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I. Program Review Overview

A. Background.
The Board of Regents requires that all existing academic programs at the University of Nevada, Reno participate in the process of program review on a regular basis. Program review is designed to examine all of the academic programs at the university as defined in Appendix B. A program review master schedule has been developed that requires program reviews be commenced beginning in the 7th year following program approval or prior program review. This schedule is available from the provost’s office and is provided at least annually to the deans of the colleges. Under special circumstances, the master schedule can be revised, or a program review can be accelerated, extended, or postponed. This request should be made through the dean and vice provost.

It is possible to combine a program review with an accreditation review. To accomplish this, the department should alert the provost’s office of this request as planning for the accreditation review begins and expect that certain adjustments or supplements to the self-study and responses and actions following the accreditation visit and report will be necessary.

Programs under review should keep in mind that a program review differs from an accreditation review, though many tasks in these reviews are similar. The purposes of a program review are improvement, alignment with established objectives, and planning for the future, rather than a process to secure approval or endorsement from a body of reviewers.

The program review process provides opportunities for programs to review their accomplishments, examine their strengths and weaknesses, and develop plans through which improvements in their effectiveness can be achieved. Program review conclusions and recommendations will be used in department, school, college, and university planning processes as well.

The most important step in program review is the preparation of a self-study by the program faculty. The process for preparing this document should begin as soon as possible after notification by the provost that a review is to be conducted and be completed by the end of November in the year of the scheduled program review. This is followed by a visit by an external review team before March 30 of each year.

Following receipt of the external reviewers’ report, responses will be obtained from the department, dean, graduate council (if the review includes a graduate program), and provost. A brief report on the major findings of the review will be provided by the provost’s office for dissemination to the Board of Regents.
The program review process must be a collective effort in which all regular faculty of the program participate. This includes discussions about the overall objectives and accomplishments of the program in preparation for the visit, as well as participation in the external review visit and the response following the visit. A successful program review will result in reaffirmation of some activities and identification of new activities to make the program better.

In summary, program review is:

- Reflection on past accomplishments and design of future directions
- Evaluation of the quality of the educational programs, including an assessment of student outcomes
- Critical analysis of department or program goals and performance
- Based on data
- Coordinated with strategic planning and accreditation, where possible
- Collaborative and participatory
- Includes a discussion of goals and performance with external reviewers
- Required by the Board of Regents

B. Administration of the Process.
The process is directed by the Office of the Provost under the supervision of the Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education. The Program Review Support Team (see Appendix A for members) provides guidance and assistance concerning the process. A majority of the funding for the program review process is provided by the provost’s office.

C. Description of the Process.
The program review process is comprised of the following steps:

1. Selection and appointment of external reviewers. (By September 30.)

2. Completion of a self-study by the program in consultation with members of the Program Review Support Team. (By November 30.)

3. Posting of the self-study, appendices/exhibits and program review schedule to the Program Review NevadaBox site for access by the following individuals: (By January 15.)
   
   Provost
   Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
   Vice President for Research and Innovation
   Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School
   Dean
   School Director, if applicable
   Department Chair or Program Director
   Coordinator, General Education & University Assessment
   Director, Academic Affairs
If the review involves a graduate program, to the Graduate Council representative through the Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School

4. Coordination of the review visit logistics, including scheduling, travel and lodging arrangements, catering, and associated university paperwork.

5. Review of the self-study by the university representatives who will meet with the external reviewers.

6. Visit and report by external reviewers.

7. Meeting of the provost with Graduate Council to receive written report.

8. Dean’s and department’s response to the external reviewers’ report.

9. Meeting of dean, department chair, provost, vice provosts, vice president for research and innovation, dean of the graduate school, and director, if applicable, to review the report and responses.

10. Conclusions and recommendations of the review by the Office of the Provost. (By May 15.)

11. A report to the Board of Regents.

The timetable for an academic program review should be one academic year. A timeline for when these tasks should be completed is provided as Appendix D. This schedule allows for occasional delays and interruptions but should be followed as closely as possible in order to complete the review on time.

D. Responsibility Areas of the Program Review

1. Department/Program Responsibilities. The department/program is responsible for the following:

   a) Designating an individual (within the department) to perform the administrative tasks of the program review listed below.
   b) Providing a list of at least five potential and willing reviewers (with curriculum vitae) through the dean to the Provost’s Office. (By September 30.)
   c) Establishing and communicating possible dates for the external review team visit with the Director, Academic Affairs. (By October 30)
   d) Preparing a self-study for the team to review prior to their visit (See Program Review Self-Study Guidelines). (By November 30).
   e) Providing a copy of the preliminary self-study to the dean and vice provost for approval in advance of distribution.
f) Finalizing the self-study for positing with a preliminary schedule to the NevadaBox site for this purpose for access by the external review team and university participants (see Section C 3. above) at least one month prior to the external review team campus visit. (By January 15.)
g) Finalizing the visit itinerary and providing support to team members during their site visit regarding meeting places, directions, dinner arrangements, etc.
h) Hosting the team during the visit as appropriate.
i) Preparing and submitting to the Dean and Provost’s office a response to the external review report.

