George Rhee (Astronomy) & Cecilia Maldonado-Daniels (Educational Leadership)

10:00 Kenneth Fernandez, Department Assessment Officer & Cathy Hanks, compiled/input the information (WRI-B224)

10:30 Political Science Department Faculty & Part-Time Instructors (WRI-B224)

11:30 Lunch with Mehran Tamadonfar, Department Chair (WRI-B225)

1:00 p.m. Political Science BA - Undergraduate Students (WRI-B224)

1:30 BA Alumni

2:00 Ms. Lea Sexton, Director, College of Liberal Arts (undergraduate) Advising Center (WRI-B131)

3:00 Political Science MA - Graduate Students

3:30 MA Alumni

4:00 Michael Bowers, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (FDH-703)

5:00 Transportation to 608 Via Colmo Ave in Henderson, Dennis

Friday, February 13

9:00 a.m. Transportation to campus, Dennis Pirages

9:30 Nasser Daneshvary, Chair, Faculty Senate (FDH-220)

10:00 Dennis Pirages, PSC Graduate Coordinator (WRI-B215)

10:30 Ron Smith, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College (FDH-309)

11:30 Lunch with Susie & Melissa, Political Science - Administrative Assistants

1:00 p.m. Chris Hudgins, Dean, College of Liberal Arts (CBC-B519)

2:00 Dave James, Associate Vice Provost of Academic Programs (FDH-707)

3:00 Internal Review Committee consultants = George Rhee & Cecilia Maldonado-Daniels

3:30 - 4:00 Transportation to 608 Via Colmo Ave in Henderson, Susie (or TBD)

9:15 pm Airport, TBD
External Reviewers’ Schedule
BA and MA Programs in Workforce Education
(All meetings are in CEB 322 unless indicated)

Thursday, February 26

Dr. Gray Arrive LAS - Pick-up at airport by Dr. Maldonado
Dr. Bartlett Arrive LAS – Pick up at airport by Dr. Gordon

Friday, February 27

8:00 a.m. Pick by Dr. Maldonado and transport to Marie Callender’s for Breakfast
9:00 Transportation to campus
9:30 Internal Review Committee consultants - James Busser (Recreation and Sports Management) & William Werner (Hotel Administration)
10:00 Workforce Education and Development Program Faculty
11:00 Meeting with COE Leadership (Dean’s Conference Room)
   - Dr. William Speer, Associate Dean
   - Dr. Sterling Saddler, Associate Dean
   - Dr. Greg Levitt, Assistant Dean
12:00 Lunch with Workforce Education Faculty
2:00 p.m. Ms. Joyce Ahn, College of Education (undergraduate) Advising Center (CEB 226)
3:00 Ron Smith, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College (FDH-309)
3:30 Michael Bowers, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (FDH 703)
4:00 Workforce Education and Development BS/M.Ed/M.S. Students and Alumni
5:00 Internal Review Committee consultants - James Busser and William Werner
5:30 Workforce Education and Development Program Faculty
6:30 Dinner with Dr. Sterling Saddler and Dr. McClain

Departure Arrangements TBA
Faculty Survey for Program Review

Is the curriculum of the program(s) under review consistent with your college’s and UNLV’s missions?
- Yes
- No

Is the program(s) curriculum up to date with the discipline?
- Yes
- No

How do you recruit students into the program(s) currently under review?

Please describe your department’s efforts to attract minority students to the program(s) under review.

Student Quality and Preparation

How are applicants to the program(s) under review evaluated for admission?

Are criteria for admission to the program(s) appropriate?
- Yes
- No

What is the academic caliber of the students attracted to the program under review?
- Excellent
- Good
- Average
- Poor

Faculty Quality

Are you a full or part time faculty member?
- Full time
- Part time

Please grade the overall quality of your department’s current faculty.
- A
- B
- C
- D
- F

Has faculty quality improved with recent hires?
- Yes
- No

Has the department retained its high quality faculty?
- Yes
- No

Are faculty salaries at UNLV able to attract quality new hires?
- Yes
- No

How would you rate overall faculty morale?
- A
- B
- C
- D
- F

Is the number and quality of part time instructors teaching in the program(s) under review appropriate?
- Too many
- Too few
- About right
- Comment box

Is service rewarded by your department?
- Yes
- No

How can the university enhance your instructional and scholarly productivity?

