



2014-15

Existing Program Review

**Prepared by the Department of Academic and Student Affairs for
the Board of Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

NSHE Leadership

Board of Regents

Mr. Rick Trachok, Chairman

Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Vice Chairman

Dr. Andrea Anderson Mr. Trevor Hayes

Mr. Cedric Crear Mr. James Dean Leavitt

Mr. Robert Davidson Mr. Sam Lieberman

Dr. Mark W. Doubrava Mr. Kevin C. Melcher

Dr. Jason Geddes Mr. Kevin J. Page

Ms. Allison Stephens

Scott Young, Acting Chief Executive Officer

Officers of the Nevada System of Higher Education

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor

Dr. Len Jessup, President

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Mr. Bart Patterson, President

Nevada State College

Dr. Mark Curtis, President

Great Basin College

Mr. Chester Burton, President

Western Nevada College

Dr. Marc Johnson, President

University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. Michael Richards, President

College of Southern Nevada

Dr. Maria Sheehan, President

Truckee Meadows Community College

Dr. Stephen Wells, President

Desert Research Institute

2014-2015

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | i |
| Summary of Eliminated and New Programs by Institution | ii |
| Summary of Characteristics of Reviewed Programs | iv |
| University of Nevada, Las Vegas | |
| Summary | 1 |
| Chemistry BA, BS, MS, PhD; Biochemistry BS, MS; Radiochemistry PhD | 2 |
| Crisis and Emergency Management MS | 5 |
| Human Services BS | 8 |
| Interior Architecture and Design BS | 12 |
| Journalism and Media Studies BA | 14 |
| Music BA, BM, MM, DMA; Jazz Studies BM | 15 |
| Philosophy BA | 17 |
| Public Affairs PhD | 19 |
| University of Nevada, Reno | |
| Summary | 21 |
| Anthropology BA | 22 |
| Anthropology MA | 23 |
| Anthropology PhD | 24 |
| Art BA | 25 |
| Art BFA | 27 |
| Art MFA | 29 |
| Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BS | 31 |
| Biochemistry MS | 32 |
| Biochemistry PhD | 33 |
| Biology BS | 34 |
| Biology MS | 35 |
| Biotechnology BS, MS | 36 |
| Chemistry BS | 37 |
| Chemistry MS | 38 |
| Chemistry PhD | 39 |
| Education PhD | 40 |
| Geography BA, BS | 41 |
| Geography MS | 42 |
| Geography PhD | 43 |
| Human Development and Family Studies BS | 44 |
| Human Development and Family Studies MS | 45 |
| Mathematics and Statistics BA, BS, MATM | 47 |
| Mathematics MS | 48 |
| Philosophy BA | 49 |
| Philosophy MA | 50 |

2014-2015

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Nevada State College | |
| Summary | 51 |
| College of Southern Nevada | |
| Summary | 52 |
| AA—No Emphasis | 53 |
| Art and Art History AA | 55 |
| Communication AA | 57 |
| Creative Writing AA | 59 |
| Deaf Studies AAS | 61 |
| English AA | 63 |
| International Languages AA | 65 |
| Interpreter Preparation AAS | 67 |
| Journalism and Media Studies AA | 69 |
| Latin American and Latina/o Studies AA | 71 |
| Music AA | 73 |
| Music Business Technology CA | 75 |
| Theatre AA | 77 |
| Great Basin College | |
| Summary | 79 |
| Land Surveying/Geomatics Emphasis BAS | 80 |
| Truckee Meadows Community College | |
| Summary | 81 |
| Administrative Professional AAS, CA | 83 |
| Apprenticeship AAS, CA | 85 |
| Architecture AA; Residential Design AAS | 87 |
| Business Studies: Business AA, AAS, CA; Bookkeeping CA | 89 |
| Criminal Justice AA; Law Enforcement Emphasis AAS | 90 |
| Graphic Communications AAS, CA | 91 |
| History AA | 93 |
| Visual Arts AA; Art History Emphasis AA | 94 |
| Western Nevada College | |
| Summary | 96 |

Executive Summary

The Review of Existing Programs report is prepared for the Academic and Student Affairs (ASA) Committee in accordance with Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5* of the *Handbook*):

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 ensure academic quality, and to determine if need, student demand, and available resources support their continuation pursuant to the following.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 and Student Affairs Committee annually.

In conducting program reviews each year, the institutions are guided by their respective process, as described in each program review in this report, and include self-study and faculty guidance and input. In addition, the universities also utilize external reviewers. The major findings and recommendations concerning the programs reviewed are unique to each institution and the program itself. Generally, program strengths include overall program quality that is valuable to students, the community and the workforce. While the findings, commendations and recommendations are mostly program specific, some general themes emerge. Recommendations for additional faculty to meet student demands, in some cases full-time faculty, are common. In addition to faculty, resource issues include the available of courses to allow students to complete on time, classroom space, and advising.

The reports submitted by the institutions for each program are included in this publication and organized by institution. A summary table at the beginning of the report extracts and compiles data from the institutional report regarding the unduplicated student headcount for the Fall of 2014 for each program and the number of students with a declared major in the program in 2014-15. This table also includes the number of graduates from the program for the past three academic years. In addition to the summary table, this publication includes a record of the programs that were eliminated or deactivated and new programs approved by the Board of Regents within the reporting year. As required by subsection 3 of *Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5*, this table also includes any (1) certificates of at least 30 credit hours, and (2) certificates of less than 30 credit hours that provide preparation necessary to take state, national and/or industry recognized certification or licensing examinations ("skills certificates") created by the community colleges that were approved by the Academic Affairs Council in the reporting year.

The full report and reports from prior years are available online at:
https://www.nevada.edu/ir/Page.php?p=pgrms_review.

2014-2015

Summary of Eliminated and New Programs by Institution

| Program | Elimination or Deactivation | New Program |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| University of Nevada, Las Vegas | | |
| Ph.D. Criminology and Criminal Justice | | X |
| D.M.P., Doctor of Medical Physics | | X |
| M.Ed., English Language Learning | | X |
| L.L.M., Gaming Law and Regulation | | X |
| Ph.D., Interdisciplinary Health Sciences | | X |
| University of Nevada, Reno | | |
| M.S./Ph.D., Neuroscience | | X |
| Nevada State College | | |
| B.A.S., Engineering Technology | | X |
| B.S., Mathematics | | X |
| B.A.S., Visual Media | | X |
| College of Southern Nevada | | |
| C.A., Applied Politics/Political Management | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Bookkeeping Fundamentals | | X |
| C.A., Dance | | X |
| A.S., Earth Science* | X | |
| A.A., Emergency Management Administration | X | |
| A.S., Environmental Science* | X | |
| A.A.S., Finance | X | |
| Skills Certificate, Firefighting | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Fire Officer I | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Fire Instructor I | | X |
| A.S., Geological Science* | X | |
| A.S., Mathematics | X | |
| A.S. Pre-Engineering* | X | |
| A.S. Physical Science | | X |
| A.S., Ornamental Horticulture/Environmental Horticulture | X | |
| A.A.S., Ornamental Horticulture | X | |
| *Consolidated into A.S. Physical Science | | |
| Great Basin College | | |
| A.A.S., Agriculture | X | |
| A.A.S., Emergency Medical Services - Paramedic | | X |
| B.A.S., Land Surveying/Geomatics (Reactivated Dec. 2014) | X | |

2014-2015

Summary of Eliminated and New Programs by Institution

| Program | Elimination or Deactivation | New Program |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Truckee Meadows Community College | | |
| Skills Certificate, Bricklayers Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Carpentry Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Cement Masons Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Certified Professional Bookkeeper | | X |
| A.A.S., Culinary Arts Entrepreneurs | | X |
| C.A., Culinary Arts Entrepreneurs | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Cybersecurity | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Electricians Apprenticeship | | X |
| B.A.S., Emergency Management and Homeland Security | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Ironworkers Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Linux Professional Certification Preparation | | X |
| B.A.S., Logistics Operations Management | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Technology | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Natural Gas Pipefitters | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Natural Gas Pressure Operators | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Natural Gas Serviceman Apprenticeship | | X |
| A.A.S., Nursing | X | |
| Skills Certificate, Operating Engineers | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Painters Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Plasterers Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Plumbers and Pipefitters | | X |
| A.A.S., Prehospital Emergency Medicine | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Refrigeration Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Sheetmetal Apprenticeship | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Tilesetters Apprenticeship | | X |
| C.A., Unmanned Aerial Systems Technician | | X |
| Western Nevada College | | |
| C.A., General Industrial Technology | | X |
| C.A., Industrial Electronics | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Industrial Electronics | | X |
| Skills Certificate, Manufacturing Technician | | X |
| Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Academy Certification | X | |

2014-2015

Summary of Characteristics of Reviewed Programs

| Program | Number of Students with Declared Major 2014-15 | Number of Graduates from Program | | | Service Headcount Fall 2014 (Duplicated) |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--|
| | | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | |
| University of Nevada, Las Vegas | | | | | |
| Chemistry B.A., B.S., M.S., Ph.D./Biochemistry B.S., M.S./Radiochemistry Ph.D. | 377 | 31 | 23 | 33 | 2,112 |
| Executive Crisis and Emergency Management M.S. | 38 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 36 |
| Human Services B.S. | 30 | 31 | 32 | 21 | 533 |
| Interior Architecture and Design B.S. | 99 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 114 |
| Journalism and Media Studies, B.A. | 208 | 73 | 86 | 79 | 473 |
| Music B.A., B.M., M.M., D.M.A./Jazz Studies B.M. | 319 | 45 | 53 | 53 | 2,039 |
| Philosophy B.A. | 99 | 17 | 22 | 21 | 2,343 |
| Public Affairs Ph.D. | 33 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 35 |
| University of Nevada, Reno | | | | | |
| Anthropology B.A. | 157 | 26 | 38 | 34 | 1,556 |
| Anthropology M.A. | 37 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 117 |
| Anthropology Ph.D. | 15 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 117 |
| Art B.A. | 232 | 47 | 38 | 54 | 1,087 |
| Art B.F.A. | 9 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 1,087 |
| Art M.F.A. | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 25 |
| Biochemistry and Molecular Biology B.S. | 431 | 40 | 68 | 81 | 698 |
| Biochemistry M.S. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 68 |
| Biochemistry Ph.D. | 16 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 68 |
| Biology B.S. | 1,112 | 155 | 172 | 190 | 3,687 |
| Biology M.S. | 22 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 67 |
| Biotechnology B.S., M.S. | 44 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 41 |
| Chemistry B.S. | 37 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 4,062 |
| Chemistry M.S. | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 215 |
| Chemistry Ph.D. | 66 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 215 |
| Education Ph.D. | 118 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 614 |
| Geography B.A., B.S. | 53 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 541 |
| Geography M.S. | 9 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 62 |
| Geography Ph.D. | 18 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 62 |
| Human Development and Family Studies B.S. | 374 | 59 | 71 | 76 | 1,022 |
| Human Development and Family Studies M.S. | 23 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 33 |
| Mathematics and Statistics B.A., B.S., M.A.T.M. | 175 | 16 | 15 | 31 | 5,947 |
| Mathematics M.S. | 24 | 18 | 16 | 11 | 83 |
| Philosophy B.A. | 74 | 12 | 6 | 20 | 911 |
| Philosophy M.A. | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 18 |

2014-2015

Summary of Characteristics of Reviewed Programs

| Program | Number of Students with Declared Major 2014-15 | Number of Graduates from Program | | | Service Headcount Fall 2014 (Duplicated) |
|---|--|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--|
| | | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | |
| Nevada State College | | | | | |
| No programs scheduled for review this academic cycle. | | | | | |
| College of Southern Nevada | | | | | |
| A.A. (No emphasis) | 3,016 | 377 | 395 | 454 | 81,156 |
| Art and Art History A.A. | 569 | 8 | 14 | 13 | 1,770 |
| Communication A.A. | 307 | 16 | 25 | 16 | 3,901 |
| Creative Writing A.A. | 147 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 11,617 |
| Deaf Studies A.A.S. | 77 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 292 |
| English A.A. | 318 | 12 | 23 | 13 | 11,617 |
| International Languages A.A. | 109 | 23 | 12 | 26 | 2,174 |
| Interpreter Preparation A.A.S. | 57 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 292 |
| Journalism and Media Studies A.A. | 305 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 215 |
| Latin American and Latina/o Studies A.A. | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Music A.A. | 249 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 3,058 |
| Music Business Technology C.A. | 97 | 7 | 15 | 17 | 2,945 |
| Theatre A.A. | 106 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 614 |
| Great Basin College | | | | | |
| Land Surveying/Geomatics Emphasis B.A.S. | 23 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 35 |
| Truckee Meadows Community College | | | | | |
| Administrative Professional A.A.S., C.A. | 79 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 67 |
| Apprenticeship A.A.S., C.A. | 28 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 185 |
| Architecture A.A; Residential Design A.A.S. | 87 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 140 |
| Business Studies: Business A.A., A.A.S., C.A./ Bookkeeping C.A. | 1,399 | 92 | 104 | 126 | 1,076 |
| Criminal Justice A.A./Law Enforcement Emphasis A.A.S. | 688 | 52 | 61 | 59 | 510 |
| Graphic Communications A.A.S., C.A. | 198 | 22 | 25 | 28 | 169 |
| History A.A. | 68 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 621 |
| Visual Arts A.A./Art History Emphasis A.A. | 97 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 809 |
| Western Nevada College | | | | | |

Program Review

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

List the existing programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that were reviewed over the past year:

DEGREE PROGRAMS

- I. List the existing programs and corresponding degree for all programs that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Economics, Bachelor of Science).
 - Chemistry B.A., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
 - Biochemistry B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
 - Radiochemistry Ph.D.
 - Executive Crisis & Emergency Management M.S.
 - Human Services B.S.
 - Interior Architecture & Design B.S.
 - Journalism & Media Studies B.A.
 - Music B.A.
 - Music B.M.
 - Music: Jazz Studies B.M.
 - Music M.M.
 - Music D.M.A
 - Philosophy B.A.
 - Public Affairs Ph.D.
- II. List any programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that received Board approval for elimination or deactivation in this academic year of review (e.g. Political Science, Master of Arts).

None
- III. List all new programs and corresponding degree programs that received Board approval in this academic year of review (e.g. History, Bachelor of Arts).
 - Criminology and Criminal Justice Ph.D.
 - Doctor of Medical Physics D.M.P.
 - English Language Learning M.Ed.
 - Gaming and Law Regulation LL.M.
 - Interdisciplinary Health Sciences Ph.D.

I. Description of Program reviewed

The mission of the UNLV Department of Chemistry is to offer high-quality education and conduct cutting-edge research to serve the students of UNLV, the campus community, the local and state communities of Nevada, and the national and international Biochemistry, Radiochemistry and Chemistry professional communities. The department is active in all sub-disciplines of chemical research, and provides educational and research opportunities at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The department of chemistry faculty offers its undergraduate students curricular programs and course content to ensure that upon graduation, students will be well prepared 1) to function as scientific professionals in the chemical and biochemical industries, or 2) to succeed in rigorous graduate and professional programs leading to masters, doctoral, medical, dental, or other related degrees. The undergraduate curricular programs are designed to offer a broad understanding of chemistry's sub-disciplines, technical laboratory expertise, build communication skills, and foster critical thinking and intellectual growth. The degree programs are consistent with the American Chemical Society (ACS) Guidelines and Evaluation Procedures for Bachelor Degree Programs.

The rigorous graduate programs and ambitious research activities in the UNLV Department of Chemistry prepare scientists for research, academia, and leadership roles in the profession.

All of the curricular programs integrate the concepts of ethics, laboratory safety, environmental stewardship, and build on critical thinking and communication skills, both oral and written.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Chemistry, Biochemistry, and Radiochemistry degrees was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty. Two external experts in the field from similar institutions visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and then produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Commendations:

The Faculty, Students, Support Staff, and Teaching Assistants of the UNLV Chemistry Department are to be commended on the evident congeniality exhibited during the Reviewer's visit, and on the associated Esprit de Corps resulting from the sense of working successfully together in a collaborative educational enterprise in evidence. The Dean of the College of Sciences has the unenviable task of allocating important resources in the face of significant competing petitioners, including aspects of GA appointments, yet is able to maintain a largely dispassionate and accurate perspective on the strengths and needs of the Chemistry Department within the College.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are made on basis of materials provided us by UNLV, two-days of frank discussion with Chemistry Faculty, Staff, and Students, as well as with Administrators on the College and Provost's Office level. Information available to us from previous familiarity with the Department and certain of its members also contributes to some extent to our recommendations.

1. Clearing the Air – The Chemistry Faculty's perceived lack of support from the Administration is somewhat more extreme than is common at other State supported Universities with which we are familiar. The appointment of an informal tripartite committee – Chemistry, College, Provost – meeting frequently to build bridges by addressing this issue may be beneficial, with the President's Office possibly advised of this effort.
2. Safety Issues – There seems to be universal agreement among Chemistry, College, and Provost that some of the Main Chemistry Building facilities are inadequate in certain respects, and touching on safety issues.