**Administrative Tasks**

As with any review process, there is a need for administrative support within the department or program for the program review. It is helpful to identify the individual to provide this support and involve that person in the review as soon as possible. These administrative tasks include the following:

- Formatting the self-study and ensuring that paper and/or electronic copies are made available to external reviewers & university participants.
- In consultation with the department chair or program director, contacting offices and individuals to schedule external review meetings and consultations; arranging locations, escorts, and catering.
- Preparing draft and final itineraries for the visit and ensuring they are available on the NevadaBox site for access by all participants.
- Preparing all hosting and payment documents related to the external review visit and forwarding them through the dean’s office to the Provost Office for signature.

2. **Dean's Responsibilities.** The academic dean is responsible for completing the following arrangements:

a) Reviewing the qualifications of the proposed reviewers provided by the department and consulting with the vice provost and provost regarding the same.
b) Reviewing and approving the preliminary self-study provided by the department.
c) Participating in the opening breakfast, an individual meeting, and the exit meeting during the review visit.
d) Preparing a response to the external review team report and the department/program response, including future goals, and submitting it to Provost’s office.

3. **Office of the Provost Responsibilities.** The Office of the Provost will be responsible for coordinating the following items:
a) Issuing program review start-up memos and instructions to departments in August of each year.
b) Establishing a NevadaBox folder for each of the program(s) undergoing review.
c) Providing data related to the program’s students, faculty, and productivity for use in the self-study process.
d) Conducting a Program Review Orientation in the fall semester for those programs undertaking a review.
e) Determining members of the external review team and designating its chair, after consultation with the Dean.
f) Corresponding with the external review team regarding invitation to serve, role and responsibilities, honoraria, expenses, review dates, travel, and follow-up correspondence concerning reports and other matters.
g) Arranging and paying for airline travel and other travel arrangements necessary to come to the university to conduct the review.
h) Providing account numbers for hosting expenses for departments/programs.
i) Posting documents on the NevadaBox site and requesting appropriate responses from dean and chair/director and others involved in the review.
j) Scheduling a meeting with the Provost; Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education; the Vice President for Research and Innovation; Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School; Dean; Director of a School, if applicable; Coordinator, General Education and University Assessment, and the Department Chair/Program Director to discuss the external review team's report, department/program response, and Dean's response.
k) If the review included a graduate program, meeting with the Graduate Council to receive its report and recommendations concerning the program review.
l) Preparing a written response to the dean and program which incorporates all reports.
m) Reporting to the Board of Regents as required.

4. **Graduate Council Responsibilities:** The Graduate Council is responsible for the following:

a) Appointing a qualified, full-time member of the UNR academic faculty to be representative to any program review of a department or program offering graduate programs, which member will
   1) review the self-study and other documents prior to the visit
   2) participate in the external review team visit
   3) prepare an initial written response to the graduate component of the self-study and the external reviewers’ report
   4) present the response to the full Graduate Council
b) Receiving the written response from the Graduate Council member to the graduate program review and discussing it with the provost at a Graduate Council meeting.
c) Working with the Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School, who is the Graduate Council’s representative on the Program Review
Support Team, which oversees the program review process administered by the Provost’s office and advises the provost on necessary changes.

5. **External Review Team's Responsibilities.** The external review team is responsible for the following:

a) Reviewing the itinerary prior to the visit.
b) Reviewing and signing the University Independent Contractor form establishing honoraria and expenses for the visit.
c) Reviewing the department/program self-study and other documents prior to the visit.
d) Providing a written report to the University.

The chair of the team is responsible for coordinating the efforts of the team prior to, during, and after the visit. The chair is also responsible for providing a report to the Provost within three weeks of the campus visit.

E. **Financial Responsibilities for Program Review**

Funding for review team honoraria, travel, lodging, and other miscellaneous expenses of the reviewers as well as hosting during the visit (limits apply) will be provided by the Office of the Provost.

The Office of the Provost has established honoraria rates for program reviewers and program reviewer chairs. The honoraria, plus any out-of-pocket travel, lodging, meals, and incidental expenses, must be paid through an Independent Contractor Agreement. A web version of the Independent Contractor Agreement can be found on the Controller’s website at the following link:


Amounts for travel, lodging, individual meals, and incidental expenses will vary for each reviewer based on their location and particular travel needs. In addition to the Independent Contractor Agreement, a W-9 or W-8BEN is needed. The Independent Contractor Agreement must be completed, signed, submitted, and approved PRIOR to the visit.

Social functions including one dinner may be appropriate during the review visit if time allows. Each program will be granted $250 from provost hosting funds toward hosting expenses during the visit. These include meetings during the review visit where meals, refreshments, or other hosting items are provided. Usually, the first of these hosting expenses is the opening breakfast. Department attendees to hosted meals held during the review visit will vary. However, only one dinner hosted with university funds should be held during the visit. Additionally, the number of hosted department faculty should be limited to two plus the host and the reviewers. Additional department attendees should arrange for payment of their own meals. Also, keep in mind that university guidelines regarding costs and alcoholic
beverages apply to the meals paid with university funds. These guidelines can be found in the University Administrative Manual, Section 1,067.

Accounting documents claiming these expenses, including valid receipts, must be submitted to the Office of the Provost for approval. If hosting costs exceed the $250, the program will be responsible for the extra expense. Hosted meals paid by a university employee can only be reimbursed from this amount.
II. Program Review Self-Study

The program is responsible for completing a self-study in accordance with the Program Review Self-Study Outline/Guidelines, which begin on page 10. While the guidelines may be adapted to meet the needs of a particular program, they should be followed as closely as possible. Much of the statistical information needed will be provided to the department as the review commences. The office of Institutional Analysis or Graduate School may be able to assist the department in locating additional information that will be useful in preparing the self-study. The Program Review Support Team regularly reviews this manual explaining the process and can provide feedback on draft documents and give whatever other assistance may be needed.