Teaching Quality

Is there an appropriate number of full time faculty to support this program(s)?
- Yes
- No (if no, they will be directed to next question)

In what specific areas is more full time faculty required?

In the program(s) under review, are the courses offered frequently enough so students can graduate on time?
- Yes
- No

Are teaching assignments in the program(s) under review appropriate and equitable?
- Yes
- No

Are grading standards sufficiently rigorous in the program(s) under review?
- Yes
- No

Is there an effort to assure consistent grading standards in the program(s) under review?
- Yes
- No

Must students meet any special requirements prior to graduation, e.g. to publish in a peer-reviewed journal, pass a state mandated exam, or participate in a master class performance?
- Yes (if yes, they will be directed to next question)
- No

Comment box
What role does faculty play in meeting these requirements?
Comment box
How does your department support the improvement of teaching in the program(s) under review?
Comment box
How have you improved your teaching in recent years?
Comment box
Is quality teaching rewarded by your department(s)?
Yes  No  Comment box

**Research Quality**
Rate the quality of research/creative activity in your department.
A  B  C  D  F  Comment box
Does research quality differ for the specific program(s) under review?
Yes  No  Comment box
How do research efforts enhance instruction in the program(s) under review?
Comment box
Is quality research rewarded by your department?
Yes  No  Comment box

**Resource Quality**
Is there adequate support staff to meet the needs of the program(s) under review?
Yes  No  Comment box
Please rate your satisfaction with the classrooms available to the program(s) under review.
A  B  C  D  F
Please rate your satisfaction with the equipment available to the program(s) under review.
A  B  C  D  F
Is there an appropriate number of full time faculty to support this program(s)?
Yes  No (if no, they will be directed to next question)  Comment box
In what specific areas do you require more full time faculty?
Comment box
In the program(s) under review, are the courses offered frequently enough so students can graduate on time?
Yes  No  Comment box
Is the number and quality of state funded GAs in the program(s) under review appropriate?
Too many  Too few  About right  Comment box
Is the number and quality of research grant funded GAs in the program(s) under review appropriate?
Too many  Too few  About right  Comment box
Does your department actively recruit students?
Yes  No  Comment box

**Overall Program Quality**
What are the principle strengths of the program(s) under review?
Comment box
If you think the program(s) need improvement, what suggestions for improvement do you have?
Comment box
What are the challenges for this program(s)?
Comment box
What opportunities do you see for this program(s)?
Comment box
General comments:
Comment box
Student Survey for Program Review

General/demographic

1. How did you learn about this program?
   (text box)

2. Do you attend classes
   Full time
   Part time

3. On average, how many credits per semester do you take?
   (fill in the blank)

Quality of program

4. Are the program expectations in the following areas clear?
   What courses must be taken
   Yes/No
   The order/timing in which courses must be taken
   Yes/No
   The major requirements (other than specific courses) for completing the program
   Yes/No
   The graduation requirements
   Yes/No

5. Are you given the opportunity to provide input regarding the operation of the program such as serving on committees, or offering suggestions to faculty and administration?
   Student input is highly encouraged
   Student input is moderately encouraged
   Student input is moderately discouraged
   Student input is highly discouraged
   No way to know

6. Does the scheduling of classes make it easy for you to take the courses you need in the correct sequence?
   Yes
   Sometimes
   No

7. Is there a clinical or internship requirement in your program?
   Yes
   No
   I don’t know

   If the student answers yes, they will be directed to the next 2 questions.

8. To what degree are you satisfied with the clinical or internship opportunities in your program?
   Very satisfied
   Satisfied
   Somewhat satisfied
   Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   Somewhat dissatisfied
   Dissatisfied
   Very dissatisfied
9. To what degree are you satisfied with the faculty role in your clinical or internship experiences?
   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

10. To what degree is your program rigorous (i.e., challenging and high quality work is expected from students)?
    - Uniformly rigorous
    - About 75% of the requirements are rigorous
    - About 50% of the requirements are rigorous
    - About 25% of the requirements are rigorous
    - Not at all rigorous

11. Please evaluate the quality of the learning experiences you have had in the program. Overall, have you been:
    - Very satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Somewhat satisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    - Somewhat dissatisfied
    - Dissatisfied
    - Very dissatisfied

12. Do you feel that your program is preparing you well for your chosen career?
    - I feel I am well prepared
    - I feel I am being adequately prepared
    - I feel I am being poorly prepared
    - I don’t know

13. Does the department have career/job placement efforts?
    - Yes
    - No
    - I don’t know

   If the student answers yes, they will be directed to the next question.