3. Administrative Chain-of-Command – Negotiation of salaries and other support of individual faculty members above the Department level are not entirely unknown at State-supported universities but can undermine Departmental cohesiveness in the long run, which can be detrimental to smooth functioning of the Department. We respectfully suggest that the Department Chair should be kept in the loop.
4. Encouraging Departmental Strengths in Research – Selected programs in Chemistry, including Biochemistry and Radiochemistry, are particularly well developed and could provide a nucleus about which further expansion in size and quality could be encouraged.
5. Computers in Chemistry – The recent acquisition of the Intel Cherry Creek Supercomputer to supplement the Eureka Supercomputer currently on the UNLV campus provides a resource to encourage Chemistry Faculty additions in the area of biochemical simulation and drug development, as well as in computational chemistry more generally. Current Faculty working in Biochemistry do perform computations in support of experimental work and in the area of genetics, but there is ample opportunity for adding highly cost-effective theoretical and computational faculty in view of the widely available resources for this purpose in addition to the recent UNLV supercomputer acquisition.
6. Advisors in Chemistry – Both graduate and undergraduate students expressed some dismay at the absence of in-house advisors in Chemistry specifically familiar with Chemistry course scheduling and related issues.
7. Chemistry Website – The Faculty profiles and areas of research and teaching presented are satisfactory in selected cases, but there is no common format which provides some barriers to potential undergraduate students and particularly to potential graduate students.
8. Private-Sector UNLV Stakeholders – Associate Provost Dr. Carl Reiber drew to our attention the apparent absence of an educationally enlightened permanent resident community of financially well-endowed individuals in the Las Vegas. In this absence, we suggest that a collaborative effort be made by the UNLV Administration with the Chemistry Department in approaching selected Institutes and Foundations for the purpose of supporting individual Faculty scholars, possibly in the form of an endowed chair. Suggested organizations would include the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Kavli Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Keck foundation, and other such familiar organizations.

The undergraduate Biochemistry student survey revealed that the majority (82%) of respondents said there were not enough classes offered to graduate in a timely manner, while 18% said there were enough classes. Comments cited the lack of sections, scheduling conflicts between upper division courses, and how some classes are only taught once a year which makes it difficult to take classes in order and still graduate in a timely manner. Comments suggested additional open sections, reducing scheduling conflicts between required classes, and offering more 200 and 300-level classes during the summer.

The majority (58.3%) of Chemistry students said that there were enough classes offered to graduate in a timely manner, while 41.7% said there were not enough classes. Comments cited scheduling conflicts with classes that are only taught once a year, upper division classes that are offered more in the Fall than in the Spring, and some of the 6 hour labs that are only held on Tuesdays and block other courses.

52% of Biochemistry students felt that the program was preparing them adequately for their chosen careers, with 19% responding that they felt well-prepared, 19% responding that they felt poorly prepared, 10% did not know.

Half (50%) of Chemistry students felt that the program was preparing them adequately for their chosen careers, with 25% responding that they felt well-prepared, 8% responding that they felt poorly prepared, and 17% did not know.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 377 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 31 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 23 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 33 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|------|
| Fall 2014 | 2112 |
|-----------|------|

MS Executive Crisis and Emergency Management

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Executive Crisis and Emergency Management (ECEM) program is a professional degree designed to maximize the expertise of experienced professionals from numerous disciplines, levels, and regions, thereby providing the opportunity to both advance individual philosophies and to gain broad exposure to a wide variety of other techniques and methodologies to effectively address natural, intentional, and technical disasters. The degree offers enhanced professional growth for the individual and a contribution to a developing body of knowledge. The program is intended for mid- to-upper level incident response managers and policy makers from the federal, state, and local level. Private sector candidates must have strong background in incident response, or be in a position that requires significant responsibility and governmental interface in this arena.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Executive Master of Science, Crisis and Emergency Management was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty and two external experts in the field from similar institutions who visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The external reviewers produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

From the external reviewer's report:

Our overall assessment of the ECEM program is that it is a unique and valuable unit with UNLV. The Program Director and administrators are clearly and deeply committed to the program and the students appreciate both the nature of the program and the exceptional quality of the faculty. The program is advancing the mission of UNLV and is preparing students for careers in emergency management and related fields and professions. The program has exhibited growth since its founding in 2003 and has a promising future. The university should take advantage of unfolding opportunities to advance the program, possibly to include the hiring of an additional full time faculty member, developing the website with additional information, and undertaking other measures to solidify its standing domestically and internationally.

The program fills a valuable niche for working professionals who are interested in advancing their careers while maintaining their employment and livelihoods for themselves and their families. The combination of traditional classroom education and flexible online learning is an attractive feature of the program. Students universally applauded this unique program which takes advantage of alternative teaching methodologies and meets the demanding schedule of non-traditional learners. The program is clearly distinct and has few (if any) competitors because the vast majority of emergency management degrees are not based on this unique hybrid model. Consequently, the program draws students from various locations in the United States and even around the world. The program is also coveted because it prepares individuals to work in various sectors of emergency management, business continuity and homeland security (among others), and the disciplinary knowledge and leadership and management skills and abilities are required now due to the technical nature of crises and will certainly be needed in the future as there will undoubtedly be more natural disasters, technological hazards and terrorist attacks. The program has grown visibly since its inception and it is logically anticipated that the degree will continue to see increased enrollment as word about this program spreads to those interested in all types of emergencies along with principles for their amelioration.

The program also has an admirable curriculum. The Crisis and Emergency Management course (ECEM 711) provides a comprehensive preview of the emergency management profession. Other core courses (e.g., ECEM 712, ECEM 714, ECEM 721, ECEM 723, ECEM 731, ECEM 732, and ECEM 733) provide knowledge regarding the nature of disasters, the public administration context, and functional aspects of emergency management. ECEM 724 and ECEM 734 provide practical skills so the student is applying knowledge that has been acquired in the program.

That being said, the curriculum could be revised slightly. The evolution of terrorism course may be too narrow, and a more explicit focus on leadership and management could be ingrained in the courses in the program. Additional electives with diverse disciplinary perspectives could also enhance the program.

MS Executive Crisis and Emergency Management

The ECEM program has undergone revision since its inception in 2003. For instance, it was initially headed by a (former military) general and now is directed by a distinguished scholar and professor. The program undergoes a periodic review and curriculum has been updated with FEMA independent study courses and recommendations from the Certified Emergency Manager program. Students are now expected to complete significant amounts of reading and evaluate the lessons from important case studies and after-action reports. Moreover, student writing expectations have increased and students improve communication skills through presentations to their classmates. The program has also focused more on terrorism, which is a trend that is picking up momentum in other master's degrees around the nation. In our discussion with the students (and recent program alumni), they were thrilled with the program, reserved high praise for the faculty, and thought it was an outstanding and very positive experience.

Over 225 students have completed the ECEM degree program since 2003. Students mentioned that they sometimes have a difficult time balancing work, school and personal/family demands. However, the degree requirements were revised (moving from an 18 month program to a 2 year program to increase flexibility for the students). Students generally asserted that they are able to complete the degree program with their cohort. They agreed that their advisor was helpful and was able to generally respond to inquiries in short order. However, some recommended that there be an earlier preview of their final project in the first year of the program so they can start thinking earlier about what they will accomplish and determine how to meet their goals.

Recommendations:

- The website does not sufficiently market the program.
- A handbook can be created to guide students through the educational process.
- The orientation during the first session should provide a solid overview of the program, including the final capstone project.
- The program director may wish to review curriculum in the program (e.g., combine community preparedness and planning courses; expand the evolution of terrorism course to include a homeland security perspective; add a course on technological hazards and cyber-terrorism).
- Periods between face to face meetings can be filled with "gotomeeting" sessions.
- Reiterate the importance of adjuncts getting back to students as soon as possible when they have questions or inquiries.
- Train adjuncts on how to use WebCampus effectively and in a similar manner to the courses taught by other professors.
- Hire at least one more faculty member in the near future.

The external program review suggests that the ECEM program is a unique gem at UNLV, across the nation, and around the world. The hybrid program captures the strengths of traditional and online learning, and the curriculum balances theoretical knowledge and practical skills. The program is headed by a capable director and qualified adjuncts deliver solid courses to passionate and bright students.

If the program is able to hire another full-time professor, increase marketing through a more thorough website, and continue to make revisions to curriculum, it is anticipated that the program will be in an even better position to corner the executive program niche and graduate coveted students who are able to advance leadership and management careers and make a difference in the organizations and communities they serve.

The faculty survey revealed that the faculty of the program believe strongly in the values of the program and have an overall high satisfaction with it. 33% of the faculty thought that the program needed additional funding.

The student survey revealed that the majority of the students did not think they were able to see an academic advisor as often as they needed to nor were they satisfied with the advisor. 63% of the students thought that the quality of the learning experiences in the program were excellent or good with two students disagreeing.

MS Executive Crisis and Emergency Management

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 38 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 14 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 12 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 15 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 36 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Bachelor of Science, Human Services degree in the Department of Educational & Clinical Studies is a rigorous program of study that helps students acquire the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to promote mental well-being and to advocate for the populations they serve. The degree program has an applied emphasis with a strong grounding in counseling research and theory. Human Services graduates are prepared to enter the workforce in paraprofessional counseling positions in mental health, addictions, and child and adolescent services or pursue graduate degrees in the helping professions.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Bachelor of Science, Human Services was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty. An external expert in the field from a similar institution visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, the dean, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and then produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

From the external reviewer's report:

Commendations:

The program, under the leadership of Dr. Cynthia Carruthers, has made great strides over the last three to four years to focus on improving the quality as well as the stability of the program.

Everyone I spoke with acknowledged the value and need for the program as well as supported the changes that have been made to the program since 2011. In particular, Dr. Cynthia Carruthers was praised as an excellent leader who took a program that was seen as "floating" and has done the work to create a solid foundation for the future. In addition, Mr. Oscar Sida is seen as enthusiastic and supportive by both students and program faculty alike. His expertise in the field of addictions is critical to the Addictions Treatment Minor.

During the review period, the program gathered feedback from students via surveys during their field experience as well as held focus groups and surveyed alumni. It is clear that department faculty listened to student and alumni input and made changes to the program based on that input. Of note is that the ongoing survey results show high levels of satisfaction with the program.

The program has excellent retention rates (95-98%) once students are enrolled in CED 400 which is their internship experience in the Fall of their senior year. Students move through the field experience coursework, CED 400 and 401, as a cohort and that seems to create a community of support for the students. In addition, the text used for the class (Sweitzer and King) is the standard for the profession and provides a model for helping students and faculty understand the flow of an internship experience as well as some of the issues and concerns that can occur in that process. The course has clear reflection assignments focused on resilience and self-care. The students who met with me during my visit spoke about the internship as a critical to their learning experience and preparation for the field.

It is clear that with limited resources and in the context of an institution undergoing major transitions including changes in key leadership positions on campus, the faculty have done an impressive amount of work to offer a high quality undergraduate education that serves community needs. Program faculty are to be highly commended for their vision and commitment to the program.

The following strategic decisions as well as program changes are all to be commended:

- Utilizing the standards defined by the Council for Standards in Human Service Education as the focus for curriculum development, course design, and assessment outcomes;
- Utilizing the standards developed for the Human Services Board Certified Practitioner exam in relation to developing curriculum such as CED 465;
- Developing an assessment program with specific student learning objectives and collecting data at multiple

points throughout the curriculum;

- Creating online “master” classes that meet Quality Matters standards and provide consistency to students through a team process;
- Dropping the addictions prevention and problem gambling minors due to low enrollment while strengthening the addictions treatment minor curriculum (Note: The minor meets state requirements for individuals who plan to seek the Certified Drug and Alcohol Counselor credential that can be earned by individuals with a bachelor’s degree.);
- Moving CED 315 (Counseling Skills) and CED 375 (Ethical and Professional Issues) to face-to-face format and CED 400/CED 401 (Field Experience) to a hybrid format;
- Creating sections of specific classes with priority enrollment for majors;
- Expanding internship options including addiction and mental health agencies;
- Requiring two levels of multicultural coursework in the major: CED 200 and CED 425;
- Curriculum changes such as:
 1. Replacing PUA 241 (Public Administration) with a new class on Case Management (CED 465);
 2. Reviewing and changing prerequisites/co-requisites to meet pedagogical best practices;
 3. Reviewing and updating course names to match national standards and better reflect course content;
 4. Reviewing and updating the Addictions Treatment minor.

In addition, the program offers general studies and service classes for other majors; serves as a feeder program for the Master’s in Clinical Mental Health, the Master’s in Marriage and Family, and the Master’s in Public Administration. The program also offers the opportunity for Graduate Teaching Assistantships for students in the Master’s in Clinical Mental Health.

The biggest concern relating to quality for this program is the lack of full-time permanent faculty in the program. In Spring/Fall 2014, “approximately 83% of classes were taught by graduate assistants, part-time instructors, or visiting lecturers; 9% were taught by Faculty in Residence; only 7% were taught by permanent faculty members.”

Recommendations:

Resources: The program needs dedicated full-time faculty lines which could be a combination of tenure-track and Faculty in Residence lines.

There is an immediate need for at least one tenure track position as well as one faculty in residence to meet the current needs of the program. The program needs ongoing administrative support to function including an assigned Program Coordinator and a Field Coordinator. As of December, Mr. Sida has been assigned the task of coordination of the program. One way to provide immediate stability for the program in the wake of Dr. Carruthers retirement, would be to assign Mr. Sida to continue his work as Program Coordinator as a Faculty in Residence. In addition, a tenure-line for a faculty position should be created and a search conducted as quickly as possible so that the program achieves long term stability and quality.

Note: Dr. Carruthers informed me that UNLV is considering creating clinical tenure track positions. This type of position would be a good fit for this program. The decision about which position should serve in the role of Program Coordinator and which position should serve as Field Coordinator will depend on the qualifications and areas of expertise of the faculty hired for these positions. The most immediate need is for program coordination and since Mr. Sida is already fulfilling that role, it makes sense to continue to utilize his skills in this area until the program has additional faculty assigned to it.

Given that both the Dean and the Vice Provost have expressed interest in growth for the program, consideration for additional faculty lines (beyond one clinical professor and one faculty in residence) will need to be incorporated in to any plans for future growth. The self-study suggested a 1:50 faculty/student ratio.

Field: The program needs a faculty member assigned as a Field Coordinator in order to manage liability issues, facilitate logistical elements of the field program, and develop relationships with agencies in the community that serve as internship sites. A Field Coordinator could support deeper partnerships with the community as well as research potential grants to support the community and the program.

In addition to the lack of a Field Coordinator, CED 400 and 401 range in size from 20-30 students making site visits difficult to impossible. The site visit is a key component of the learning experience in an internship class and offers students the opportunity to meet with a faculty member and an agency supervisor to receive direct feedback about performance and discuss future career and educational plans. The program should make incorporating a site visit in to field experience a priority. It is possible that site visits could be split between 400 and 401 so all visits would not need to occur in one semester.

Consideration should be given to capping the enrollment in the field classes. Obviously, this can only happen with additional faculty resources. (Note: My department sets the maximum enrollment for a field class at 15 students. Social Work departments often cap enrollment in field at 12.)

Curriculum: With additional faculty resources, the program should assess if other classes such as CED 117, 300, and 425 should be offered in a face-to-face or hybrid format. The students I met with during my visit were clamoring for more face-to-face classes and said that too much of the curriculum was only offered online. In addition, there are pedagogical concerns for curriculum focused on interpersonal relationships and counseling in an online format. Offering a traditional in-class or hybrid format offers opportunities for mock counseling sessions and related practice experience that an online class cannot offer. One student I spoke with said that although she loved the classes, the online format made her feel "like I was learning on my own."

At this point in time, the Human Services curriculum offers a solid general overview of the field. In my meeting with students, they expressed the importance of their minors in Addiction Treatment or Marriage and Family Therapy in terms of acquisition of specific clinical knowledge to supplement their Human Services major. The students believed that, while minors are not required by UNLV, advisors should strongly encourage majors in Human Services to complete a minor with a clinical focus.

With more faculty resources, the program could develop curriculum focused on specific populations or issues. Dr. Carruthers spoke about developing concentrations in youth development, gerontology, and/or disabilities. Given that Clark County is the fifth largest K-12 school district in the country and that the program is in a department with education programs, developing coursework in Youth Development would be a natural place to begin to design curriculum with a focus that serves specific community needs.

Assessment: The efforts to develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) and assess them shows a commitment to student learning and program effectiveness. Program faculty used the data and feedback to make specific curricular changes such as adding a Case Management class to the requirements for the major. I am quite impressed by the amount of assessment that has been done in such a short time as well as by the program response to the results.

Some of the current student learning objectives are not written in a way that is easy to observe or measure; some of the artifacts that have been selected do not seem to measure the specific outcome desired; and some of the objectives include two or more unique goals in one objective. I have not seen the actual artifacts and rubrics for each of the SLOs, so my comments are based on what was included in the self-study.

National Organization for Human Services (NOHS): Program faculty are not members of NOHS nor have they participated in the annual NOHS conference. I recommend that funding be provided for program faculty to join NOHS and attend the annual conference to develop relationships with other Human Services program on the national level.

Accreditation: With the current staffing structure, accreditation through the CSHSE is not feasible. Nonetheless, continuing efforts to align student learning outcomes and curriculum with the standards defined by CSHSE will prepare the program to seek accreditation if program faculty with the support of the chair and dean decide to seek accreditation in the future.

According to Alumni data, 70% of the alumni are in graduate school full or part time currently; the majority of the remaining alumni planned to attend graduate school in the future. HS students typically pursue Clinical Mental Health, Social Work, Marriage and Family Therapy, or Public Administration graduate degrees.