While these guidelines contain many questions and suggestions for useful data, the primary purpose of program review is not answering questions and providing data. Program review becomes a valuable tool for improvement when goals, objectives, outcomes, and plans are examined in the context of expectations and data.

Ideally, the self-study is authored by the entire department or a subcommittee appointed to the task. Likewise, the self-study document should be available for review by the entire department as it is being finalized and prior to the external visit.

A key component of the self-study will be data that can be examined to confirm or dispel notions about the degrees of success or the magnitude of needs. A significant amount of data can be assembled with the assistance of various offices on campus. Some data will exist only at the program level, and, in some instances, it will be recognized that data are lacking and must be obtained in the future. In addition to presenting information, data, and ideas, the self-study should include information on the performance indicators developed in the strategic planning process and the department or program’s progress on those indicators. It is also appropriate to include useful performance indicators from other groups, such as professional organizations.

Descriptions and data are important in order for readers to understand the self-study conclusions and recommendations. It is essential that careful analysis be provided in order to extract the maximum value from the process. This includes not only an examination of trends from the past to present but projections into the future. Since this is not a process for obtaining a stamp of approval, such as accreditation, but one to provide self improvement, it is encouraged that the self-study delve into the important future challenges and opportunities for the program and take advantage of both self-reflection and the expertise of the external review team.
A word of caution is in order regarding solving problems or making improvements exclusively with the use of new resources. This approach will inevitably lead to disappointment; program review is not an opportunity to list what the program can do only if the funds become available. It is expected that many solutions and improvements can be accomplished with careful planning and a focus on the most effective use of existing resources.

What follows is a brief outline of what should be addressed in the Program Review Self-Study. Additional issues and information may be included, as appropriate for your program(s).

When identifying and analyzing trends, data should be examined for the period since the last program review, typically the last seven years.

The document should be written so that it is clear to your external reviewers who may not be familiar with special terms and acronyms. A glossary of terms is included as Appendix B for your reference.
Introductory Materials: Cover page, Vital Statistics Table

Part I: Program History, Mission, and Administrative Structure

I.1 Program History

Briefly describe the historical development of the program and associated components.

I.2 Mission

Provide the program mission statement. Indicate how the program mission relates to the mission and goals of the university as a whole as shown in the most recent University Strategic Plan. If your program mission has changed during the last seven years, please describe how.

I.3 Administrative Structure and Objectives

Describe the administrative structure of the program, including formal and informal relations with other programs, institutes, centers, etc. If there have been any changes as a result of the previous program review, describe them.

What are your program’s objectives and to what extent are they being met?

I.4 Analysis

Regarding your program and/or department objectives, to what extent are they being met? Are they still the right objectives for your program or department? Why? For each of your program’s goals, how well do they align with and support the goals of your administrative unit as a whole? Include some commentary on the department or program’s mission and structure and how it is likely to evolve in the future.
Part II: Undergraduate Courses and Degree Program(s)

The purpose of this section of the self-study is to describe undergraduate program(s) and outcomes. During the review period, what has each program achieved? This includes data and information about majors, minors, service courses, interdisciplinary programs, internships, service learning, and any other activities related to the student experience in the degree program.

Data may be obtained from various sources. The Institutional Analysis Office has information and other resources that will be helpful in preparing the self-study. Results from the program’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan will provide data related to program performance. Current program assessment plans are publicly available at www.unr.edu/assessment, while previous assessment reports are available to UNR faculty with a NetID and password at https://sharepoint.unr.edu/sites/assessment. Alumni and Employer survey data are also available at https://apps.unr.edu/AlumniSurvey/secure/Login.

You may use additional data maintained by the program office, if deemed necessary. Regional and national trend data should be included.

II.1 Undergraduate program organization, objectives, and effectiveness

Identify the undergraduate degrees, majors, options, minors, interdisciplinary programs, certificates, etc. offered. Identify service courses that are offered for other programs as well as courses your program uses from other programs, including the Core Curriculum. Comment on any changes as a result of the previous program review.

Provide information on course offerings. Examples of data to include are how full-time and part-time faculty are allocated, size of classes, frequency with which required and elective courses are taught, and other parameters that describe the program quality and the alignment of the program offerings with student demand.

Provide the student learning outcomes for each degree program as contained in the program’s assessment plan. What are the results of discipline-based assessment of student learning in the program? Also provide student learning outcomes for each course offered by the department.

Comment on any innovative teaching or course delivery methods that have been used, successfully or otherwise, to improve the effectiveness of the program. Include student opportunities outside of regular classes.

Describe any changes that affect the accessibility of the program for students. Examples might include use of technology, scheduling, or instructional techniques or new delivery methods such as online courses.

II.2 Undergraduate Students

Provide information on the quality, number and diversity of students entering the undergraduate programs. Include data on entering freshmen and transfer students from other
programs or other institutions. Quality indicators might include entering grade point average and/or test scores on placement exams, remedial courses taken, faculty recommendations or other criteria.

Characterize the flow of students through the program with information such as the number of students in the various lower and upper division levels and time-to-degree. How is student progress monitored? How does the program or department measure retention in its program or programs? (See the glossary at the end of these guidelines for a definition of terms.)