14. What is your level of satisfaction with the department or colleges career/job placement efforts?
    - Very satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Somewhat satisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    - Somewhat dissatisfied
    - Dissatisfied
    - Very dissatisfied

15. What are the strengths of the program?
    (fill in the blank)

16. What are the weaknesses of the program?
    (fill in the blank)
17. General comments:
(fill in the blank)

Quality of resources

18. Do you think that there is adequate support staff in your program to meet your needs as a student?
   - Support staff is better than adequate
   - Support staff is adequate
   - Support staff is somewhat adequate
   - Support staff is wholly inadequate
   - I’ve never interacted with support staff
   - There is no support staff for the program

19. Have faculty members generally been available for academic support or counseling if you need them?
   - Always available
   - Sometimes available
   - Rarely available
   - Never available
   - Don’t know, have never needed them

20. To what degree are you satisfied with the classrooms available in your department/program?
   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

21. To what degree are you satisfied with the equipment available in your department/program?
   - Very satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied

22. To what degree are you satisfied with the library resources you have used?
   - Very satisfied  (text box)
   - Satisfied  (text box)
   - Somewhat satisfied  (text box)
   - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  (text box)
   - Somewhat dissatisfied  (text box)
   - Dissatisfied  (text box)
   - Very dissatisfied  (text box)

23. Are you aware of financial aid and scholarships, and if so, are they adequate?
   - I’m aware and they are adequate
   - I’m aware and they are not adequate
   - I’m not aware of available financial aid or scholarships
24. To what degree are you satisfied with the academic advisors for your program?
   Very satisfied
   Satisfied
   Somewhat satisfied
   Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   Somewhat dissatisfied
   Dissatisfied
   Very dissatisfied
Program Review
External Reviewer’s Information

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
4505 S. Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154-1099
702.895.2322

External Reviewer Guidelines
Thank you for assisting in UNLV’s continuous improvement by undertaking this program review!
Below you will find some information about your visit to the campus and a template to assist in formatting the final report.

Information about the Review

- The program being reviewed will have a contact person to assist you with details and answer questions.
- All arrangements for the review are handled by the program being review.
- During your campus visit, you will meet with a variety of people involved in the program including:
  
  - Faculty Senate Internal Review Committee consultant
  - Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs or his designee
  - College/school dean
  - Department chair/program director
  - Faculty members
  - Advising centers (if applicable)
  - Graduate College Dean
  - Graduate college program review chairperson (if applicable)
  - Present and (possibly) former students

- External reviewers should combine their information about the program into a single report (8-10 pages) and submit it electronically (preferably in Microsoft Word format) within 30 days of the visit. A template is included.
- The report is submitted to: Dr. Michael Bowers, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, at michael.bowers@unlv.edu.
- The report should address all of the areas presented in the template as well as summary of both commendations and recommendations concerning each program under review.

- Basic information about the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the program(s) under review can be found at: www.unlv.edu and https://ir.unlv.edu/IAP/Reports/Content/At+UNLV+-+Student+Profiles.aspx.
- Additional contacts, if needed:
  - Gail Griffin, Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, 702.895.0482, gail.griffin@unlv.edu
  - Kristene Fisher, Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, 702.895.5182, kristene.fisher@unlv.edu
Section 4. Review of New and Existing Academic Programs

1. A review of existing academic programs shall be conducted by the universities, state college, and community colleges on at least a ten-year cycle to assure academic quality, and to determine if need, student demand, and available resources support their continuation pursuant to the following.

   a. The review of existing programs must include multiple criteria. Although criteria may vary slightly between campuses, as institutions have different missions and responsibilities, there should be comparable data from all programs. The review must include both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of program effectiveness, and peer review.