Local human service agencies are stakeholders of the Human Services Program. A recent analysis of the State of Nevada's mental health workforce indicated that Clark County had significant shortages. Although many mental health professions require advanced degrees to obtain a professional license to practice, HS graduates can find employment in psychosocial rehabilitation, aging services, and youth services. If the students also pursue one of the addictions minors, they are eligible to pursue their Certified Drug and Alcohol Counselor credential and practice. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), the job outlook for Social and Community Service Managers and Social and Human Service Assistants is expected to grow by 22% and 21% respectively, much faster than the average for all occupations.

The faculty survey revealed that six of the seven faculty responding to the survey believe that there are not enough faculty to appropriately serve the students. Over half of the respondents stated that the online education system is dated and does not work well in the program.

The student survey revealed that one half of the students did not believe that courses were offered often enough to graduate in a timely manner. Students were resoundingly satisfied with the academic advising and felt that they are being well-prepared for their career.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 30 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 31 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 32 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 21 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 533 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The program provides high quality individualized professional education that is responsive to expertise evident in current and projected modes of professional practice. The professional development of the students is further enhanced by the program's unique relationship to the extraordinary industrial and artistic development of the city of Las Vegas, which provides opportunities to engage in innovative and creative design projects. Graduates are well prepared to pursue advanced studies or to make a seamless transition into the profession and advance onto positions of increased responsibilities and achievement of professional licensure. Central to the philosophy of the Interior Architecture and Design program is the premise that design professionals share a common foundation of knowledge that is to comprise the basis of the curriculum for the first two years in undergraduate studies.

II. Review Process and Criteria

This program review was based on an extensive Council for Interior Design (CIDA) Accreditation self-study and a program review self-study completed by the unit.

CIDA reaffirmed accreditation for the program for six years effective July 2014.

Online surveys were conducted with program undergraduate students and faculty on basic topics pertinent to the program such as facilities and equipment. The surveys are reviewed and summarized by a member of the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

While the employment of general interior design practitioners is projected to grow approximately 20 percent from 2012 to 2022, demand for specialized design services already integral to the Interior Architecture program's curriculum, such as healthcare design, is expected to exponentially grow (<http://www.bls.gov/ooh/arts-and-design/interior-designers.htm>).

CIDA's findings and conclusions included the following:

- The interior architecture program at UNLV is successful in delivering a professional-level education that prepares students for entry into the design profession. The energy and commitment of faculty and the support of the administration were strong.
- The visiting team found a number of program strengths including the focus on collaboration and teamwork throughout all levels of design studios, interaction with multiple disciplines, application of historical precedents, and visualizing and applying 3-dimensional solutions throughout the curriculum.
- The visiting team found weaknesses in students' understanding and analysis of anthropometrics and accessibility guidelines.
- There were many opportunities for students to demonstrate their skills in innovative and creative thinking, especially in high-end hospitality design; however, students did not show a strong understanding of designing for lower-income groups.
- The majority of studio faculty have passed the National Council for Interior Design Qualification exam and have interior design degrees. Overall, faculty showed a strong dedication to working together across the curriculum to provide a quality education. Student interviews indicated they valued the commitment and mentorship provided by faculty.

The faculty survey found that faculty had some concerns with specific classrooms; 77% were satisfied with the equipment available; 93% were satisfied with the library resources; over half said the program needed 1-2 additional faculty members. Narrative commentary included that this was an excellent program with great students, a vibrant program with the School of Architecture, and that it was internationally ranked. Several mentioned that with the addition of more faculty lines or 2 more full time faculty, the program would be even better. Incentives to get more foreign students involved in the program would be good.

BS Interior Architecture & Design

Professional work experience in approved design business entities is a degree requirement. Supervision is provided by both the Program Coordinator and the cooperating entity. A minimum 200 hours of satisfactory professional work experience is required to receive course credit. Approximately 9 of 10 interns are offered permanent positions by sponsoring agencies.

Students are provided opportunities to be engaged in all aspects of the program's educational experience as they progress toward the achievement of their educational and career goals in a timely manner. The faculty and program coordinator are in frequent communication with all students in the program from the time they enter it to several years following graduation. Academic advising, mentoring, career guidance, job placements, and general networking are all integral to this communication.

Employer demand for potential employees exceeds the number of available graduates. The pre-assigned credibility of the program's graduates in the market place is one of the outcomes of the program's productive relationships with regional and national business entities that ensure student internship opportunities and employment. Graduates seamlessly transition into the profession and advance onto positions of increased responsibilities and achievement of licensure.

The faculty survey revealed that half of the faculty believe more faculty are needed to appropriately support the program. One half also thought that the program needed more funding. 24% of the faculty commented that they felt the program was very high quality and internationally recognized for that quality.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 99 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 6 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 8 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 8 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 114 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The program leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism and Media Studies is designed to prepare students to become thoughtful scholars and effective professionals in broadcast and print journalism, integrated marketing communication, advertising, public relations and media technologies. Areas of concentration include: journalism, integrated marketing communication (IMC) and media studies.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Bachelor of Arts, Journalism & Media Studies was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty. Two external experts in the field from similar institutions visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and then produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Commendations from the external reviewers included the faculty used by the program, which is more than 12,000 square feet of broadcast space and the energetic and well-trained staff operation the radio and television station.

Recommendations were: eliminate the bottlenecks that prevent students from graduating including a lack of an adequate number of courses available, enrollment caps and understaffed advising; revise the curriculum and make room for courses pertaining to the digital age in which media currently finds itself; write a strategic plan including fundraising, grant writing; and more diversity in faculty.

The faculty survey revealed that they believe more full-time faculty are needed to support the program and the institution needs to invest in the program. Faculty also expressed concern that students are unprepared for college and that perhaps admission standards should be raised and there should be an entrance exam.

31% of junior and senior students in the program responded to the survey and their concerns included that the program does not have enough courses available, some core curriculum courses are only offered once a year and that many of the courses in the catalog are never or rarely offered. They also stated that it was difficult to get an appointment with an advisor and that courses focus on the old style and information that is obsolete.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 208 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 73 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 86 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 79 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 473 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Music offers an excellent professional and liberal arts education to students pursuing a career in music performance, history and literature, music education, conducting, music theory, Orff Schulwerk (the Orff Method is a way of teaching children about music that engages their mind and body through a mixture of singing, dancing, acting and the use of percussion instruments), composition, or jazz studies. The department enrolls more than 400 music majors and attracts students from throughout America and international students from Japan, China, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Europe, and Canada.

The UNLV Latin Jazz Ensemble was awarded Outstanding Performance 2014 DownBeat Magazine Student Music Awards and student Carlos Mata was awarded Outstanding Performance Undergraduate College for his Large Ensemble Jazz Arrangement.

II. Review Process and Criteria

This program review was based on an extensive National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) self-study, an on-site evaluation by NASM, interviews with faculty, staff, and students, and a written report by the NASM evaluation team.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

A. Need/Demand for Program

1. Need

Stakeholder needs for the program include the Clark County School District, Las Vegas charter schools, regional school districts and colleges, the entertainment industry (which is substantial in Las Vegas), local, regional, and national orchestras, opera companies, private student studio, and church music programs.

2. Demand

Demand is for professional degrees (music education, state licensure), post-baccalaureate degrees in performance, composition, and jazz studies.

B. Quality of Program and Student Outcomes

1. Quality

In addition to honors won by the music program and some of its students, the quality of the program is indicated through the reaffirmation of accreditation in a rigorous process of analysis and evaluation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the only accrediting agency for schools of music. The self-study produced by the program and the on-site evaluation of it by NASM clearly touch all areas of the program including faculty, students, budget, facilities, inventory, and other resources. The NASM evaluation and standards are among the highest in discipline accreditations.

2. Student outcomes.

The Department of Music developed and established learning outcomes for students pursuing degrees. These learning outcomes integrate the common body of knowledge and skills outlined in the NASM handbook. The faculty refers to the learning outcomes when planning their courses and the department employs the learning outcomes as a cross-reference to ensure that essential competencies are met in all curricula.

Commendations:

The faculty was commended for their qualifications, collegiality, commitment to the institution and the students. The chair was praised for being highly regarded and effective and the staff for their hard work and capability. The department's technology and support was commended, as where the music library, and the Jazz studies program. The institution's degree webpages with the learning outcomes for all programs was praised.

BA, BM, MM, DMA Music; BM Jazz Studies

Recommendations:

The NASM evaluation team expressed concerns about funding for the Department of Music, sufficiency of faculty compared to the numbers of students admitted, quantity and quality of facilities and maintenance of those facilities, and whether students being admitted for master and doctoral programs are meeting the prerequisites satisfactorily. The evaluation team suggested that the department work to provide a reliable stream of revenue through external development and fundraising.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 319 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 45 |
| 2013-14 | 53 |
| 2014-15 | 53 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 2,039 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Philosophy offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in philosophy. The course of study is designed to provide students with a critical background in logic and argumentation, as well as an extended introduction to some of the most important philosophical themes and traditions from ancient to contemporary times.

Philosophy literally means "love of wisdom," and for most of human history anyone who pursued knowledge was considered a philosopher. Today, the term "philosophy" refers to a narrower academic discipline, though philosophers still continue to seek answers to life's most important questions: How should I live? What can I know? Does God exist? Do numbers? What is the nature of language and the human mind? Of science and art? Of meaning, logic and truth?

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Bachelor of Arts, Philosophy was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty. Two external experts in the field from similar institutions visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and then produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Commendations:

The department is to be commended for their service to the college and university. Not long ago, the department was threatened with elimination due to budget cuts. They have responded constructively and aggressively, bringing the relevance of philosophical skills and knowledge to diverse audiences.

The faculty should be commended for their devotion to their students. More than twenty undergraduates met with the evaluators to convey their admiration and respect for the time and efforts of the faculty. Many of these students reported that neither they nor their friends in other majors know of any other faculty with comparable devotion to their students.

The faculty should also be commended for their efforts at maintaining strong connections with current research in philosophy. This is done at the individual level but also at the department level through their very active colloquium series.

This is a very strong philosophy department made up of a very talented, hardworking and dedicated group of faculty.

Recommendations:

There is an immediate need for more faculty lines. There is a strong consensus that a hire should be made in normative or applied ethics, with an interest in teaching philosophy of law. This is an urgent need, especially given the recent establishment of a law and social justice emphasis for majors. There also is consensus around a need to have someone to teach in the field of philosophical approaches to medicine and medical research. Such a hire could also focus on applied ethics, specifically bioethics, but could also just as usefully be focused in philosophy of statistics and inductive reasoning. This latter focus would nicely complement the faculty whose emphasis is in deductive reasoning and provide another person to help teach and coordinate the large number of 102 classes provided by the department. There is also strong interest in hiring someone to teach 19th-century history, an extremely important segment of philosophy's history that is not currently being offered. The addition of any of these lines would require funding but the department is in a strong position to argue for College lines being extended to them given their success in attracting majors and their teaching of such a large number of students from outside their major. It should be added that any new additions to the faculty should be made with an eye toward bringing greater gender and/or racial diversity to the department.

If more faculty lines are awarded, the department would be in an excellent position to develop an MA program in philosophy. Quality MA programs are valuable in preparing students for successful applications to premier Ph.D. programs. The current faculty certainly has the basic capacity to establish a high-quality MA program, but

the department must first be in a position to shore up the high demands they now face. An MA program would have to be planned along with a multi-year hiring commitment.

Also as noted above, the department would be well-served by having a second administrative staff member. The business of the department – from course offerings to adjunct faculty management to colloquia to student enrollment management – certainly exceeds the workload of a single individual.

A few more specific recommendations include conglomerating several adjunct hires into faculty in residence lines may help to even out the quality of instruction in 102. Establish a common syllabus for 102 may serve the same end. If at all possible, given workload assignments – it would help to have a faculty member serve as an undergraduate advisor, who could help advertise scholarship possibilities for students.

When we met with the dean we discussed some possibilities for funding the department's colloquium series. Pursuing funding for this series, whether from summer teaching funds or via a small endowment (or both) would be a strong sign of support for the department from the administration. Given the colloquium's double role in department enrichment and student instruction, a selection of funding sources may be available.

Six of the ten faculty who responded to the survey believe there is not enough full time faculty to support the program and four believe there is not enough part-time faculty. Six faculty members do not believe that funding is adequate for the program.

The student survey revealed only a minor lack of satisfaction with academic advising.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 99 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 17 |
| 2013-14 | 22 |
| 2014-15 | 21 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 2,343 |
|-----------|-------|

PhD Public Affairs

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The mission of the Ph.D. in Public Affairs is to be the nexus between the academic community and the world of service and practice in the private, non-profit, and public sector. The degree prepares individuals to study issues facing society in the context of public, private, and non-profit organizations and institutions. The program is interdisciplinary and draws upon faculty from across the college.

The degree program is designed to prepare students for one of two career paths: (1) to conduct research, consult, and serve as analysts within and to organizations; or (2) to enter the academic world at the college or university level.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program review of the Public Affairs Ph.D. was based on a self-study completed by the program with the involvement of the faculty. Two external experts in the field from similar institutions visited the campus, conducted interviews with students, faculty, staff, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and then produced a comprehensive report on the program.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Commendations:

Dr. Lee Bernick is clearly “keeping the ship afloat.” Faculty and students regularly reference Professor Bernick as the hardest working faculty member in the program. This, though, has to change. It is not fair to Professor Bernick, who maintains an active research agenda critical for faculty in a Ph.D. program, and not good for the program.

Overall, the students that we interviewed during our dinner meeting seem to have a positive impression of the program. Our dinner was professional and the students were forthright. We did not have an opportunity to interview part-time students.

Recommendations:

1. The program needs to focus greater attention on a clear mission statement that will serve the needs of students, faculty, college and university. At this time, the mission statement is broad and vague, which helps maintain flexibility in keeping the degree program afloat, but it doesn't help attract students into a degree program that will offer core competencies that can be then linked to career outcomes—students want to know what they are getting for their tuition dollar and where it will lead them in terms of a career.
2. Degree program needs to have clear core competencies and to link competencies to student learning outcomes in ALL core and elective courses. The external review team was not privy to anything that showed a clear linkage.
3. Further effort needs to be made to explore joint degrees with the health sciences, given that the degree program is within a College of Urban Affairs, and is largely serving the Southern Nevada market. With the likely parting of ways with a growing Criminal Justice degree program, the doctoral program in Public Affairs is offered an opportunity to more closely align its mission with select public affairs issues tied to a revised mission statement, clear core competencies, and student learning outcomes. A broader focus on public affairs than that found in Criminal Justice may, ironically, offer more of a niche in local, regional, and national academic markets.
4. Communicate more regularly with faculty who are not directly a part of Public Affairs to explain what the program is about, nature of requirements, and how it fits in with the rest of the school and College. Faculty outside the program need to know what the program is doing, which will help both advising and recruitment, as faculty have a deeper sense of the kinds of thing the program offers and can align students' interests with faculty and department interests and broader objectives.
5. The program needs greater structure—not too much more, but more. The key is to combine greater structure with the levels of flexibility that currently exist. One possibility is to create tracks for students beyond the second year. What those tracks would be would be open to negotiation but it would both simplify the program for non-Public Affairs faculty and create a greater sense of ownership in it as well. Additional structure would

also signal to potential applicants and the external community that the program is legitimate, and would enhance the marketability of the program and value of the degree for current students.

6. Program needs to move beyond a one-faculty member operation and other program faculty need to take a stronger leadership role. Reflective of this is the perception, based upon our interviews with faculty that they do not really know what is going on in the program, why it exists, and what its successes are. One of the clearest things to come out of the meeting with faculty is that they just do not know much about how the program is designed, what its successes are or have been, or where it is really going. They have M.A. students and from time to time come across very good ones interested in pursuing further study that they then advise to go on for the Ph.D. The Ph.D. students then go through a year and a half together before they take comprehensive exams. During that time, faculty outside of Public Affairs have little information about what students are testing in and have less information about the kinds of coursework they complete as part of the degree. Students pursuing the Ph.D. come back into the orbit of School of Public and Public Affairs (SEPA) faculty once that is completed. They then work with faculty in their area of interest who chair their dissertation committees. Greater attention should be given to ensuring that faculty across units within SEPA and the College know what is going on in the Ph.D. program in Public Affairs.
7. Some faculty expressed concern that getting more students may not necessarily be a good thing. Moreover, having bad students trying to write dissertations would be a time sink. On the plus side, many had very positive experiences with Public Affairs students especially regarding the dissertation phase. We did not get the sense that they felt overburdened by their involvement in the program.
8. Advising needs to be addressed. As is, students take comprehensive exams at start of third year then go their own way. Their needs to be more formalized process of recruiting students to work with particular faculty. At present, student interests, talents, and desires are identified by individual faculty who work in other graduate units within SEPA. Students are then encouraged to apply to the Ph.D. in Public Affairs. One way to possibly do this is to broaden the admissions committee for new Ph.D. students to include more faculty within the College of Urban Affairs. This would have the benefit of making more faculty aware of the program, thus increasing buy-in, and making faculty sensitive to possibilities available to promising young students interested in pursuing Ph.D. level work. This of course would represent a tax on faculty time, but it may be worth the investment.

The faculty survey revealed that the majority of faculty felt there are too few faculty teaching. Graduate students and part-time instructors are teaching doctoral students and this is not appropriate. Faculty also believe that there is limited funding in the college and too many competing priorities.