Describe the methods for recruiting students into your program. Include efforts to recruit underrepresented groups, students from out of state, and international students.

To what extent do students enhance their academic program beyond regular courses? Examples might include internships, research/creative activity, service learning, study abroad, student disciplinary-based clubs or honoraries, professional organizations, research or teaching assistantships, etc.

Provide a description of the academic advising and mentoring in the program.

Provide information on the success of your graduates in terms of employment, continued academic advancement, awards, etc., and how that information is obtained. Provide as complete as possible a summary of graduates over the last 7 years and their employment history or placement in professional or graduate programs.

II.3 Analysis

Provide an analysis of the undergraduate programs and outcomes. It is important to analyze the data provided earlier in relation to your program goals and objectives. What has the program achieved with respect to majors, minors, service courses, interdisciplinary programs, internships, service learning, and other experiences related to the student experience in the program?

Regarding the curriculum for each program, provide an analysis of the course offerings and how they contribute to the overall design of each program. What has been learned from the program’s assessment plans and results regarding student learning outcomes? How has the assessment information been used to change the program or programs since the last program review, and what are the effects or impacts of the changes?

To what extent does the curriculum meet current and future student needs? Are the retention and time-to-degree numbers appropriate for your program and students?

Provide an assessment of the effectiveness of academic advising and mentoring in the program.

Consider information provided on the enrollments, retention, and success of graduates in Section II.2. Analyze the information to discover any trends or shifts and what these might
mean. Where possible, compare this information to similar sized programs in the US and also to the top-rated programs in the US.
Part III: Graduate Courses and Degree Program(s)

III.1 Graduate program organization, objectives and effectiveness
Provide an overview of the objectives and mission of your graduate program.

Summarize the relation of the graduate program to the needs of the state, nation, and other programs if this has changed since the program was first initiated. Describe any significant changes to the program organization or objectives since the last program review.

Identify the graduate degrees, majors, options, certificates, and interdisciplinary programs contributing to the graduate program. Identify any graduate level service courses that are offered for other programs as well as courses your program uses from other programs.

Provide a summary of the program’s advisement policies and procedures for resolution of any student/advisor conflicts. Describe the advising, mentoring, and thesis direction procedures used in the program. Identify the number of graduate faculty in the program, number of faculty members actively advising, mentoring, or directing theses for students at this time, average number of students assigned to each active faculty, standard deviation of advisees per faculty, and historical trends in these numbers. Describe the student governance and participation in the program and in curriculum development.

Describe the course offerings and how they contribute to the overall design of the curriculum.

Describe the methodologies used to develop curriculum and plans of study for graduate students.

What, if any, specific courses or listed electives are required for each degree? The Program Review should include the frequency with which required and critical elective courses are offered.

Describe the administrative structure of the graduate program and its relation to department structure. What resources are used to administer the graduate program, and how are these resources allocated?

Describe student-learning outcomes as contained in the program’s assessment plan and how these are incorporated into any revisions. Also provide student learning outcomes for each graduate course offered by the department.

Specific information should include time to completion of master’s and doctoral degrees. Comparison of these statistics to the top rated programs in the discipline should be included. *(Note that time to degree should only be compared to other similar disciplines and should not be used to rate dissimilar programs or fields).*
III.2 Graduate Students

Provide the number of students at master’s and doctoral level and total number of students. Provide information on the quality and diversity of students entering the graduate program. Quality indicators could include entering GPAs, undergraduate degree-granting institutions, GRE or GMAT scores, faculty recommendations, and student awards.

Provide a description of recruiting and admissions procedures of the graduate program. This should also include recruiting efforts and successes for underrepresented groups, out-of-state students and international students.

Describe the historical trends in graduate student assistance (TA’s, RA’s, Internships, etc.) over the last 7 years. *(Include any shifts to RA support from TA support.)*

To what extent do students enhance their academic courses through seminar or speaker series, internships, study abroad, attending professional conferences, etc?

Provide quantitative and qualitative measures of student research output, such as publications, professional presentations, citation indicators, and student awards over the past 7 years.

Provide as complete as possible a summary of graduates over the last 7 years and their employment history or, as relates to master’s degree students, acceptance to other doctoral programs. How are their successes monitored? Compare this summary to similar sized programs in the US and also to the top rated programs in the US.

III.3 Analysis

Provide an analysis of the graduate programs and outcomes. It is important to analyze the data provided earlier in relation to your program goals and objectives. What has the program achieved with respect to majors, service courses, interdisciplinary programs, internships, service learning, and other experiences related to the student experience in the program?

Regarding the curriculum for each program, provide an analysis of the course offerings and how they contribute to the overall design of each program. What has been learned from the program’s assessment plans and results regarding student learning outcomes? How has the assessment information been used to change the program or programs since the last program review, and what are the effects or impacts of the changes?

To what extent does the curriculum meet current and future student needs? Are the retention and time to degree numbers appropriate for your program and students?

Provide an assessment of the effectiveness of academic advising, mentoring, and thesis direction in the program.

Consider information provided on the enrollments, retention, and success of graduates in Section II. Analyze the information to discover any trends or shifts and what these might
mean. Where possible, compare this information to similar sized programs in the US and also to the top-rated programs in the US.