   b. Criteria to be utilized in the review of existing programs shall include the following: quality, need/demand for the program, relation to the institutional mission, cost, relationship to other programs in the System, student outcomes, and quality and adequacy of resources such as library materials, equipment, space, and nonacademic services.

   c. An annual report will be published by the institution on the results of existing program evaluations and a summary of that report will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office and presented to the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee annually. (B/R 9/09)

2. New programs at the universities, state college, and community colleges shall be reviewed following the third and fifth year of the program’s existence. The criteria for review shall be established by the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs and must include a report comparing originally projected enrollments and expenses to actual third and fifth year figures. (B/R 3/07)

3. Desert Research Institute - A five-year cycle will be used for the review of all DRI research programs. A report will be published on the results of program evaluation and a summary of that report will be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office and presented to the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee. Additional reports or status reports on DRI research programs outside of the five-year cycle may be brought forward at any time at the discretion of the Institute. (B/R 9/09)

4. In addition to the review process established in this section, the Board or a President may initiate additional program reviews as deemed necessary. (B/R 3/07)
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is a research institution committed to rigorous educational programs and the highest standards of a liberal education. We produce accomplished graduates who are well prepared to enter the work force or to continue their education in graduate and professional programs. Our faculty, students, and staff enthusiastically confront the challenges of economic and cultural diversification, urban growth, social justice, and sustainability. Our commitment to our dynamic region and State centrally influences our research and educational programs, which improves our local communities. Our commitment to the national and international communities ensures that our research and educational programs engage both traditional and innovative areas of study and global concerns. UNLV’s distinctive identity and values permeate a unique institution that brings the best of the world to our region and, in turn, produces knowledge to improve the region and world around us.

UNLV is committed to and driven by these shared values that will guide our decision making:

- High expectations for student learning and success;
- Discovery through research, scholarship, and creative activity;
- Nurturing equity, diversity, and inclusiveness that promotes respect, support, and empowerment;
- Social, environmental, and economic sustainability;
- Strong, reciprocal, and interdependent relationships between UNLV and the region around us;
- An entrepreneurial, innovative, and unconventional spirit.

http://www.unlv.edu/about/mission.html
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

External Reviewer’s Report

Program Reviewed:
Degrees:
Program Chair:
Dean:

Reviewer’s Names and Institutions:

Date of Report:

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS
The layout of the questions below follows the format of the self-study of which you should have received a copy prior to your campus visit. Please use the questions below as guidelines for your final report. Feel free to add information and comments to this outline.
I. Mission and Goals
   A. Does the mission statement of the program seem appropriate for:
      1. Student outcomes
      2. Relationship to the department
      3. Relationship to the college
      4. Relationship to the university (See Appendix 1 for UNLV Mission Statement)

II. Do the goals of the program seem linked appropriately to:
   A. Student outcomes
   B. The department/college
   C. The university (See Appendix 2 for UNLV Goals)

III. Need/Demand for Program
   A. Is the need/demand for the program in line with what you know of similar programs?

IV. Quality of Program
   A. What is the quality of the program compared with what you know of similar programs?

V. Student Outcomes
   A. Has there been improvement in the student outcomes in recent years?
   B. Are the trends comparable to what other programs are experiencing?
   C. What suggestions do you have to improve the outcomes?

VI. Relationship to Other Programs in System
   A. Does there seem to be any barriers to students completing their degree in a timely manner?

VII. Cost
   A. Is the cost of the program high or low compared with what you know of similar programs?

VIII. Quality and Adequacy of Resources
   A. Is the quality of the program sufficient to obtain the desired outcomes?
   B. Are the adequacy of the resources of the program sufficient to obtain the desired outcomes?

IX. Commendations

X. Recommendations

XI. Final Statements
   A. Are there any other comments you would like to make about the program that are not covered in other sections?

NEXT STEPS
Please send this report to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dr. Michael Bowers at michael.bowers@unlv.edu. Expect your check to be mailed within 3 days of Dr. Bowers receiving the report. If you have not received your check within 2 weeks of submitting your report, contact Kristene Fisher at kristene.fisher@unlv.edu, 702-895-5182. Thank you for your assistance with this program review!