The student survey revealed a high level of overall satisfaction with the program. About 20% of the students felt they did not understand the expectations of the order and timing in which courses must be taken. Two part-time students felt that they were not able to see an advisor as often as they needed. One student mentioned that four of the six required courses were taught by the program director which the student felt left "little accountability or variety in the teaching methods".

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 33 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 5 |
| 2013-14 | 5 |
| 2014-15 | 2 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 35 |
|-----------|----|

Program Review

University of Nevada, Reno

List the existing programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that were reviewed over the past year:

DEGREE PROGRAMS

- I. List the existing programs and corresponding degree for all programs that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Economics, Bachelor of Science).
 - Anthropology B.A., M.A., Ph.D. (Completed)
 - Art B.A., B.F.A., M.F.A.
 - Biochemistry and Molecular Biology B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
 - Biology B.S., M.S. (Completed)
 - Biotechnology B.S., M.S.
 - Chemistry B.S., M.S., Ph.D. (Completed)
 - Education Ph.D.
 - Geography B.A., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
 - Human Development and Family Studies B.S., M.S.
 - Mathematics and Statistics B.A., B.S., MATM
 - Mathematics M.S.
 - Philosophy B.A., M.A. (Completed)
- II. List any programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that received Board approval for elimination or deactivation in this academic year of review (e.g. Political Science, Master of Arts).

None
- III. List all new programs and corresponding degree programs that received Board approval in this academic year of review (e.g. History, Bachelor of Arts).

Neuroscience, M.S., Ph.D.

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Anthropology's undergraduate B.A. degree program gives students the intellectual means and maturity to analyze, interpret, and respect variety in human lifeways throughout all parts of the modern world. Topically diverse courses and research experience in cultural anthropology, archaeology, physical anthropology, and linguistics are offered. The undergraduate program provides a strong foundation for graduate studies in anthropology at the University of Nevada, Reno or elsewhere.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Anthropology undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit February 27-28, 2014. The outside reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties took place on October 2, 2014, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review has been issued by the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Future Direction of the Department. The department was directed to finalize its conversation regarding a "niche focus" or three to four themes that could cut across all faculty members' fields and that it could adopt to unite itself and plan for the future.

Department Communication; Faculty Mentoring. The department leadership was directed to ensure faculty receive communications as to deadlines and other department information.

Extramural Funding. The department was advised to explore an NSF-IGERT and other grant opportunities. The department chair was directed to ensure all department faculty are aware of the availability of assistance on campus in preparing effective grant proposals.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 157 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 26 |
| 2013-14 | 38 |
| 2014-15 | 34 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,556 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Anthropology's M.A. degree program develops students into independent original thinkers who can design and carry out complex research, communicate results of the results of research, and make significant advances in scientific study of humanity. Topically diverse courses and research experience in cultural anthropology, archaeology, physical anthropology, and linguistics are offered.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Anthropology undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit February 27-28, 2014. The outside reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties took place on October 2, 2014, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review has been issued by the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Future Direction of the Department. The department was directed to finalize its conversation regarding a "niche focus" or three to four themes that could cut across all faculty members' fields and that it could adopt to unite itself and plan for the future.

Department Communication; Faculty Mentoring. The department leadership was directed to ensure faculty receive communications as to deadlines and other department information.

Extramural Funding. The department was advised to explore an NSF-IGERT and other grant opportunities. The department chair was directed to ensure all department faculty are aware of the availability of assistance on campus in preparing effective grant proposals.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 37 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 7 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 6 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 12 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 117 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Anthropology's Ph.D. degree program offers tracks in prehistoric archaeology, historical archaeology, cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and linguistic anthropology. The department has an in-house research museum with rotating exhibits, physical anthropology lab, ethnography lab, prehistoric archaeology lab, and historical archaeology lab.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Anthropology undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit February 27-28, 2014. The outside reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties took place on October 2, 2014, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review has been issued by the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Future Direction of the Department. The department was directed to finalize its conversation regarding a "niche focus" or three to four themes that could cut across all faculty members' fields and that it could adopt to unite itself and plan for the future.

Department Communication; Faculty Mentoring. The department leadership was directed to ensure faculty receive communications as to deadlines and other department information.

Extramural Funding. The department was advised to explore an NSF-IGERT and other grant opportunities. The department chair was directed to ensure all department faculty are aware of the availability of assistance on campus in preparing effective grant proposals.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 15 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 1 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 0 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 117 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The BA degree program serves as the primary undergraduate offering for the Department of Art. Undergraduate degree candidates, both majors and minors, choose either Studio Art or Art History. In the Studio Art program students choose a specific area of emphasis (concentration) from one of seven available fields or disciplines (Ceramics, Digital Media, Drawing, Painting, Photography/Time Based Media/Videography, Printmaking, Sculpture.) The Department of Art also has an area of major emphasis of 39 credits in the history of art. This is not a separate degree but an area of emphasis similar to areas of emphasis in the various studio disciplines, such as painting. All department concentrations in the BA program have as one of their objectives the education of well-prepared practitioners and scholars who are able to serve in a world increasingly more oriented toward, and dependent upon, visual communication. The department's objective is to present a discipline specific, challenging course of study to prepare graduates to thrive in the competitive world of the practicing artist and to flourish in their field[s] of interest.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The BA degree program serves as the primary undergraduate offering for the Department of Art. Undergraduate degree candidates, both majors and minors, choose either Studio Art or Art History. In the Studio Art program students choose a specific area of emphasis (concentration) from one of seven available fields or disciplines (Ceramics, Digital Media, Drawing, Painting, Photography/Time Based Media/Videography, Printmaking, Sculpture.) The Department of Art also has an area of major emphasis of 39 credits in the history of art. This is not a separate degree but an area of emphasis similar to areas of emphasis in the various studio disciplines, such as painting. All department concentrations in the BA program have as one of their objectives the education of well-prepared practitioners and scholars who are able to serve in a world increasingly more oriented toward, and dependent upon, visual communication. The department's objective is to present a discipline specific, challenging course of study to prepare graduates to thrive in the competitive world of the practicing artist and to flourish in their field[s] of interest.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

NASAD Accreditation. The department will prepare an analysis for what would be needed in order to successfully apply for and achieve this accreditation should be done. This analysis will be useful as the department plans for its future and sets priorities regarding future directions for the department regarding curriculum and faculty hiring.

Faculty Workload. The college and department leadership will examine department faculty role statements to ensure there is a fair and equitable division of the teaching, research, and service needs of the department.

Department Leadership. The dean has plans to initiate a national search for an external chair as recommended by the reviewers.

Facilities. There were several facilities or space issues presented by the reviewers and discussed in the responses. The department will begin to work with the dean and director for help from relevant offices on campus to identify (1) any critical safety improvements that must be acted on as soon as possible and (2) the desirable sharing arrangements, space cleanups, renovations, or improvements to space to address the inadequacies of the spaces currently used by the department and mentioned by the reviewers.

Curriculum/Strategic Planning. With regard to the curriculum, the department will engage in a facilitated strategic planning exercise this year that will form the foundation for conversations on needed curriculum changes.

Faculty Hiring; Mentoring. The department has begun to formulate short-term, strategic-hiring priorities in order to take advantage of opportunities to compete for new faculty positions and address critical issues.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 232 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 47 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 38 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 54 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,087 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The BFA Degree Program is a two-year intensive program focusing on interdisciplinary professional studio practice. The BFA program accepts applications for candidates via a yearly Portfolio Review Application process just prior to their junior year. The program is highly competitive and designed specifically for those exceptional individuals who show the most promise, initiative, and interest in interdisciplinary studies. The BFA program is a cornerstone of the Department of Art's undergraduate offerings. It features a rigorous course of study and activities that culminate in an exhibition and academic thesis paper. BFA candidates are mentored by a three-person committee composed of faculty members chosen by the student with the approval of the BFA coordinator. Students and their committee members meet regularly to discuss the student's work, evaluate the learning process, and create/develop a plan for completing the requirements for the degree.

Degree objectives are met through specific courses. Art 499 (BFA Thesis Project) addresses the creation of an advanced body of work and a thesis paper over a year-long period. ART 498 (Seminar On Visual Arts) focuses on developing highly refined verbal and written contextualizations of students' creative practices. ART 442 (Intermedia Studio), team-taught by a few faculty members on a rotating basis, is a course that uses a less structured critique formula.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Art undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in fall 2014. The report was provided to two external reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit February 4-5, 2015. The outside reviewers were asked to provide the department, school, college and university leadership with a report detailing the accomplishments of the department as well as strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the department, the dean and director, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties took place on August 24, 2015, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review has been issued by the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

NASAD Accreditation. The department will prepare an analysis for what would be needed in order to successfully apply for and achieve this accreditation should be done. This analysis will be useful as the department plans for its future and sets priorities regarding future directions for the department regarding curriculum and faculty hiring.

Faculty Workload. The college and department leadership will examine department faculty role statements to ensure there is a fair and equitable division of the teaching, research, and service needs of the department.

Department Leadership. The dean has plans to initiate a national search for an external chair as recommended by the reviewers.

Facilities. There were several facilities or space issues presented by the reviewers and discussed in the responses. The department will begin to work with the dean and director for help from relevant offices on campus to identify (1) any critical safety improvements that must be acted on as soon as possible and (2) the desirable sharing arrangements, space cleanups, renovations, or improvements to space to address the inadequacies of the spaces currently used by the department and mentioned by the reviewers.

Curriculum/Strategic Planning. With regard to the curriculum, the department will engage in a facilitated strategic planning exercise this year that will form the foundation for conversations on needed curriculum changes.

Faculty Hiring; Mentoring. The department has begun to formulate short-term, strategic-hiring priorities in order to take advantage of opportunities to compete for new faculty positions and address critical issues

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 9 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 6 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 6 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,087 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The MFA degree program is intended for talented, highly motivated students who have a comprehensive art portfolio and have successfully completed a Bachelor's degree. In particular, the MFA serves students that have earned a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Fine Arts in art. MFA candidates must present a Bachelor's degree or Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art with a minimum 3.0 grade-point average from an accredited university, school, or college. The Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Art at the University of Nevada, Reno is a three-year, sixty credit hour, terminal degree in Studio Art. The program offers students advanced development in areas of two- and three-dimensional studio art specialization (including but not limited to book arts, ceramics, digital-media, drawing, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture, and video); as well as comprehensive experience in critical theory and art historical knowledge and context.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Art undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in fall 2014. The report was provided to two external reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit February 4-5, 2015. The outside reviewers were asked to provide the department, school, college and university leadership with a report detailing the accomplishments of the department as well as strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the department, the dean and director, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties took place on August 24, 2015, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review has been issued by the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

NASAD Accreditation. The department will prepare an analysis for what would be needed in order to successfully apply for and achieve this accreditation should be done. This analysis will be useful as the department plans for its future and sets priorities regarding future directions for the department regarding curriculum and faculty hiring.

Faculty Workload. The college and department leadership will examine department faculty role statements to ensure there is a fair and equitable division of the teaching, research, and service needs of the department.

Department Leadership. The dean has plans to initiate a national search for an external chair as recommended by the reviewers.

Facilities. There were several facilities or space issues presented by the reviewers and discussed in the responses. The department will begin to work with the dean and director for help from relevant offices on campus to identify (1) any critical safety improvements that must be acted on as soon as possible and (2) the desirable sharing arrangements, space cleanups, renovations, or improvements to space to address the inadequacies of the spaces currently used by the department and mentioned by the reviewers.

Curriculum/Strategic Planning. With regard to the curriculum, the department will engage in a facilitated strategic planning exercise this year that will form the foundation for conversations on needed curriculum changes.

Faculty Hiring; Mentoring. The department has begun to formulate short-term, strategic-hiring priorities in order to take advantage of opportunities to compete for new faculty positions and address critical issues.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 8 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 4 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 2 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 25 |
|-----------|----|

BS Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The biochemistry program prepares students for competitive and rewarding careers in science, medicine or research. The biochemistry major places a strong emphasis on practical, hands-on experience, making graduates of the biochemistry program well prepared for the job market.

Biochemistry provides an excellent background for biotechnology research, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nutrition, veterinary medicine and education. The Biochemistry program is effectively divided into two phases. During the first two years the curriculum is focused on satisfying university general education requirements and foundational science classes in math, chemistry and biology. During the successive two years, students progress into rigorous upper division classes in Biochemistry that emphasize the structure function relationship of biomacromolecules, the regulation of metabolic processes, molecular biology, and molecular biophysics. Training in laboratory techniques, using modern instrumentation and methodologies, is provided by three intensive laboratory courses in analytical biochemistry, protein biochemistry and molecular biology. Students complete their program with a senior thesis that requires two semesters of laboratory research.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The undergraduate and graduate programs in the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Department were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the fall 2014. The report was provided to three reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 26-27, 2015. The external reviewers were asked to review the program for the purpose of providing a report on the opportunities that exist for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in May 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties will take place this semester, followed by a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Findings and conclusions to the review will be memorialized in a memo to the program leaders from the Provost following the closing meeting described above and will be reported in next year's report.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 431 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 40 |
| 2013-14 | 68 |
| 2014-15 | 81 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 698 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Biochemistry master's degree is part of the campus-wide, interdisciplinary Molecular Biosciences graduate program. Students benefit from exposure to faculty members appointed in both the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources (CABNR) and the University of Nevada School of Medicine (UNSOM). The aim of the graduate program is to train scientists for critical analysis and solution of biochemical problems at the molecular level.

The program of study includes lecture courses, laboratory rotations, journal club presentations and discussion groups, a qualifying written and oral examination, thesis research, and one or more semesters of teaching experience. First-year students take a core curriculum and gain research experience by rotating through student-selected research laboratories. Laboratory rotations facilitate the choice of a thesis advisor. Master's research projects are selected by the student in consultation with a major thesis advisor and an advisory committee. The requirements for the master's degree are generally completed in two years or less. The program, which is designed to prepare students for careers in research and/or teaching, emphasizes a cooperative, personal working environment among students and members of the faculty.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The undergraduate and graduate programs in the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Department were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the fall 2014. The report was provided to three reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 26-27, 2015. The external reviewers were asked to review the program for the purpose of providing a report on the opportunities that exist for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in May 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties will take place this semester, followed by a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Findings and conclusions to the review will be memorialized in a memo to the program leaders from the Provost following the closing meeting described above and will be reported in next year's report.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 0 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 2 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 1 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 68 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Biochemistry Ph.D. degree is part of the campus-wide, interdisciplinary Molecular Biosciences graduate program. Students benefit from exposure to faculty members appointed in both the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources (CABNR) and the University of Nevada School of Medicine (UNSOM). The aim of the graduate programs is to train scientists for critical analysis and solution of biochemical problems at the molecular level.

The program of study includes lecture courses, laboratory rotations, journal club presentations and discussion groups, a qualifying written and oral examination, dissertation research, and one or more semesters of teaching experience. First-year students take a core curriculum and gain research experience by rotating through student-selected research laboratories. Laboratory rotations facilitate the choice of a dissertation advisor. Dissertation research projects are selected by the student in consultation with a major dissertation advisor and an advisory committee. The requirements for the doctorate are generally completed in four to five years. The program, which is designed to prepare students for careers in research and/or teaching, emphasizes a cooperative, personal working environment among students and members of the faculty.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The undergraduate and graduate programs in the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Department were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the fall 2014. The report was provided to three reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 26-27, 2015. The external reviewers were asked to review the program for the purpose of providing a report on the opportunities that exist for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in May 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties will take place this semester, followed by a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Findings and conclusions to the review will be memorialized in a memo to the program leaders from the Provost following the closing meeting described above and will be reported in next year's report.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 16 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 9 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 4 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 68 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The undergraduate program offered by the Department of Biology terminates in a Bachelor of Science degree in Biology. The Biology curriculum provides students with a strong foundation for either a career in the biological sciences upon graduation or for further professional training in fields such as medicine, dentistry, nursing, conservation biology, wildlife biology, and biotechnology. The Biology major culminates with a capstone course in Evolution, a course that integrates information from all areas of biology, and emphasizes the critical analysis and interpretation of scientific data.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Biology undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on April 9-10, 2014. The outside reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in June 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Undergraduate Instruction. The department will continue using tools for monitoring enrollment trends and will collaborate with schedulers and advisors to avoid scheduling conflicts. The administration will investigate a policy change on course retakes.

Assessment. The department's peer instructor program continues to operate well and is critical in meeting student enrollment demands. The department will improve methods for assessing the effectiveness of the program and will investigate how it might determine student satisfaction on other issues of interest to the department.

Faculty Mentoring. The chair will continue to refine the methods used to mentor junior faculty and will expand progress toward tenure-and-promotion reviews beyond the 3rd and 4th years .

Space. It is recognized that research and instructional space are a serious limitations for the department. The administration will work with the department to address space issues, and the department was encouraged to consider placing greater emphasis on hiring computationally oriented faculty.