For any graduate programs, consider the recruiting and admissions procedures, including those for underrepresented groups, out-of-state students, and international students. Have these been successful? If not, how might they be improved?
Part IV: Faculty

IV.1 Faculty Composition and Workloads

Describe the faculty in terms of rank, tenure status, degrees held, gender, ethnicity, and discipline specialties. Include similar information for non-regular faculty (e.g., part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, etc.). Curriculum vitae for faculty, with an emphasis on achievements during the last seven years, should be provided in an appendix or as an exhibit to the self-study.

Describe the faculty allocation of responsibilities in the program for teaching, faculty scholarship or artistry, mentoring and advising, graduate and undergraduate research or creative work, committee or administrative work, etc. Include regular faculty as well as part-time, letter of appointment, teaching assistants, and adjunct faculty. To what extent does the allocation of faculty resources meet the needs and objectives of the programs? Are changes planned?

Describe searches for new faculty during the last seven years. Include whether the position was new or a replacement, the extent of the search, the number of applicants, and how the new hire complements the program.

IV.2 Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, Outreach, and Professional Service

Describe the research, scholarship, creative activity, outreach, and professional service of the faculty in the manner most appropriate for your discipline and consistent with your program mission and goals. Include outreach that is related to your program objectives as well as professional consulting. Describe the overall productivity on research, scholarship, creative activity, and professional service of faculty in the program over the past seven years.

Comment on the extent to which undergraduate and graduate students are involved in these activities. Describe how external support to students has been provided in the past and will be provided in the future.

IV.3 Analysis

Provide an analysis of the faculty resources for the program. To what extent does the allocation of faculty resources meet the needs and objectives of the programs? Are changes warranted?

Has the discipline changed? How have faculty responded to the change? How have your hiring strategies or strategic planning changed?

Considering the research, scholarship, creative activity, and professional service of faculty over the past seven years, what has been the impact of these efforts? How does this productivity compare to programs to which you aspire? How does this productivity compare to performance indicators set forth in the department, college and university strategic plan?
Part V: Program Resources, Physical Plant, and Facilities

Describe the funding sources (state, grants/contracts, endowments, etc.) available to support the program activities.

Describe the physical facilities, including information technology, and support services used by the program. Describe changes that have taken place during the past seven years.
Part VI: Future Plans

Summarize the strengths and challenges for the program and describe how they have been or will be addressed. Provide any appropriate planning documents, including data related to performance indicators that will be used to measure progress.

Considering the trends and analysis of the flow of students through the program, what are future plans for improving enrollments, retention, and time to degree, if any?

Provide projections for faculty, curricular changes, research activities, facilities, and other important future needs and describe how these projections will be addressed both with and without new resources.

List three or four changes that are planned for program improvement during the next few years.
The external review team that will come to the campus for a site visit is appointed by the Executive Vice President & Provost in consultation with the Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education, the Dean, the Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School, and the Chair/Program Director. The purpose of the external review visit is to provide an opportunity for carefully selected professionals to review the work of the program, discuss their findings and recommendations, and assist the program in the development of means to improve its effectiveness. The external review team is responsible for submitting a report within three weeks of the visit. See The External Review Report section of this manual beginning on page 23.

Prior to completion of the self-study and no later than September 30, a list of at least five potential reviewers from other institutions, who are recognized in their field, should be provided by the program. Recommended reviewers should reflect the various academic areas covered by the department or program. Professional organizations and specialized accrediting bodies frequently have a roster of qualified reviewers. Potential reviewers should be contacted by a representative of the program to ascertain their willingness to serve, and recommendations are to be forwarded to the vice provost, undergraduate education and dean, accompanied by curriculum vitae for each reviewer. Since the university seeks to avoid any conflicts of interest, the department or program should indicate any personal or professional relationships the department chair or program director has with any of the proposed reviewers. Two to three reviewers will be approved by the provost, one of which will be designated as chair to lead in the review process and prepare the final report following the campus visit. Letters requesting reviewers to serve will be sent by the provost, and the dean and department will be contacted when the team is complete.
A. Itinerary for External Review Team Visit

The external review team will spend 1 ½ to two days on campus discussing the self-study and related information with administrators, faculty, staff, advisory groups, students, and others related to the department/program. The itinerary should be developed by the program or department in consultation with appropriate campus personnel as well as with the chair of the external review team. When scheduling the entrance and exit meetings and the individual meetings with university representatives, it is important to consult with their calendar keepers well in advance of the visit to ensure their availability. It is important to provide time(s) for the reviewers to meet alone, especially at least one hour prior to the exit meeting.

A preliminary itinerary should be prepared and available with the self-study document by January 15. This will allow time for any necessary additions or changes once participants have had a chance to review the document. A sample itinerary is provided as Appendix E.

Listed below are itinerary participants who must be involved; others may be added if needed.

**Itinerary Participants**

**Initial breakfast meeting of the team with the following group:**
Executive Vice President & Provost
Vice President for Research and Innovation
Vice Provost, Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School
Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Dean of the College
Director of the School in which the department is located, if applicable

**Meeting of the team with the following individuals:**
Dean of the College
Director of a School in which the department is located, if applicable
Department Chair/Program Director

**Meetings of the team or individual team members with:**
Department/Program Faculty
Faculty in related or served programs
Graduate Council program review representative (if applicable)
Vice President for Research and Innovation
Vice Provost, Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School
Student representatives
Alumni (if available)
Employers of graduates (if available)
Advisory groups (if applicable)
Others, as appropriate

Exit meeting of the team with the following group:
Executive Vice President & Provost
Vice President for Research and Innovation
Vice Provost, Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School
Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Dean of the College
Coordinator, General Education and University Assessment
Director, Academic Affairs
Outline for External Review Team Reports
The external review team visit is the culmination of an extensive process of self-examination by the program. External reviewers are chosen to provide feedback from a broader perspective and to provide guidance to the program and the administration.

At the closing/exit meeting, the external review team should provide a verbal outline of the external review report and the major topics to be addressed. The final written report should be submitted within three weeks.

The final external review report should include commendations as well as recommendations. In particular, the reviewers should examine and comment on the department’s analysis of its use of resources, as well as the relevance and viability of the program, included anticipated demand and trends in enrollment. Suggestions as to how the program should be evaluated using external measures or standards will be helpful. There should be a special emphasis on improvements that require no new resources. Both the dean and the program faculty will have an opportunity to respond to the external reviewers’ report before the entire process is concluded.

As a suggestion, the final report might be organized in the following manner:

I. Department/Program Strengths

II. Department/Program Weaknesses

III. Strategies for Improvement

IV. A list of recommendations that would require no additional resources

V. Evaluation of the external review process/site visit/self-study document
VI. Program Review Follow-Up

Following receipt of the external reviewers’ report, staff in the provost’s office will post the report on the NevadaBox site for access by all administrators involved in the review including the Provost; Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education; Dean; School Director; Chair/Director; Vice President for Research and Innovation; Vice Provost, Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School; Coordinator, General Education and University Assessment; and Graduate Council representative for the program review. Responses from the Dean and Department Chair will also be requested. In addition, if applicable, the Provost will meet with the Graduate Council to receive its input on the program review.

Following submission of all responses and input, a follow-up meeting of the Provost and administrators involved in the review will be scheduled by the Provost’s office to discuss the program review. Following that meeting, the Provost will prepare a memorandum with a summary of conclusions and recommendations and forward it to the department, with a copy to the Dean.

In the fall of each year, the provost’s office submits a Summary Report of the University’s program reviews to the Board of Regents. The report format is as follows:

I. Description of the Program
II. Review Process and Criteria
III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Review
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Program Review Support Team

Contact People

Joseph Cline, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education, MS 0005, Phone 784-1740, e-mail cline@unr.edu.

David Zeh, Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School, MS 0326, Phone 784-6869, e-mail zehd@unr.edu.

Arthur Chenin, Institutional Analysis, MS 0118, Phone 784-4546, e-mail achenin@unr.edu.

Audrey M. Casey, Director, Academic Affairs, MS 0005, Phone 682-7483, e-mail acasey@unr.edu.

Russell Stone, Director, University Assessment & Accreditation, MS 1005, Phone 682-7489, e-mail crstone@unr.edu.

Links and Websites

Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents Handbook section on Program Review:

http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/T4CH14NSHEPlanningProgramReviewArticulationandEnrollment(1).pdf

Provost Office Website:
http://www.unr.edu/provost

University of Nevada, Reno, Office of Institutional Analysis:
http://www.unr.edu/ia

Current program assessment plans are publicly available at http://www.unr.edu/assessment/plans-and-forms, while previous assessment reports are available to UNR faculty with NetID and password at https://sharepoint.unr.edu/sites/assessment. UNR alumni, graduation, and employer survey results (searchable by department, degree, and year) can be accessed by NetID login at https://apps.unr.edu/AlumniSurvey/secure/Login.

If you experience any problems accessing the above material, please contact Russell Stone at crstone@unr.edu.

You have been provided with FY2014 data (available to date) for awards and expenditures. The Office of Sponsored Projects posts previous years' reports at www.unr.edu/sponsored-projects/reports.
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Program Review Terms/Definitions:

**program review** - refers to an examination process by a department offering academic programs. This examination process includes data and information gathering, analysis, professional dialog among faculty, an external reviewer visit, reports and responses, and a final memorandum of direction from the provost.

**academic program** – a cohesive arrangement of college-level credit courses which in part or in its entirety lead towards the awarding of a degree or certificate. These include undergraduate bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees as well as minors and certificates. Academic programs are subject to the program review process.

**final memorandum** - A document from the provost to the department or program outlining the expected actions and directions for addressing issues found during the program review.

**program review master schedule** – a spreadsheet maintained by the provost’s office listing all academic programs and designating the academic year in which the academic program will go through the academic program review process.

**self-study** – a written document containing a systematic and thorough examination of an academic program’s components in light of guidelines contained in the program review manual.

**regular faculty** – as defined in Section 2.3.2 of the University’s bylaws:

a. “Academic faculty” means instructional, research, and library faculty as defined by the Board of Regents. These faculty shall possess at least the master's degree or its equivalent in the appropriate academic discipline, unless the President waives this requirement.

   (i) “Tenured faculty” means members of the professional staff who have received appointments with tenure.
   (ii) “Tenure-track faculty” means academic faculty who are on probationary status, and who are eligible to be considered for tenure.
   (iii) “Nontenure-track faculty” means academic faculty who are not eligible for tenure.

b. “Administrative faculty” means those professional staff employed in executive, supervisory or support positions, as defined by the Board of Regents. These faculty shall possess at least the bachelor's degree or its equivalent, unless the President waives this requirement.