Strategic Planning. The chair will bring strategic planning topics to the faculty for exploration in the current academic year and will pursue broader strategic planning in the succeeding years.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-------|
| 2014-15 | 1,112 |
|---------|-------|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2012-13 | 155 |
| 2013-14 | 172 |
| 2014-15 | 190 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 3,687 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Biology has two distinct Master of Science degree programs. Plan A is a thesis-driven program, in which students conduct research and write an original thesis. The career pathway for these students typically involves either continuing on to a Ph.D. degree program or gaining employment in biological research. Plan B is a non-thesis master's program based upon coursework outlined for the student by the Faculty Advisors for the Plan B master's program. The Plan B master's degree is intended as a terminal degree for students seeking careers in industry, education, or federal and state agencies. The Master's degree program in Biology is enriched through the Department's participation in multiple interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Biology undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on April 9-10, 2014. The outside reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in June 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Graduate Program. Mandatory annual reviews of graduate student progress be implemented for not only the Biology M.S. program, but also the interdisciplinary EECB and CMB programs. The department is working on expanded recruiting efforts to enhance what they currently do.

Assessment. The department's peer instructor program continues to operate well and is critical in meeting student enrollment demands. The department will improve methods for assessing the effectiveness of the program and will investigate how it might determine student satisfaction on other issues of interest to the department.

Faculty Mentoring. The chair will continue to refine the methods used to mentor junior faculty and will expand progress toward tenure-and-promotion reviews beyond the 3rd and 4th years .

Space. It is recognized that research and instructional space are a serious limitations for the department. The administration will work with the department to address space issues, and the department was encouraged to consider placing greater emphasis on hiring computationally oriented faculty.

Strategic Planning. The chair will bring strategic planning topics to the faculty for exploration in the current academic year and will pursue broader strategic planning in the succeeding years.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 22 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 6 |
| 2013-14 | 4 |
| 2014-15 | 5 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 67 |
|-----------|----|

University of Nevada, Reno

BS, MS Biotechnology

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The biotechnology program aims to produce well-trained researchers with theoretical knowledge, technical skills and real-world experience based on both academic research experiences and internships in the biotechnology industry. During their first three years of the 5-year BS-MS Biotechnology program, undergraduates from Biochemistry, Biology, Neurobiology, Microbiology or Nutrition prepare for entry into the upper level curriculum while pursuing the normal course of study from their home departments. Students can identify themselves as Biotechnology majors as early as freshman year in order to receive specialized advisement; however, they must re-apply in their junior year for entry into the graduate level curriculum (year 5). Students who do not continue in the program after the third year will be able to finish their BS degrees in their original home departments in their fourth year. During the summer session between years 3 and 4 and between 4 and 5 the students are involved in research or internship programs. This practical research/internship experience, combined with the multidisciplinary core curriculum and advanced course work are key elements of this accelerated program.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The undergraduate and graduate programs in the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Department were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the fall 2014. The report was provided to three reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 26-27, 2015. The external reviewers were asked to review the program for the purpose of providing a report on the opportunities that exist for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in May 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties will take place this semester, followed by a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Findings and conclusions to the review will be memorialized in a memo to the program leaders from the Provost following the closing meeting described above and will be reported in next year's report.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 44 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 8 |
| 2013-14 | 10 |
| 2014-15 | 15 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 41 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The B.S. in Chemistry degree currently has four sub-plans, called emphases. The Professional Chemistry and Environmental Chemistry emphases follows the standards set by the American Chemical Society for program certification. The General Chemistry and Pre-medical emphases requires a subset of the courses in the certified emphases and are intended to provide a good background in chemistry while allowing flexibility to take courses needed for preparation in medical or other professional schools, for the teaching profession, and for other students not intending to go on to graduate school in chemistry. Undergraduate chemistry majors complete lecture courses providing a general background in the physical sciences and mathematics, together with a sequence of courses in general, organic, analytical, inorganic, and physical chemistry. Laboratories give hands-on experience in chemical methods and instrumentation. The department also strongly encourages undergraduate students to become involved in laboratory research under the supervision of a faculty member, frequently culminating in a written Senior Thesis.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The B.S. in Chemistry degree currently has four sub-plans, called emphases. The Professional Chemistry and Environmental Chemistry emphases follows the standards set by the American Chemical Society for program certification. The General Chemistry and Pre-medical emphases requires a subset of the courses in the certified emphases and are intended to provide a good background in chemistry while allowing flexibility to take courses needed for preparation in medical or other professional schools, for the teaching profession, and for other students not intending to go on to graduate school in chemistry. Undergraduate chemistry majors complete lecture courses providing a general background in the physical sciences and mathematics, together with a sequence of courses in general, organic, analytical, inorganic, and physical chemistry. Laboratories give hands-on experience in chemical methods and instrumentation. The department also strongly encourages undergraduate students to become involved in laboratory research under the supervision of a faculty member, frequently culminating in a written Senior Thesis.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Undergraduate Instruction. The department continues to struggle with the tension between the instructional and research missions of the department. A change in the University course retake policy will be explored which may provide some relief.

Faculty Mentoring. The chair is implementing improvements in the department's mentoring of junior faculty, ensuring they have the information they need to further their independent research and explore additional collaborative research projects. Associate professors will be provided with counsel and assistance regarding progression to full professorship.

Teaching Lab Costs. The department is exploring implementing a course fee to address the burden on the department operating budget of maintaining the teaching lab equipment.

Space. It is recognized that research and instructional space are a serious limitations for the department. The administration will work with the department to address space issues.

IV. Descriptive Statistics**A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:**

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 37 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 17 |
| 2013-14 | 16 |
| 2014-15 | 14 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 4,062 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Chemistry offers two M.S. degrees in Chemistry, a research-based Thesis Masters degree (Plan A), and a non-Thesis Masters Degree (Plan B). Research is the foundation for all the graduate degree programs offered by the Department of Chemistry, with research study options in the department including analytical chemistry, organic chemistry, inorganic chemistry, physical chemistry, chemical physics, theoretical chemistry, physical organic chemistry, bio-organic chemistry, bioinorganic chemistry, and organometallic chemistry. Graduate students gain, during their research, extensive hands-on experience with department instrumentation.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Chemistry undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 10-11, 2014. The external reviewers reviewed the programs in order to provide a report to the department and relevant administrators on the program's accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for the future. A final report was issued by the external reviewers in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, and a final meeting of all parties was held. A final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Graduate Recruitment. The department will expand its activities to increase numbers and student diversity.

Faculty Mentoring. The chair is implementing improvements in the department's mentoring of junior faculty, ensuring they have the information they need to further their independent research and explore additional collaborative research projects. Associate professors will be provided with counsel and assistance regarding progression to full professorship.

Teaching Lab Costs. The department is exploring implementing a course fee to address the burden on the department operating budget of maintaining the teaching lab equipment.

Space. It is recognized that research and instructional space are a serious limitations for the department. The administration will work with the department to address space issues.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 6 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 2 |
| 2013-14 | 4 |
| 2014-15 | 2 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 215 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Ph.D. degree in Chemistry is a research-based graduate study program requiring coursework and original research under the direction of a faculty adviser. Students are encouraged to select a research adviser and start on dissertation (Ph.D.) research by the second semester in residence. This is especially important as one's research topic is a large factor in determining subsequent course curriculum. Research study options in the department include organic chemistry, inorganic chemistry, physical chemistry, theoretical chemistry, chemical physics, physical organic chemistry, bio-organic chemistry, bio-inorganic chemistry, and organometallic chemistry.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Chemistry undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 10-11, 2014. The external reviewers reviewed the programs in order to provide a report to the department and relevant administrators on the program's accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for the future. A final report was issued by the external reviewers in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, and a final meeting of all parties was held. A final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Graduate Recruitment. The department will expand its activities to increase numbers and student diversity.

Faculty Mentoring. The chair is implementing improvements in the department's mentoring of junior faculty, ensuring they have the information they need to further their independent research and explore additional collaborative research projects. Associate professors will be provided with counsel and assistance regarding progression to full professorship.

Teaching Lab Costs. The department is exploring implementing a course fee to address the burden on the department operating budget of maintaining the teaching lab equipment.

Space. It is recognized that research and instructional space are a serious limitations for the department. The administration will work with the department to address space issues.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 66 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 6 |
| 2013-14 | 5 |
| 2014-15 | 9 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 215 |
|-----------|-----|

PhD Education

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The College of Education offers a Ph.D. in Education (Doctor of Philosophy) degree with eight areas of emphasis. Areas of emphasis available in the education Ph.D. program include the following: Counselor Education and Supervision; Development, Learning and Technology; Educational Leadership; English Language Learners/Emergent Bilinguals; Equity and Diversity in Education; Literacy Studies; Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education; and Special Education and Disabilities Studies. The program prepares students at an advanced level to work in the professorial ranks of higher education or assume positions of leadership in schools and agencies.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The College of Education Ph.D. program was scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the faculty of the program and completed in the spring 2015. The report was provided to the reviewers before the on-campus review visit from March 2-3, 2015. One of the two outside reviewers was unable to attend the review due to weather but participated in reviewing documents and participated in some phone conversations. A final report was issued by the evaluators on March 30, 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the college and the graduate council, with a final meeting of all parties taking place on September 29, 2015. A closing memo setting forth the findings and recommendations resulting from the review is being prepared and will be sent to the program representatives soon.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The college is reviewing its admissions standards for the program and is working on a proposal to address the variability among doctoral admittees.

The program leadership has instituted mentoring and enforcing deadlines as recommended by the reviewers. Advising materials have been improved.

The balance of assignment/load of faculty as dissertation chairs is being addressed through a combination of methods.

They have improved the marketing of the program and are beginning to give the highest priority for GAs to doctoral students. They have begun to include Graduate Research Assistantships in grant proposals.

The college senate is working on revised bylaws.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 118 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 14 |
| 2013-14 | 13 |
| 2014-15 | 16 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 614 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Geography offers two undergraduate degrees, a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Geography and a Bachelor of Science with a major in Geography. Study specializations include: biogeography, climatology, cultural and international studies, cartography and computer mapping, geographic information systems (GIS), urban and regional planning, and water resources. All students complete a core within geography that provides a broad background in the discipline and prepares them for pursuing either degree. The Bachelor of Arts program emphasizes proficiency in a broad range of geographic course work. This degree program also develops skills in a foreign language. The Bachelor of Science program emphasizes proficiency in physical geography, geospatial methods, and human/environment interactions. This degree program also develops skills in mathematics and statistics. Students in both programs take 21 credits of electives from approved courses in the department.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Geography undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in January 2015. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on February 12-13, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs and met with relevant faculty, staff, students and administrators to determine the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and identify opportunities as its plans for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors shortly after the review visit. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost will be sent in early October, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The department has received a tenure track position in GIS for FY 16 and was directed to plan for the logical next steps for adding positions, considering possibilities it identified in the self-study as well as areas suggested by the reviewers.

The department should pursue conversations regarding a name change and the creation of tracks or specializations that will be clearer to external constituents and attract more students.

The department was directed to conduct a review to ensure that the undergraduate curriculum is being delivered in the most efficient manner possible.

As a result of space and facilities needs identified in the self-study and by the reviewers, the department was directed to identify (1) any critical and (2) desirable renovations to the facilities and provide that information so that it can be addressed as funds become available.

The department was directed to ensure that there are good plans in place for mentoring junior faculty on teaching, research, grant writing, and promotion and tenure.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 53 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 17 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 12 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 9 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 541 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Master of Science (M.S.) degree in Geography has two degree plans: Plan A (31 credits) includes a thesis on original research; Plan B (36 credits) replaces the thesis with a professional paper. The department faculty emphasizes human-environment interactions, and the curriculum and research specialize in the study of desert and mountain landscapes and people in arid and mountainous environments. Department faculty also promote the integration of physical, human, cultural, and resource geography.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Geography undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in January 2015. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on February 12-13, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs and met with relevant faculty, staff, students and administrators to determine the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and identify opportunities as its plans for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors shortly after the review visit. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost will be sent in early October, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The department has received a tenure track position in GIS for FY 16 and was directed to plan for the logical next step for adding positions, considering possibilities it identified in the self-study as well as areas suggested by the reviewers.

The department should pursue conversations regarding a name change and the creation of tracks or specializations that will be clearer to external constituents and attract more students.

As a result of space and facilities needs identified in the self-study and by the reviewers, the department was directed to identify (1) any critical and (2) desirable renovations to the facilities and provide that information so that it can be addressed as funds become available.

The department was directed to ensure that there are good plans in place for mentoring junior faculty on teaching, research, grant writing, and promotion and tenure.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 9 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 2 |
| 2013-14 | 5 |
| 2014-15 | 5 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 62 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Geography at the University of Nevada, Reno offers a Ph.D. program in Geography. The department's curriculum and research specialize in the study of desert and mountain landscapes and people in arid and mountainous environments. Students who hold a Master's degree in Geography or a related discipline are eligible for admission.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Geography undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in January 2015. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on February 12-13, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs and met with relevant faculty, staff, students and administrators to determine the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and identify opportunities as its plans for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors shortly after the review visit. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost will be sent in early October, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The department has received a tenure track position in GIS for FY 16 and was directed to plan for the logical next step for adding positions, considering possibilities it identified in the self-study as well as areas suggested by the reviewers.

The department should pursue conversations regarding a name change and the creation of tracks or specializations that will be clearer to external constituents and attract more students.

As a result of space and facilities needs identified in the self-study and by the reviewers, the department was directed to identify (1) any critical and (2) desirable renovations to the facilities and provide that information so that it can be addressed as funds become available.

The department was directed to ensure that there are good plans in place for mentoring junior faculty on teaching, research, grant writing, and promotion and tenure.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 18 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 2 |
| 2013-14 | 3 |
| 2014-15 | 1 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 62 |
|-----------|----|

BS Human Development & Family Studies

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Human Development and Family Studies program prepares students to work with children, adolescents, teens, and families in a variety of professions. The study of theory and research findings is coordinated with a variety of supervised field experiences. Students investigate the ways individuals interact within the family system and with the larger socioeconomic environment, as well as the process of biosocial, psychosocial, and cognitive development across the lifespan.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Human Development and Family Studies undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the Fall 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on February 2-3, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in late February 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost will be sent in early October, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The program leadership was encouraged to engage in strategic planning to discuss the desirability of implementing entrance requirements, eliminating the minor in favor of developing certificates related to disciplines, or phasing out the CFLE certificate. Related topics are whether there are any curriculum modifications that could be made to avoid duplication or create efficiencies and the perception that upper division courses lack rigor.

It is expected that the new positions awarded to the program in the recent RFP process should begin to address the pressures being experienced in meeting instructional demands and will also enhance the program's research funding and productivity. The program leadership was instructed to have good plans in place for mentoring these new faculty on teaching, research, grant writing, and promotion and tenure.

The department has committed to exploring ways of supporting and evaluating its LOAs, and implementing improvements.

It was recognized that the program has many strong links to several UNR programs and departments. Likewise, community engagement is strong. However, these strengths are not as widely known as most think they should be. The department will discuss steps the program could take to market itself more extensively and garner the attention it needs.

There were a few areas identified where additional data or outcomes information would be beneficial. The program was encouraged to work with appropriate offices to identify, obtain and then examine data regarding recruitment, opinions from graduates on course work, advising, mentoring, program preparation, thesis support, etc.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 374 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 59 |
| 2013-14 | 71 |
| 2014-15 | 76 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,022 |
|-----------|-------|

MS Human Development & Family Studies

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The mission of the Master of Science graduate program in HDFS is to produce knowledgeable, well-qualified graduates who are prepared to enter the professional workforce as informed, well-rounded specialists in at least one area of the lifespan and in the study of families, and who are prepared to undertake further graduate level education if desired. The graduate program aims to generate graduates who are well versed in relevant theories, research methods, and the conduct and dissemination of quality research so that they are able to understand the current body of literature in HDFS and are prepared to expand this knowledge base through research of their own.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Human Development and Family Studies undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the Fall 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on February 2-3, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing opportunities for the department and relevant administrators to review the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and plan for the future. A final report was issued by the site visitors in late February 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost will be sent in early October, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The program leadership was encouraged to engage in strategic planning to discuss the desirability of implementing entrance requirements, eliminating the minor in favor of developing certificates related to disciplines, or phasing out the CFLE certificate. Related topics are whether there are any curriculum modifications that could be made to avoid duplication or create efficiencies and the perception that upper division courses lack rigor.

It is expected that the new positions awarded to the program in the recent RFP process should begin to address the pressures being experienced in meeting instructional demands and will also enhance the program's research funding and productivity. The program leadership was instructed to have good plans in place for mentoring these new faculty on teaching, research, grant writing, and promotion and tenure.

The strength of the master's program where students are able to develop strong connections to the faculty was noted by the reviewers. Students are supported in their independent research projects and many go on to present their findings or publish their work.

It was agreed that the graduate student numbers need to increase, and the program was directed to explore the ideas discussed for doing this such as participating in the Grad Fit Program; capitalizing on excellent alumni and other UNR programs for students as well as reaching out regionally and statewide.

It was recognized that the program has many strong links to several UNR programs and departments. Likewise, community engagement is strong. However, these strengths are not as widely known as most think they should be. The department will discuss steps the program could take to market itself more extensively and garner the attention it needs.

There were a few areas identified where additional data or outcomes information would be beneficial. The program was encouraged to work with appropriate offices to identify, obtain and then examine data regarding recruitment, opinions from graduates on course work, advising, mentoring, program preparation, thesis support, etc.