The following definitions are to guide the use of student enrollment indicators in the self-study. If different terminology is required (e.g., to follow established indicators within a discipline or used by a pertinent association), it should be clearly defined.
time-to-degree or graduation - Generally defined as the amount of time it takes a student to complete a designated program or course of study. Time-to-degree is normally measured and reported as the “normal or conventional” time-to-degree, “reasonable time-to-degree” and “extended time-to-degree.”

a. Normal (conventional) time-to-degree is the period in which students at an institution complete all of the requirements for a degree or certificate according to the institution’s catalog. IPEDS/GRS defines normal time-to-degree as four years (8 semesters or trimesters, or 12 quarters, excluding summer terms) for a bachelor’s degree, two years (four semesters or trimesters, or 6 quarters excluding summer) for an associate’s degree; and the scheduled times for certificate programs.

b. Reasonable time-to-degree: that period of time that normally reflects 150% of the normal time-to-degree. For a four-year bachelor’s degree, the reasonable time-to-degree is six years.

c. Eventual time-to-degree is defined by the Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting (JCAR) as the point at which 95% of a cohort has graduated. The time required to complete a graduate degree may be measured in three different ways:

1. Total time-to-degree: Number of years between the awarding of the baccalaureate degree and the attainment of the advanced degree and is used by the National Research Council in its Survey of Earned Doctorates.

2. Elapsed time-to-degree: Time from entry into your graduate program to the awarding of the degree.

3. Registered time-to-degree: Time during which student was registered in your graduate program, excluding any time taken off between enrollment (stop out time).

The cohort from which the graduation rate is derived must be clearly defined (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, new vs. continuing vs. transfer students, etc.)

retention rate - Student retention is generally defined as the number of incoming students who remain throughout the formal completion of their course of study. It may be measured from semester-to-semester, from year-to-year, or from entry-to-degree attainment. Typically it includes first-time freshmen, full-time students, or all students (Source: 1990 Chancellor’s Office Report). The rate is often expressed as a percentage of an entering class, which enrolls for each succeeding academic year and graduates within the same time period. For the purpose of program review, a student who re-enrolls, but in a different program, is not retained by the program (though the student is retained by the institution). The cohort from which the retention rate is derived must be clearly defined (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, new vs. continuing vs. transfer students etc.)

persistence - Refers to students who are continuously enrolled at UNR or at other institutions we can track students to. Persistence measures refer to measuring a student’s continued enrollment at an institution of higher learning, either this university or at any other institution of higher learning.

graduation - From the NCAA Graduation Rates Disclosure Form Instructions 1995:
The freshman-cohort graduation rate compares the number of students who graduate from your institution within six years of their entrance to the number who were in the original freshman cohort for the given year. The rate does not include transfers; it divides the number
graduated by the number enrolled in the cohort year. For graduate programs, clearly define a new-student cohort in terms of credit hour load (full-time vs. part-time).

**stop out** - A student who left the program and returned at a later date. Defined as a previously enrolled student who subsequently does not enroll, with or without notice, for a period of at least one regular academic term (excluding summer). A student who is not yet re-enrolled, but is believed to do so (in an ascertainable way), may be counted as a stop out. A more general definition describes the process as the period of time when a student stops attending the institution. Usually the student is in good academic standing but chooses to stop for financial, health, employment, or other personal reasons. The stop out rate should be clearly defined (e.g., including/excluding not yet re-enrolled students).

**drop out** - A student who has been enrolled and fails to re-enroll for the succeeding term, excluding summer terms. The student, by definition, will not have completed the degree or certificate objectives of the program in which he/she was enrolled. Unlike a stopped out student, a dropped out student has not re-enrolled after a specified number of elapsed (non-enrolled) terms and is believed will not return.
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**final memorandum** - A document from the provost to the department or program outlining the expected actions and directions for addressing issues found during the program review.
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The following definitions are to guide the use of student enrollment indicators in the self-study. If different terminology is required (e.g., to follow established indicators within a discipline or used by a pertinent association), it should be clearly defined.
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1. Total time-to-degree: Number of years between the awarding of the baccalaureate degree and the attainment of the advanced degree and is used by the National Research Council in its Survey of Earned Doctorates.
2. Elapsed time-to-degree: Time from entry into your graduate program to the awarding of the degree.
3. Registered time-to-degree: Time during which student was registered in your graduate program, excluding any time taken off between enrollment (stop out time).

The cohort from which the graduation rate is derived must be clearly defined (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, new vs. continuing vs. transfer students, etc.)

retention rate - Student retention is generally defined as the number of incoming students who remain throughout the formal completion of their course of study. It may be measured from semester-to-semester, from year-to-year, or from entry-to-degrees attainment. Typically it includes first-time freshmen, full-time students, or all students (Source: 1990 Chancellor’s Office Report). The rate is often expressed as a percentage of an entering class, which enrolls for each succeeding academic year and graduates within the same time period. For the purpose of program review, a student who re-enrolls, but in a different program, is not retained by the program (though the student is retained by the institution). The cohort from which the retention rate is derived must be clearly defined (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, new vs. continuing vs. transfer students etc.)

persistence - Refers to students who are continuously enrolled at UNR or at other institutions we can track students to. Persistence measures refer to measuring a student’s continued enrollment at an institution of higher learning, either this university or at any other institution of higher learning.

graduation - From the NCAA Graduation Rates Disclosure Form Instructions 1995: The freshman-cohort graduation rate compares the number of students who graduate from your institution within six years of their entrance to the number who were in the original freshman cohort for the given year. The rate does not include transfers; it divides the number
graduated by the number enrolled in the cohort year. For graduate programs, clearly define a new-student cohort in terms of credit hour load (full-time vs. part-time).

**stop out** - A student who left the program and returned at a later date. Defined as a previously enrolled student who subsequently does not enroll, with or without notice, for a period of at least one regular academic term (excluding summer). A student who is not yet re-enrolled, but is believed to do so (in an ascertainable way), may be counted as a stop out. A more general definition describes the process as the period of time when a student stops attending the institution. Usually the student is in good academic standing but chooses to stop for financial, health, employment, or other personal reasons. The stop out rate should be clearly defined (e.g., including/excluding not yet re-enrolled students)

**drop out** - A student who has been enrolled and fails to re-enroll for the succeeding term, excluding summer terms. The student, by definition, will not have completed the degree or certificate objectives of the program in which he/she was enrolled. Unlike a stopped out student, a dropped out student has not re-enrolled after a specified number of elapsed (non-enrolled) terms and is believed will not return.
# Program Review Timeline

**Appendix C**

**To be completed by:** Name  
**Deadline:** Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done?</th>
<th>Department/Unit</th>
<th>Date by:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive startup memo</td>
<td>July/August</td>
<td>Bring any dept. representatives who will work on the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend Program Review Orientation</td>
<td>Fall of each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemble self-study report team</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>Department faculty &amp; staff who will prepare self-study report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine possible external review team members</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact possible external review team members</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>Phone/email to determine willingness and general availability to serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forward names of review team nominees to dean &amp; vice provost, undergraduate education</td>
<td>30-Sep</td>
<td>Include CVs &amp; contact information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine possible external review dates</td>
<td>30-Nov</td>
<td>Work with director, academic affairs to suggest possible dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forward preliminary self-study to Dean; Vice Provost</td>
<td>30-Nov</td>
<td>Send to dean &amp; vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute final self-study to reviewers &amp; others</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>Send to director, academic affairs for posting on DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange visit schedule meetings/prepare schedule</td>
<td>15-Feb</td>
<td>Send to director, academic affairs for posting on DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Review Visit</td>
<td>Before March 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide response to external review report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
<td>Send to director, academic affairs for posting on DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend follow-up meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also attended by dean, provost, vice provosts, and others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done?</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Date by:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive copy of startup memo</td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consult with Vice Provost on External Review team membership</td>
<td>15-Oct</td>
<td>Submitted by chair w/ CVs &amp; contact information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Self-study</td>
<td>15-Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in External Review Visit</td>
<td>Before March 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive/Review External Review Report</td>
<td>Before April 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide response to external review report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks</td>
<td>Send to director, academic affairs for posting on DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend follow-up meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also attended by chair, provost, vice provosts, and others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done?</th>
<th>Graduate Council</th>
<th>Date by:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoints representative to Program Review</td>
<td>by January 1</td>
<td>Inform director, academic affairs of liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative reviews self-study</td>
<td>30-Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative participates in External Review Visit</td>
<td>Before March 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive/Consider report from representative</td>
<td>by 8/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses report w/ Provost at a meeting</td>
<td>by 8/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done?</th>
<th>Provost's Office</th>
<th>Date by:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue program review startup memos</td>
<td>July/August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize &amp; offer Program Review Orientation</td>
<td>Early fall of each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides data and prior program review info.</td>
<td>July/August</td>
<td>Posted to DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepares and send formal invites to reviewers</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Sent by director, academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works with Dept. and Reviewers to establish visit date</td>
<td>October/November</td>
<td>By director, academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranges travel, lodging for reviewers; prepares reviewer contracts</td>
<td>December/January</td>
<td>By director, academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure review schedule is received from department</td>
<td>30 days prior to visit</td>
<td>Posted to DropBox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in External Review Visit</td>
<td>Before March 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive external review report &amp; makes available</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks</td>
<td>Posts to Shared Drop Box Folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange for payment/reimbursement of reviewers</td>
<td>Within 30 days of visit</td>
<td>By director, academic affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive dept. &amp; dean responses to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable, meet w/ Grad. Council for input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule follow-up meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide formal closing memo to Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete final report to Board of Regents</td>
<td>Fall of each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Department/Program Name - Program Review

**University of Nevada, Reno - _____ _____ - __, 20__**

## Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>7:30-9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Breakfast Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Please specify location: (Usually, restaurant at reviewers' hotel.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Kevin Carman (Provost), Joe Cline (Vice Provost), David Zeh (Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School), Mridul Gautam (Vice President, Research &amp; Innovation), (Dean, ___), and (if applicable) __________ (Director, School of ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1/2 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Current students (undergraduates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Faculty in related or served programs (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1/2 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Graduate Council liaison (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Prepare for Dinner</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Dinner w/ Chair + 2 Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Name/Org./Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 - 1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>Lunch/Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:45</td>
<td>Exit Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Departure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Review team meets to prepare for exit interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Review team meets to prepare for exit interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Location: tba</td>
<td>Review team meets to prepare for exit interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Airline</th>
<th>Flight No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Cell phones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Cell phones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Cell phones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Cell phones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Cell phones</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>