MS Human Development & Family Studies

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 23 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 4 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 12 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 33 |
|-----------|----|

BA, BS, MATM Mathematics

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The bachelor's degrees in mathematics have options for applied mathematics, discrete mathematics/operations research, statistics, or general study. The bachelor of arts degree provides a traditional liberal arts experience through a balanced course of study in the arts, humanities, foreign language, social and natural sciences. The bachelor of science degree is an "expanded major," which provides a more intense experience in mathematics, computing and science. The MATM program is designed to upgrade the mathematical and educational expertise of practicing (or those intending to be practicing) secondary teachers. Mathematics is best taught by people who know and enjoy mathematics, and the program seeks to produce individuals with strong mathematical backgrounds who are committed to the teaching of mathematics.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Mathematics and Statistics undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the early spring 2015. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 9-10, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs for the purpose of providing a report to the department and relevant administrators on the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for the future. A final report was issued by the external reviewers in early April 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The chair should move forward with a strategic planning process. The process should be open, with faculty being informed along the way as plans and decisions are made. The chair and dean should meet to plan the process in more detail and determine if and when a facilitator could be used in these efforts.

The department should investigate recommendations from the reviewers regarding revision of the undergraduate curriculum including reducing the number of tracks and reducing the number of required courses. Regarding class sizes, any decisions or recommendations from the department regarding class sizes should be justified where possible with information on national averages or standards.

Faculty should continue to be research active, productive and publishing in good journals. There should be support offered to faculty in order to achieve this, and faculty should be made aware of the resources available to them from the college and VPRI division for this work.

Administrative leaders are willing to attend department meetings to indicate support for the leadership and answer questions on university priorities.

The administration is aware of the space challenges for department faculty and continues to address space issues as it can.

The chair will put together a proposal for the department faculty's computer and technology needs as soon as possible.

One outcome of department planning should be a departmental plan for short- and long-term, strategic-hiring priorities.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 175 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 16 |
| 2013-14 | 15 |
| 2014-15 | 31 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 5,947 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Graduate students can earn a Master of Science (MS) in Mathematics, and may choose among three emphasis areas: the Pure Mathematics option, the Applied Mathematics option, and the Statistics option. Thesis and non-thesis options are available for each option.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Mathematics and Statistics undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the early spring 2015. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 9-10, 2015. The external reviewers reviewed the programs for the purpose of providing a report to the department and relevant administrators on the program's accomplishments, examine its strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for the future. A final report was issued by the external reviewers in early April 2015. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review were solicited. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review is being finalized.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The chair should move forward with a strategic planning process. The process should be open, with faculty being informed along the way as plans and decisions are made. The chair and dean should meet to plan the process in more detail and determine if and when a facilitator could be used in these efforts.

The department should investigate recommendations from the reviewers regarding revision of the undergraduate curriculum including reducing the number of tracks and reducing the number of required courses. Regarding class sizes, any decisions or recommendations from the department regarding class sizes should be justified where possible with information on national averages or standards.

Faculty should continue to be research active, productive and publishing in good journals. There should be support offered to faculty in order to achieve this, and faculty should be made aware of the resources available to them from the college and VPRI division for this work.

Administrative leaders are willing to attend department meetings to indicate support for the leadership and answer questions on university priorities.

The administration is aware of the space challenges for department faculty and continues to address space issues as it can.

The chair will put together a proposal for the department faculty's computer and technology needs as soon as possible.

One outcome of department planning should be a departmental plan for short- and long-term, strategic-hiring priorities.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 24 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 18 |
| 2013-14 | 16 |
| 2014-15 | 11 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 83 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Philosophy has two undergraduate B.A. degree programs - one in Ethics, Law, and Politics and the other in General Philosophy. The general philosophy major is designed for students who wish to get a broad understanding of philosophy and to cover the basic areas of philosophy, including required courses and three emphasis areas: history of philosophy; metaphysics, epistemology, and the history and philosophy of science; value theory. The ELP major is designed for students who wish to study philosophy with emphasis on topics in ethics, legal philosophy, and political philosophy. This major covers the basic areas of philosophy--including required courses and three emphasis areas (history of philosophy; metaphysics, epistemology, and the history and philosophy of science; value theory)--but puts the greatest emphasis on value theory. Both the general and ELP major require a minimum of 36 credits in Philosophy, with a minimum of 120 university-wide credits to graduate, at least 42 credits of which are in upper-division courses.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Philosophy undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 13-14, 2014. The external reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing information on opportunities for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's accomplishments and strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost was issued on August 18, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Curriculum revisions recommended by the reviewers and acknowledged in the department's response are currently being considered.

The department and its faculty were asked to arrive at a consensus as to issues discussed in the review related to faculty numbers, workload and future hires. Additionally, the department leadership was asked to ensure mentorship of junior faculty is occurring with information about the necessary levels of scholarship for achieving tenure being provided.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 74 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 12 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 6 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 20 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 911 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Department of Philosophy has two graduate M.A. degree programs - one in Ethics, Law, and Politics and the other in General Philosophy. The general philosophy major is designed for students who wish to get a broad understanding of philosophy and to cover the basic areas of philosophy, including required courses and three emphasis areas: history of philosophy; metaphysics, epistemology, and the history and philosophy of science; value theory. The Ethics, Law, and Politics M.A. is a program that covers basic philosophy with emphasis on topics in ethics, philosophy of law, and political philosophy. Graduate students in the program take most of their classes in upper division undergraduate courses that are open for graduate-level credit. The mission of the MA program is to provide students with (1) a broad background in the history of philosophy, (2) advanced critical thinking skills, (3) the ability to reflect on and solve problems in any area of endeavor. The underlying goal of the department's mission is to contribute to scholarly excellence at the University of Nevada, Reno. The MA program prepares students for PhD programs in philosophy and graduate work in other areas, such as law, education, politics, and medicine. Because of the general and widely reflective nature of philosophy, philosophy can help prepare students for a career in virtually any field.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The Philosophy undergraduate and graduate programs were scheduled for regular program review as mandated by the Board of Regents and University policy. A self-study document for the programs was developed by the department faculty and completed in the spring 2014. The report was provided to two reviewers before they conducted an on-campus visit on March 13-14, 2014. The external reviewers reviewed the programs with the purpose of providing information on opportunities for the department and relevant administrators as well as the program's accomplishments and strengths and weaknesses. A final report was issued by the site visitors in March 2014. In accordance with institution practice, responses to the review are being solicited from the program, the dean, and the graduate council. A final meeting of all parties has taken place, and a final memo of recommendations and findings from the review from the provost was issued on August 18, 2015.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Curriculum revisions recommended by the reviewers and acknowledged in the department's response are currently being considered.

The department will investigate ways of ensuring that graduate students have the opportunity to take more 700-level courses in the program. Additionally, it will determine appropriate alternatives to the comprehensive exam, eliminated by faculty vote in April 2014.

The department and its faculty were asked to arrive at a consensus as to issues discussed in the review related to faculty numbers, workload, and future hires. Additionally, the department leadership was asked to ensure mentorship of junior faculty is occurring with information about the necessary levels of scholarship for achieving tenure being provided.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 9 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 6 |
| 2013-14 | 2 |
| 2014-15 | 1 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 18 |
|-----------|----|

Program Review Nevada State College

Nevada State College did not have any programs scheduled for review during this academic year.

Program Review

College of Southern Nevada

List the existing programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that were reviewed over the past year:

DEGREE PROGRAMS

I. List the existing programs and corresponding degree for all programs that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Economics, Bachelor of Science).

- A.A. (no emphasis)
- Art and Art History, A.A.
- Communication, A.A.
- Creative Writing, A.A.
- Deaf Studies, A.A.S.
- English, A.A.
- International Languages, A.A.
- Interpreter Preparation, A.A.S.
- Journalism and Media Studies, A.A.
- Latin American and Latina/o Studies, A.A.
- Music, A.A.
- Theatre, A.A.

II. List any programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that received Board approval for elimination or deactivation in this academic year of review (e.g. Political Science, Master of Arts).

None

III. List all new programs and corresponding degree programs that received Board approval in this academic year of review (e.g. History, Bachelor of Arts).

None

CERTIFICATES

I. List the certificates (at least 30 credits and under 30 credits) that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Bookkeeping or Certified Nursing Assistant).

Music Business Technology, C.A.

II. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received Academic Affairs Council (AAC) approval to be established in this academic year of review.

Dance, C.A.

III. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None

IV. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval to be established in this academic year of review and the corresponding state, national and/or industry recognized certification or license for which the certificate program provides such preparation.

None

V. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None

AA No Emphasis

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Associate of Arts Degree is a general transfer program for students who are planning to transfer to UNLV, UNR, NSC, GBC or another baccalaureate-level institution. The AA allows for a disciplinary emphasis and leads to further, specialized study at a four-year college or university. The AA (no emphasis) is especially appropriate for those students who have transferred to CSN, or changed majors and need a more liberally determined set of requirements.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are

sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.

9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Strengths

- Opportunity for student to explore a variety of areas of study, then package as a degree
- Opportunity for transfer students to transfer in more credits than in other programs
- As a transfer degree to UNLV, it takes care of all general education requirements.
- Highest number of degrees awarded in Arts & Letters

Weaknesses

- Counselors often encourage students to complete sooner by entering this degree, rather than completing their own desired area of study
- Degree is less systematic than others
- Currently, faculty advisors are not assigned to this area—only in their own disciplines
- It is difficult to track the number of students because they frequently only declare this major when they want to graduate.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-------|
| 2014-15 | 3,016 |
|---------|-------|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2012-13 | 377 |
|---------|-----|

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2013-14 | 395 |
|---------|-----|

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 454 |
|---------|-----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Fall 2014 | 81,156 |
|-----------|--------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Art courses are offered for majors, non-majors and the general population of students. All of the courses in the Art & Art History Program can fulfill the Fine Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences requirements of most AA, AS, AAS, degrees at CSN.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Departmental Highlights since last Program Review:

1. Systematic revision of all programs has resulted in:
 - Clearer, more measureable outcomes
 - Enhanced targeting of outcomes by courses, through analysis of program matrices
 - Adjustment of all AA degrees to be 60 credits
 - Adoption of new general education requirements as approved by Faculty Senate
2. Creation and approval of the newest Fine Arts program, the Certificate of Achievement in Dance
3. Adoption of performance rubrics in several courses, including MUS 121 Music Appreciation, ART 298 Portfolio Review, MUS 231, 232, 285b Recording courses, and music juries.
4. Revision of course descriptions and outcomes in many DAN, ART, MUS, MUSE, MUSA, and THTR courses, to eliminate problems with prerequisites, more clearly articulate course content, and enhance assessment opportunities.
5. Expanded curricular offerings in MUS, including MUS 102 Beginning Music Theory, MUS 229 Survey of Latin American Music, several music technology courses, and an online version of MUS 181 Business of Music.
6. Adoption of zero-based budgeting model to save money and increase accountability.
7. Expansion of ART studio spaces, adding one room at the Charleston campus.
8. Expansion of the MUS recording spaces, adding a small lab at the Cheyenne campus. Work is in progress for outfitting a second music technology lab on the Cheyenne campus.
9. Expansion of duties of the classified Gallery Manager, to become an Administrative Faculty position coordinating all college visual art displays and gallery exhibits.
10. Creation of the Jay Morrison and Tom Ferguson Music Scholarship Funds.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 569 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 8 |
| 2013-14 | 14 |
| 2014-15 | 13 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,770 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Students who enroll in the Communication Program are looking for a solid foundation in communication theory and practical application of communication skills. The majority of these students transfer to a baccalaureate-level institution to continue their studies. Program courses help students learn to be effective communicators in interpersonal, group, and public settings; to utilize critical thinking skills in making informed, reasoned and equitable decisions; and to understand that communicating in the workplace often involves communication across cultures.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Most of the review done in the COM program has been done in the context of the basic course COM 101. This course has a history of being assessed in a variety of ways. Additionally, we have used data from COM lab consultations to describe areas of concern for our students. Currently we are in the second year of our COM 101 three year assessment plan.

OUR COM 101 uses rubrics and survey information developed by the National Communication Association for its review of the COM 101 course.

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers

prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.

7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The program review has found three main strengths: 1) a robust and well-conceived assessment program, 2) faculty commitment to professional development, & 3) assessment of student learning through an indirect measure of COM lab use.

The first major finding of concern in the program review is that the ratio of part time instructors to full time instructors is high. To address this concern new full time faculty should be identifies, hired and retained.

The second major finding of concern is that there is no sequencing of COM courses. This makes finding the appropriate level time/course to assess the students' knowledge of the Communication discipline difficult because of the uneven number of actual COM courses that a student may have taken prior to any particular course. A guided pathway will enable students to understand an appropriate sequence in order to progress through the program without prerequisites to determine the course order.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|------------|
| 2014-15 | 307 |
|---------|------------|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 16 |
| 2013-14 | 25 |
| 2014-15 | 16 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 3,901 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The AA degree with Creative Writing emphasis focuses on the writing of fiction or poetry. As knowledge of the genres and traditions of literature is central to the development of a writer or poet, courses include the study of the elements of fiction and poetry are integrated into this program.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

English Department Highlights Since Last Program Review

1. Clearer and more readily assessable outcomes for Composition courses
 - a. Outcomes for all Composition I courses and equivalents have been revised
 - b. Assessment plans have been revised to match new course outcomes
2. Standardized placement for Composition students using WritePlacer
 - a. Students now get immediate placement results
 - b. Test preparation is now offered online and in the writing Centers
3. Building the foundation for a robust Reading program
 - a. A reading specialist has been hired, a reading placement test has been put in place through Accuplacer, and a series of reading courses are currently going through the curriculum process
 - b. Mandatory Reading testing will be implemented as of fall 2015.
4. Creation of Steiner Scholarship Awards
 - a. Steiner's Pubs is part of the advisory board for the English department
 - b. Writing contests are advertised yearly with one final winner each in the categories of Poetry and Short Story.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 147 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 4 |
| 2013-14 | 11 |
| 2014-15 | 4 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Fall 2014 | 11,617 |
|-----------|--------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Two AAS degrees are offered through two distinct programs of study both comprised of courses using the AM prefix. The AAS in Deaf Studies is a language program that aims at the achievement of fluency in American Sign Language.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Two Associate of Applied Science Degrees (AAS) are offered through two distinct programs of study both comprised of courses using the AM prefix.

(1) The AAS in Deaf Studies is a language program that aims at the achievement of fluency in American Sign Language. (2) The AAS with an Interpreter Preparation Emphasis (IPP program) is a professional translation program that provides an initial credential for students seeking careers in service to the Deaf community in medical, legal or social-service areas, for example, and is the only functioning program of its kind in the Nevada.

In fact, these two degrees constitute a two-plus-two program; however, upon completing the second course of study, a student only ends up with two AAS degrees - the second of which may have required four years of work. Since the credential for employment as an interpreter is minimally a BA, students are obligated to leave Nevada to become eligible for employment. Students have shown reluctance to sign up for this degree, and the low enrollment figures for the IPP reflect this. This is a problem that needs a solution in order to assure that Deaf citizens of Nevada are provided with the access and services to which they are entitled.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 77 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 10 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 9 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 11 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 292 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Associate of Arts Degree with an English Emphasis helps students develop and apply critical thinking, analytical writing, and communication skills. Students who complete these degree requirements will be prepared to transfer to a four-year institution.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

English Department Highlights Since Last Program Review

1. Clearer and more readily assessable outcomes for Composition courses
 - a. Outcomes for all Composition I courses and equivalents have been revised
 - b. Assessment plans have been revised to match new course outcomes
2. Standardized placement for Composition students using WritePlacer
 - a. Students now get immediate placement results
 - b. Test preparation is now offered online and in the writing Centers
3. Building the foundation for a robust Reading program
 - a. A reading specialist has been hired, a reading placement test has been put in place through Accuplacer, and a series of reading courses are currently going through the curriculum process
 - b. Mandatory Reading testing will be implemented as of fall 2015.
4. Creation of Steiner Scholarship Awards
 - a. Steiner's Pubs is part of the advisory board for the English department
 - b. Writing contests are advertised yearly with one final winner each in the categories of Poetry and Short Story.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 318 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 12 |
| 2013-14 | 23 |
| 2014-15 | 13 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Fall 2014 | 11,617 |
|-----------|--------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

This transferable degree program offers study options from all three categories of language with choices from 10 different languages: Category 1, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish; Category 2, Russian; Category 3, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Associate of Arts Degrees (AA) with an International Languages Emphasis are offered in nine disciplines: Arabic (ARA), Chinese (Mandarin) (CHI), French (FREN), German (GER), Italian (ITAL), Japanese (JPN), Portuguese (PORT), Russian (RUS) and Spanish (SPAN).

These languages offer a program of study of 14 credits, which means that a complete sequence of four courses – 111, 112, 211, 212 – is available. Furthermore, these courses transfer individually as equivalent to similarly numbered one- and two-hundred level courses at most nationally-accredited institutions. (More detail on specific programs is provided in the Appendix.)

In addition to these degree-track languages, the Department of International Languages offers courses in Spanish for Heritage Speakers (SPAN 226 & 227), Filipino (FIL) and Korean (KOR). Although, complete degree sequences are not available, these courses are used to satisfy general education requirements. Moreover, they support the core theme of diversity and offer heritage speakers opportunities to “scaffold” their education from a base of special and personal interest. Finally, Latin (LAT) attracts students in domains as diverse as linguistics, medicine and theology, and at least one Latin class always “makes.”

Chinese and Korean are both poised to expand but are inhibited, in part, by the lack of full-time content specialists/instructors. The Chinese part-timers Wang Chen Wei and Ling Chin Szu have done an remarkable job in building their program, but specialized leadership is necessary to take this program to the next level. Although the data provided are from 2013, they show CHI with enrollment numbers very close to those of Italian and surpassing German!

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 109 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 23 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 12 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 26 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 2,174 |
|-----------|-------|

AAS Interpreter Preparation

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Two AAS degrees are offered through two distinct programs of study both comprised of courses using the AM prefix. The AAS with an Interpreter Preparation Emphasis (IPP program) is a professional translation program that provides an initial credential for students seeking careers in service to the Deaf community in medical, legal, or social-service areas.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.

AAS Interpreter Preparation

9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Two Associate of Applied Science Degrees (AAS) are offered through two distinct programs of study both comprised of courses using the AM prefix.

(1) The AAS in Deaf Studies is a language program that aims at the achievement of fluency in American Sign Language. (2) The AAS with an Interpreter Preparation Emphasis (IPP program) is a professional translation program that provides an initial credential for students seeking careers in service to the Deaf community in medical, legal or social-service areas, for example, and is the only functioning program of its kind in the Nevada.

In fact, these two degrees constitute a two-plus-two program; however, upon completing the second course of study, a student only ends up with two AAS degrees - the second of which may have required four years of work. Since the credential for employment as an interpreter is minimally a BA, students are obligated to leave Nevada to become eligible for employment. Students have shown reluctance to sign up for this degree, and the low enrollment figures for the IPP reflect this. This is a problem that needs a solution in order to assure that Deaf citizens of Nevada are provided with the access and services to which they are entitled.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 57 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 5 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 1 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 2 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 292 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Associate of Arts in Journalism/ Media Studies has two tracks: news production and advertising/ public relations. Students will complete a core set of classes and then choose a track they wish to follow pertaining to their specific interests. In this program, students will be provided with the most current and relevant instruction in the field of journalism and integrated marketing communications.

Students entering the field of journalism need the skills to compete in the multimedia landscape. The news production track focuses on writing, reporting, analyzing and producing media for print, online and broadcast. The advertising / public relations track focuses on public relations (PR), advertising, direct marketing and multimedia communication for careers in PR and advertising. Both tracks give students the basic knowledge needed for higher education and gainful employment.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The JOUR program has a number of outcomes that are assessed as a student moves through the JOUR course work. JOUR Program Outcomes are assessed students take JOUR 100 & JOUR 101. All student learning outcomes are assessed in the courses JOUR 105-210. JOUR Program Outcomes 2-4 are reviewed through assignments in course JOUR 220-JOUR 276 & COM 196.

Those program outcomes are as follows:

1. Use journalistic news judgement, values and ethics to increase media literacy and competencies in the field.
2. Acquire journalistic skills including: research, reporting, interviewing & writing.
3. Produce journalistic currency such as: news articles written various styles, broadcast news packages for radio & television; advertising, public relations & marketing materials; and visual media including videos, photographs, and websites while complying with relevant media law.
4. Use modern equipment to produce media including: computers & software, radio and television apparatus such as cameras and microphones, news website operating systems, social media websites, and digital media.
5. Employ skills in a work situation including internships & production courses.

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research,

and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)

5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

One of the findings of the JOUR assessment plan is that one of the assigned faculty members is no longer with the department in a full time capacity. Another challenge is that the assessment plan needs to match the current curriculum changes. A new lead faculty member for JOUR should be selected (this has been implemented in FAL 2015). A new multi-year assessment plan should be developed to address the faculty changes in the JOUR program and curriculum updates.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 305 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 15 |
| 2013-14 | 10 |
| 2014-15 | 13 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 215 |
|-----------|-----|

AA Latin American and Latina/o Studies Program

I. Description of Program Reviewed

This interdisciplinary degree offers courses on Latin America and Latinas/Latinos in the U.S. It aims at providing an overview of the historical, political, cultural, financial, psychological, and artistic factors that have contributed to create the current conditions, identity, and diversity of these groups.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

AA Latin American and Latina/o Studies Program

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The possibility to obtain an Associate of Arts (AA) in a non-language program in Latin American and Latina/o Studies exists in the department; however, in nearly ten years this program has not produced a graduate. A new director has recently come on board, and she may provide the program with the impetus it needs to get off the ground.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 7 |
|---------|---|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 0 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 0 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 0 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 25 |
|-----------|----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

A transferable program designed to enhance fluency in the written language of music, develop literacy in the historical styles, acquire broad experience in applied music through private instruction and ensemble participation.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.
9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Departmental Highlights since last Program Review:

1. Systematic revision of all programs has resulted in:
 - Clearer, more measureable outcomes
 - Enhanced targeting of outcomes by courses, through analysis of program matrices
 - Adjustment of all AA degrees to be 60 credits
 - Adoption of new general education requirements as approved by Faculty Senate
2. Creation and approval of the newest Fine Arts program, the Certificate of Achievement in Dance
3. Adoption of performance rubrics in several courses, including MUS 121 Music Appreciation, ART 298 Portfolio Review, MUS 231, 232, 285b Recording courses, and music juries.
4. Revision of course descriptions and outcomes in many DAN, ART, MUS, MUSE, MUSA, and THTR courses, to eliminate problems with prerequisites, more clearly articulate course content, and enhance assessment opportunities.
5. Expanded curricular offerings in MUS, including MUS 102 Beginning Music Theory, MUS 229 Survey of Latin American Music, several music technology courses, and an online version of MUS 181 Business of Music.
6. Adoption of zero-based budgeting model to save money and increase accountability.
7. Expansion of ART studio spaces, adding one room at the Charleston campus.
8. Expansion of the MUS recording spaces, adding a small lab at the Cheyenne campus. Work is in progress for outfitting a second music technology lab on the Cheyenne campus.
9. Expansion of duties of the classified Gallery Manager, to become an Administrative Faculty position coordinating all college visual art displays and gallery exhibits.
10. Creation of the Jay Morrison and Tom Ferguson Music Scholarship Funds.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 249 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 2 |
| 2013-14 | 9 |
| 2014-15 | 5 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 3,058 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

This certificate is designed for students who wish to pursue careers in commercial music production, marketing, recording or management. The program provides in-depth studies of recording technology in the studio setting, with ample time for projects and research. Two levels of Business of Music are also offered to give students a comprehensive overview of all facets of the music industry, including management, budgeting, copyrights and related legal issues. In addition, students are required to take courses in general music, communication and computer literacy in order to give them the tools needed to succeed in the open marketplace.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review

Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.

9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Systematic revision of all programs has resulted in:

- Clearer, more measureable outcomes
- Enhanced targeting of outcomes by courses, through analysis of program matrices

Enrollment: The program averages approximately 100 students per year, declared.

Success Rates: The program graduates an average of 10 students per year, with the largest class being 20 students in 2007-2008.

The Recording Studio received a \$200,000 upgrade in 2008, including an SSL AWS900 console, the latest ProTools recording/editing system, and significantly improved microphone inventory and other associated hardware.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 97 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 7 |
| 2013-14 | 15 |
| 2014-15 | 17 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 2,945 |
|-----------|-------|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The CSN Theatre program will enhance your skills as an actor. In addition to learning the practical aspects of acting, you will develop vocal and physical techniques. The enhancement of oral and written communication and the improvement of creative problem solving are additional benefits.

CSN's Theatre Technology program is known and respected throughout the Las Vegas entertainment community. The theatre technology courses at CSN are endorsed by the Stagehands Union (I.A.T.S.E. Local 720) and are required for all potential members entering the union.

II. Review Process and Criteria

Academic Program Reviews are faculty driven with the review process involving faculty from the program being reviewed. The program review process includes responding to a standard (for CSN) set of narrative questions, review and analysis of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, and analysis of assessment plan implementation and results.

1. The Academic Standards Committee oversees and monitors the Academic Program Review Process. The ASC meets at least once each semester to identify programs to be reviewed (fall meeting), and review and comment on the Academic Program Review Document and the External Review Report generated by the process (spring meeting).
2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the appropriate Dean and the Academic Standards Committee of a scheduled program review. Upon being notified by the VPAA, the Dean notifies the appropriate department chair of the scheduled review, asks the department chair to appoint a Program Review Committee (PRC), and requests all relevant program information from Institutional Research. This information is provided to the Program Review Committee. The VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair work cooperatively to identify appropriate and qualified external reviewers.
3. Upon notification by the Dean the Department Chair appoints the Program Review Committee, designates the chair of that committee and forwards the names of those appointed to the Dean for confirmation. The Department Chair gathers all additional material needed for the program review (course syllabi, college catalogues, etc.) and provides them to the Program Review Committee.
4. The Program Review Committee reviews the material provided by the Dean, Office of Institutional Research, and the Department Chair. Following the criteria and format outlined in Appendix B of this document, the Program Review Committee analyzes the data and information and prepares a Program Review Document. (A self study prepared for specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement.)
5. Upon completion the Program Review Document is forwarded by the chair of the Program Review Committee to the appropriate Department Chair. The Department Chair reviews the draft Program Review Document and forwards it, along with his/her comments and recommendations as specified in Appendix B, to the appropriate Dean. The Dean reviews the Program Review Document and provides the information requested in Appendix B specific to the Dean, then forwards it, along with his report and comments and the chair's comments and recommendations to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards a copy of the Program Review Document, along with all comments and recommendations, to the ASC and the External Reviewers.
6. The External Reviewers consider the Program Review Document and comments as well as any supporting materials provided. The External Reviewers may spend time on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and looking at program resources (library, facilities, technical). The External Reviewers prepare a report of their findings and recommendations. Copies of the External Reviewers Report are sent to the VPAA who sends them to the Program Review Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the ASC.
7. The Program Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean review the External Review Report and comment. Their comments are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA forwards the comments to the ASC.
8. The ASC reviews the Program Review Document, comments and recommendations, and the External Review

Report, comments and recommendations. The ASC drafts commendations and recommendations which are sent to the VPAA and the Faculty Senate Chair.

9. The VPAA summarizes all findings and recommendations and forwards them to the CSN President.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Departmental Highlights since last Program Review:

1. Systematic revision of all programs has resulted in:
 - Clearer, more measureable outcomes
 - Enhanced targeting of outcomes by courses, through analysis of program matrices
 - Adjustment of all AA degrees to be 60 credits
 - Adoption of new general education requirements as approved by Faculty Senate
2. Creation and approval of the newest Fine Arts program, the Certificate of Achievement in Dance
3. Adoption of performance rubrics in several courses, including MUS 121 Music Appreciation, ART 298 Portfolio Review, MUS 231, 232, 285b Recording courses, and music juries.
4. Revision of course descriptions and outcomes in many DAN, ART, MUS, MUSE, MUSA, and THTR courses, to eliminate problems with prerequisites, more clearly articulate course content, and enhance assessment opportunities.
5. Expanded curricular offerings in MUS, including MUS 102 Beginning Music Theory, MUS 229 Survey of Latin American Music, several music technology courses, and an online version of MUS 181 Business of Music.
6. Adoption of zero-based budgeting model to save money and increase accountability.
7. Expansion of ART studio spaces, adding one room at the Charleston campus.
8. Expansion of the MUS recording spaces, adding a small lab at the Cheyenne campus. Work is in progress for outfitting a second music technology lab on the Cheyenne campus.
9. Expansion of duties of the classified Gallery Manager, to become an Administrative Faculty position coordinating all college visual art displays and gallery exhibits.
10. Creation of the Jay Morrison and Tom Ferguson Music Scholarship Funds.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 106 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 3 |
| 2013-14 | 10 |
| 2014-15 | 4 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 614 |
|-----------|-----|

Program Review

Great Basin College

List the existing programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that were reviewed over the past year:

DEGREE PROGRAMS

- I. List the existing programs and corresponding degree for all programs that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Economics, Bachelor of Science).
 - Land Surveying/Geomatics emphasis, B.A.S.
- II. List any programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that received Board approval for elimination or deactivation in this academic year of review (e.g. Political Science, Master of Arts).
 - Agriculture, A.A.S. (eliminated)
 - Land Surveying/Geomatics emphasis, B.A.S. (also reactivated in this year)
- III. List all new programs and corresponding degree programs that received Board approval in this academic year of review (e.g. History, Bachelor of Arts).
 - Emergency Medical Services - Paramedic, A.A.S.

CERTIFICATES

- I. List the certificates (at least 30 credits and under 30 credits) that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Bookkeeping or Certified Nursing Assistant).

None
- II. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received Academic Affairs Council (AAC) approval to be established in this academic year of review.

None
- III. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None
- IV. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval to be established in this academic year of review and the corresponding state, national and/or industry recognized certification or license for which the certificate program provides such preparation.

None
- V. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Land Surveying/Geomatics emphasis, Bachelor of Applied Science

II. Review Process and Criteria

GBC policy 3.40 provides the process and multiple criteria for program review. This can be found on the web at: <http://gbcnv.edu/administration/policies.html>

This process contains the requirements required in the NSHE Board of Regents "Handbook."

There was an extensive program self-study which included collection of data and a review and site visit from an external reviewer. The Land Surveying/Geomatics Advisory Board was involved in the process. The review resulted in a substantial written report.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The program is unusual in that it was both deactivated and reactivated within the year. Reactivation was based in large on findings contained in this program review. A significant finding is that, as discovered in the process of deactivating the program, a much greater interest in the program exists than previously known. Interest is of such a level that continuation is warranted.

The external reviewer of the program provided this summary: "The Land Surveying and Geomatics program at Great Basin College is a strong professional education program. Students, faculty, technical support and administration exhibit a strong interest in growing and improving the program. The program curriculum is robust and the Land Surveying and Geomatics courses are robust. The land surveying and geomatics profession of Nevada and surrounding states are being well served by this program."

Directions and recommendations for the future of the program were also determined. Better marketing of the program to increase the enrollment base of the unique, fully online program is imperative. It is also recommended that an additional instructor be brought into the program at some time, as this would be a step in obtaining ABET accreditation; this would in turn increase interest and participation in the program. Continuing with ongoing upgrades in curriculum and equipment are also among the recommendations.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 23 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 5 |
| 2013-14 | 5 |
| 2014-15 | 8 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 35 |
|-----------|----|

Program Review

Truckee Meadows Community College

List the existing programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that were reviewed over the past year:

DEGREE PROGRAMS

- I. List the existing programs and corresponding degree for all programs that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Economics, Bachelor of Science).
 - Administrative Professional A.A.S.
 - Apprenticeship A.A.S.
 - Architecture A.A.; Residential Design A.A.S.
 - Business A.A., A.A.S.
 - Criminal Justice A.A.; Law Enforcement Emphasis A.A.S.
 - Graphic Communications A.A.S.
 - History A.A.
 - Visual Arts A.A.; Art History Emphasis A.A.
- II. List any programs and corresponding degree level for all programs that received Board approval for elimination or deactivation in this academic year of review (e.g. Political Science, Master of Arts).

Nursing, A.A.S.
- III. List all new programs and corresponding degree programs that received Board approval in this academic year of review (e.g. History, Bachelor of Arts).
 - Pre-Hospital Emergency Medicine, A.A.S.
 - Emergency Management and Homeland Security, B.A.S.
 - Logistics Operations Management, B.A.S.
 - Culinary Arts Entrepreneurs, A.A.S.

Program Review

Truckee Meadows Community College

CERTIFICATES

- I. List the certificates (at least 30 credits and under 30 credits) that were reviewed over this academic year of review (e.g. Bookkeeping or Certified Nursing Assistant).
 - Administrative Professional, C.A.
 - Apprenticeship, C.A.
 - Bookkeeping, C.A.
 - Business, C.A.
 - Graphic Communications, C.A.
- II. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received Academic Affairs Council (AAC) approval to be established in this academic year of review.
 - Unmanned Aerial Systems, C.A.
 - Culinary Arts Entrepreneurs, C.A.
- III. List the certificate programs of at least 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None
- IV. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval to be established in this academic year of review and the corresponding state, national and/or industry recognized certification or license for which the certificate program provides such preparation.
 - Bricklayers Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Carpentry Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Cement Masons Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Certified Professional Bookkeeper, Skills Certificate
 - Cybersecurity, Skills Certificate
 - Electricians Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Ironworkers Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Linux Professional Certification Preparation, Skills Certificate
 - Magnetic Resonance Imaging Technology, Skills Certificate
 - Natural Gas Pipefitters, Skills Certificate
 - Natural Gas Pressure Operators, Skills Certificate
 - Natural Gas Serviceman Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Operating Engineers, Skills Certificate
 - Painters Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Plasterers Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Plumbers and Pipefitters, Skills Certificate
 - Refrigeration Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Sheetmetal Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
 - Tilers Apprenticeship, Skills Certificate
- V. List the certificate programs of less than 30 credits that received AAC approval for elimination in this academic year of review.

None

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Truckee Meadows Community College's Administrative Professional program is housed within the Business Division of the College. The program offers an Associate of Applied Science degree and a Certificate of Achievement in Administrative Professional. The Administrative Professional program has a total of 460 declared majors and has averaged 92 students each year for the past five years in Computer and Office Technology (COT) courses, which are required in the degree program and the focus of this program/unit review and course data analyses. The program utilizes relevant courses from many different disciplines for its core and emphasis requirements to make up an effective curriculum that ensures well-rounded administrative professional training including courses in accounting, business, computer information technology, information systems, and management. This program was completely redesigned five years ago and has been growing steadily since that time with 58 students in fiscal year 2010 and more than doubling to 119 students in fiscal year 2014.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

This is an excellent workforce-related degree (AAS) and certificate of achievement which prepares graduates for working as administrative assistants in a business setting with skills related to office procedures, computer applications, communications, customer service, accounting, and supervision. It has an average of 60 declared majors per semester. The enrollment in its courses is growing, but still low. Declared majors are likely to be part-time and may not graduate if employment is gained early. The number of graduates per academic year is not large enough for the program to continue beyond its tenth year if improvement is not shown. The workforce need for this program is demonstrated by national and local data, so there is strong college support for its continuation in some form. Specific recommendations for increasing student success in the program have been developed by the Program/Unit Review Committee, the Dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the program itself. The program will submit an annual update on its implementation of these recommendations and its growth in student success data. Its active Advisory Committee is a significant plus in ensuring that the curriculum is continually examined for its relevance in a rapidly changing environment and in supporting the program in recruiting.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 79 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 5 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2013-14 | 6 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2014-15 | 7 |
|---------|---|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|----|
| Fall 2014 | 67 |
|-----------|----|

AAS, CA Apprenticeship Program

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The TMCC –Building Trades Apprenticeship program provides training in skilled workforce areas that constantly require changes as the knowledge, technology and job-related skills are modified. The various apprenticeship programs are influenced by local, regional and national code provisions along with specific municipal and industry license requirements.

The local and national area trade unions provide a professional educational and on the job training opportunity, leading to achievement as an apprentice for student participants. TMCC provides additional opportunities for apprenticeship students to enhance their knowledge through certificates and degrees in association with the union training programs. The current Apprenticeship program is managed within TMCC by the Technical Sciences Division.

Only indentured apprenticeship students, sponsored by local union apprenticeship programs and approved by the Nevada State Apprenticeship Council are permitted to enroll and participate in the emphasis area course and curriculum. The apprenticeship program courses have been designed to provide participants with basic technical trade knowledge and manual skills required for their type of employment. Courses include subjects such as trade and industry law, job safety, job skill practices, tool and equipment operation and applied math applications. Participants can typically complete their emphasis area of study and on-the-job training requirements within three to five years, leading to journeyman status.

Most apprenticeship participants complete thirty credit hours of technical courses within their three to five year time enrollment and are only permitted to enroll in ten credit hours annually. Once the participants complete ten credits per year, they meet the annual requirements for 144 hours of classroom training. Participants are required by the indentured apprenticeship programs to complete six core credit hours of on-the-job training and work experience, usually through internship training with employers. In addition, participants are required to complete at least three credit hours of technical core courses related to plan reading and drawing interpretation.

Currently, the completion of an Associate of Applied Science Degree requires completion of 21 credit hours of General Education courses, 10 credit hours of Core Emphasis courses that are combined with the approved Elective Apprenticeship courses for the degree minimum of 60 credits. In comparison, the Certificate of Achievement requires completion of 9 credit hours of General Education courses, 10 credit hours of Core Emphasis courses combined with 11 credit hours of approved Elective Apprenticeship courses for the certificate minimum of 30 credits.

The following Northern Nevada Apprenticeship programs participate with TMCC for the Certificate of Achievement and Associate of Applied Science Degree as delineated in the Memorandum of Understanding between TMCC and the individual Apprenticeship Training Programs.

- Northern Nevada Bricklayers and Tilesetters, JATC
- Northern Nevada Carpenters, JATC
- Northern Nevada Plasterers and Cement Masons, JATC
- Northern Nevada Electrical, JATC
- Painters and Allied Trades, JATC
- Field Ironworkers, JATC
- Northern Nevada Plumbers and Pipefitters, JATC
- Northern Nevada Sheet Metal Apprenticeship, JATC
- Northern Nevada Operating Engineers, JATC
- Nevada Energy Gas Apprenticeship

AAS, CA Apprenticeship Program

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 28 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 2 |
| 2013-14 | 0 |
| 2014-15 | 1 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 185 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Currently the architectural programs provide technical, transfer, and general education courses leading to a two-year Associate of Arts transfer degree in Architecture and a terminal Architectural Design Technology degree – Associate of Applied Science in Residential Design. The program also offers community and continuing education courses and workshops. The faculty members are dedicated to providing lifelong learning opportunities that help students achieve their goals, aspirations, and dreams. Emphasizing responsible social interaction while utilizing the resources of the local community, the programs seek to improve the quality of life for our diverse community by emphasizing designs with environmental sustainability.

Future plans will seek to merge the Architecture program with the Construction Technologies Department. This decision was supported by the Architectural Advisory Board. The Board realized the mutual benefits of this synergistic relationship. As a by-product of the merger, a strategic goal will address the renaming and a rebranding of the program. With the advice and direction of the Architectural Advisory Board, the Architecture Program will offer a variety of educational tracks. Four tracks are currently being proposed:

Track 1: AA, Architecture transferring to the University of Nevada in Las Vegas (UNLV)

Track 2: AA, Architecture transferring to the New School of Architecture located in San Diego, CA.

Track 3: Residential Design

Track 4: AA, Landscape Architecture transferring to UNLV

Tracks 1 and 2 reflect the current student transfer trends and are also supported by articulation agreements. Track 3 is widely supported by the Nevada State Board of Architects. The residential design program is unique because Nevada is the only state in the union that regulates the profession through licensure. While the fourth track, Landscape Architecture, was removed from TMCC due to low yield, it has been re-introduced for two reasons. They include recent support by the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Nevada State Board of Landscape Architects.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Architecture offers technical, transfer, and general education courses leading to a two year AA transfer degree in Architecture and a terminal Architectural Design Technology degree – AAS in Residential Design. In recent years, the loss of two faculty members has left the program with fewer resources to recruit and support students and the recession has slowed down Northern Nevada’s need for architecture graduates, resulting in the program’s current status as low yield. However, the program now has a fulltime tenure-track faculty member and appears to be energetically pursuing pathways to meet the growing needs of the construction industry locally as the economy is rebounding. Current studies are focusing on 1) merger of Construction Technologies with Architecture to produce students better prepared for today’s workplace, 2) seeking formal transfer agreements with more accredited bachelor’s architecture programs, 3) partnership with WNC in Construction Management bachelor’s degree, and 4) exploring demands from industry related to landscape architecture and interior design. This excellent program will be monitored and given three more years to rebound in number of graduates or through program restructuring before its low yield status results in its discontinuation.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 87 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 6 |
| 2013-14 | 9 |
| 2014-15 | 9 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 140 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

TMCC Business Studies provides students with the skills and knowledge to compete and succeed in today's marketplace. Each of our courses gives students up-to-date, practical business fundamentals. We are proud of our high-quality instruction that leads to student success. The department provides education which can result in transfer and terminal degrees, certificates or provide individual professional development, strengthening the region's workforce.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/ Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Business has three transfer Associate of Art degrees in Business, Entrepreneurship, and Logistics Management. All are articulated with UNR to provide a pathway for business students to attain the baccalaureate degree. It also currently has two Associate of Applied Sciences degrees in Logistics Management and Business. There are four certificates of achievement, and two skills certificates. An additional AAS and Certificate of Achievement in Culinary Arts Entrepreneurship just began in Fall 2015. The program's work in proposing a BAS in Logistics Management in partnership with Technical Sciences in response to workforce needs in Northern Nevada is to be commended. Recently approved by the Board of Regents, this program will provide a valuable new entry point into jobs for AAS graduates. With a small number of fulltime faculty and staff, Business Studies has created an excellent program which attracts students who persist to completion. An Advisory Board is strong and very supportive, actively involved in curriculum development and planning. Joint programs in entrepreneurship should continue to be explored as demanded by employers, as well as gifts, grants, and external contracts in order to serve the needs of the business community.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-------|
| 2014-15 | 1,399 |
|---------|-------|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2012-13 | 92 |
| 2013-14 | 104 |
| 2014-15 | 126 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Fall 2014 | 1,076 |
|-----------|-------|

AA Criminal Justice; AAS Law Enforcement Emphasis

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Criminal Justice Program offers an Associate of Arts Degree in Criminal Justice or Associate of Applied Science, Law enforcement emphasis. The Criminal Justice Program includes program and transfer specific courses for Criminal Justice (CRJ) majors as well as General Education for non-declared students. Students enrolled in Criminal Justice curriculum constitute a diverse representation of our community and student career paths. Students graduate with a strong foundation for entry into careers in law enforcement, probation, law, and corrections.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

This program offers an AA degree in Criminal Justice designed for transfer to a baccalaureate program, primarily UNR, and an AAS Law Enforcement degree related to employment in law enforcement, probation, investigations, corrections, and corporate security. Enrollment in CRJ courses is high, and it is a popular program for students planning to transfer to UNR. Students in CRJ majors are younger and more diverse than a typical TMCC student, and the program has done a good job of recruiting females into a traditionally male profession. For the past two years, the program has had only one full-time faculty member, carrying a vacant faculty line, but has maintained enrollment through use of part-time faculty. A newly approved AAS degree in Pre-Hospital Emergency Medicine and BAS degree in Emergency Management and Homeland Security will augment and supplement the current CRJ degrees. As a result of this program review, a search for a tenured faculty member is anticipated in 2015-16, the academic area is being moved into a coordinated program which includes public safety, and specific assessment activities for this program are being put in place on an ongoing basis.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 688 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 52 |
| 2013-14 | 61 |
| 2014-15 | 59 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 510 |
|-----------|-----|

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Graphic Communications (GRC) Program of Truckee Meadows Community College provides training that meets industry and government standards and aids in the growth and development of northern Nevada's workforce by providing quality education to those seeking to begin or advance their career in the Graphic Communications industry. Individual unit programs consist of general education courses and emphasis-specific technical courses that provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to be successful in today's high-tech graphics workplace.

The Graphic Communications Program is a member of the Liberal Arts Division of Truckee Meadows Community College within the Visual and Performing Arts Department. The GRC program's three computer labs are located in the Sierra Building, and various other classrooms and facilities are located in other buildings on the Dandini campus.

The major emphases and areas of study within the Graphic Communications Program are Print Media Design, Time-based Media Design and Web and standalone Interactive Media Design, although students may choose emphasis courses from across the program's curriculum.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

The Graphic Communications Program offers an AAS and a certificate of achievement, serving 164 majors in print, motion, audio, and web-based and standalone interactive media content creation and production. It has three fulltime faculty and three to six part-time faculty per semester who manage three Macintosh computer labs, containing a total of seventy-five computer workstations. The program faculty are particularly strong in working with students through mentoring and advisement. This program is very popular with students and leads to employment in a variety of industries. Integration with area high school programs is strong. The program has transfer agreements with GBC and UNLV for baccalaureate degree attainment, but is studying whether these agreements are meeting the needs of their students and Reno-area industries. It anticipates the creation of skills certificates and is working with its Advisory Committee to assess the needs in this rapidly evolving technical field. UNR is strengthening its programs in this area and their decisions may impact the direction in which Graphic Communications moves. This is an excellent, though expensive, program in high demand, which is expected to continue to change and evolve to meet workforce needs.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 2014-15 | 198 |
|---------|-----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 22 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2013-14 | 25 |
|---------|----|

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 28 |
|---------|----|

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 169 |
|-----------|-----|

AA History

I. Description of Program Reviewed

The Associate of Arts degree emphasis in History is designed for students seeking careers in history or related fields. The degree includes general education requirements to gain a breadth of knowledge in a wide array of disciplines. Students will also specialize in the theoretical, methodological, and topical concerns of the History discipline. This course of study is designed as a university transfer degree, but it can be tailored for those wishing to gain critical analysis skills. The Associate of Arts degree emphasis in History is fully accepted at any baccalaureate-granting institution in the NSHE system, and it is fully transferable to almost all four-year schools in the nation.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

History has a reputation for excellent instruction delivered by four tenured Ph.D. faculty members who are dedicated to providing students with rigorous course content and appropriate support for learning, whether in person or online. It offers key courses which meet U.S. and Nevada constitution requirements and which transfer to four-year institutions. Currently, History's student retention rate is high. Nevertheless, enrollment in history courses has been dropping in recent years. There are plans in place to try to increase student enrollment and completion, which will require proactive actions by its faculty and staff. There may also be partnership available with its move back to the Liberal Arts Division, which will assist. Attention to the numbers and quality of the part-time faculty pool is identified as a priority going forward. The implementation of the K-12 Common Core is expected to enable higher level critical analysis and effective writing skills by recent high school graduates and may impact all course content. History faculty are carefully analyzing the impact of the new general education Silver Core at UNR and the Common Core Standards on their courses and curriculum. This is an excellent program with challenges related to enrollment and potential curricular demands.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 68 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2012-13 | 4 |
| 2013-14 | 8 |
| 2014-15 | 3 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 621 |
|-----------|-----|

AA Visual Arts; AA Art History Emphasis

I. Description of Program Reviewed

Truckee Meadows Community College Fine Arts Program, working within the Liberal Arts Division, is broad in scope and diverse in nature, and can be divided into three areas for the purpose of better describing its characteristics. These are: Art History, Visual Arts and the Art Galleries. Each of these three disciplines has a mission specific to its focus; however, they all share a common principle Art mission. The Visual Arts department currently includes Photography, Ceramics, Sculpture, Print-making, Painting, and Drawing. The Fine Arts program also includes courses that fulfill the General Education and Diversity requirements. The Fine Arts Program serves an average of 1,027 (5 year average) enrolled students per semester. There are 252 Fine Arts Majors enrolled (Fall 2014) and 24 (Fall 2014) Art History Emphasis Majors enrolled in the Fine Arts Program. Art History and Art Appreciation classes are generally 3 credits and meet for 150 minutes per week and Art Studio courses typically meet for 300 minutes per week and count as 3 credits. The 2.5 hours of studio class time is typically divided between lecture-demonstrations, presentation and critique of student art, and time in which students create art, usually with opportunities for one-on-one assistance from the instructor.

The Visual Arts Program is a member of the Liberal Arts Division of Truckee Meadows Community College within the Visual and Performing Arts Department. The Visual Arts program has classrooms and labs in two separate buildings. The photography department is located in the Sierra Building and includes one digital lab that is also used as a classroom and one lab/classroom adjacent to the darkroom. The Red Mountain Building includes the following classrooms and labs: RDMT 214 (Art History), RDMT 215 (Ceramics Lab), RDMT 216 (Printmaking, Visual Foundations, and classroom for Ceramics lecture), RDMT 217 (Painting, Drawing, and Visual Foundations) RDMT 218 (Drawing, Rendering and Illustration, Screen Printing, Watercolor, and shared with Graphic Communications Print Lab), RDMT 219 (Sculpture, Jewelry when offered, and Visual Foundations), and RDMT 321P (Gallery Practice). In addition to classrooms and labs, the Visual Arts Program includes seven galleries at two sites. Two galleries are located at the Meadowood Site and five galleries are located at the Dandini Campus.

The Visual Arts Program offers an Associate of Fine Arts Degree and an Associate of Arts Degree with an Emphasis in Art History. The Associate of Fine Arts Degrees are transferable to University of Nevada, Reno as well as the other NSHE institutions.

II. Review Process and Criteria

The program/unit review (PUR) process begins with preparation of a self-study by a committee of faculty and staff, with input from the supervising dean. The self-study describes the program and addresses issues in curriculum and student success, demographics and enrollment, and resources. It forms the basis for the program/unit's educational master plan and summarizes the results of course, discipline, and program assessment for a 5-7 year period in a single document. The report is reviewed by the Program/Unit Review Committee (PURC), which validates the work of the self-study and provides a broad institutional overview. Following a meeting with the self-study chair and dean, the PUR Committee reports the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), who prepares a report for the President indicating recommended strategies for the academic area to focus on. These strategies are linked to TMCC's mission through our Strategic Master Plan's core themes and provide direction for future initiatives within the academic area. As such, future resource allocation through the Resource Allocation Process are dictated by the recommended strategies. Upon approval of the President, the VPAA charges the department and dean to implement the recommended strategies.

In the years between PURs, academic areas are required to complete an Annual Progress Report (APR), which addresses their progress in attaining the recommended strategies. These reports are drafted by the Self-study Chairs/Department Chairs/Directors/Coordinators and then reviewed and approved by the dean and finally the VPAA, providing a continual focus on the recommended strategies for the academic area in the context of the Strategic Master Plan.

AA Visual Arts; AA Art History Emphasis

III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Program Review

Visual Arts provides our students with courses in the transferable Associate of Fine Arts degree and a transferable Associate of Fine Arts with an Emphasis in Art History. These courses also meet General Education and Diversity requirements and are popular with occasional course-takers. Important also, Visual Arts offers courses in gallery management. One of its faculty has oversight over all the galleries at TMCC. An additional tenure-track hire was completed this year, which should give added stability to the program. This academic area runs all of the eight galleries at TMCC and provides the College and the broader community with valuable art and art lectures. Exceptionally well-qualified part-time faculty teach in the program, enhancing the quality of the offerings. However, the program is behind in course assessments and will need to focus on this area for both full- and part-time faculty efforts in the next year. This program is to be commended for its work with Washoe County School District and in generating external funding to support galleries and programs.

IV. Descriptive Statistics

A. Number of students with a declared major in the program area:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2014-15 | 97 |
|---------|----|

B. Number of graduates from the program for the following years:

| | |
|---------|----|
| 2012-13 | 5 |
| 2013-14 | 15 |
| 2014-15 | 10 |

C. Headcount of students enrolled in any course related to the program (duplicated):

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2014 | 809 |
|-----------|-----|

Program Review

Western Nevada College

Western Nevada College did not have any programs scheduled for review during this academic year.