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Overview of the University of Nevada, Reno

The University of Nevada was founded in 1874 in Elko as the state’s first institution of higher education. Relocated to Reno in 1887, the University remained the state’s only institution of higher education for 75 years. The first building on the Reno campus, Morrill Hall, is still in use today and the campus has grown from a small cluster of buildings surrounding a central quadrangle (modeled after Thomas Jefferson’s design for the University of Virginia) to a 200-plus acre site just north of downtown Reno. The University is one of eight institutions of higher education governed by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).

The University is the state’s historic flagship institution of higher education. It is also the state’s land-grant institution and this distinction necessitates that the University maintain a statewide presence. The University ranks among the top research institutions nationally according to the Carnegie Foundation’s listing of colleges and universities. With more than 100 graduate degree programs, more than $120 million in external grants and contracts, and a faculty whose educational experiences include the top research institutions in the world, the University is already a significant institution of scholarship and learning. Its research capacity and activity continues to grow at a rapid pace.

Student enrollment totaled 16,663 in fall 2006 including approximately 3,200 graduate students. (Enrollment has increased by 25 percent since the University’s last accreditation report.) Baccalaureate degrees are offered in 76 disciplines and more than 100 graduate degree programs (77 master’s and 43 doctoral programs) from which students may choose. In 2005-2006, the University granted 1,972 Baccalaureate, 552 Masters, 98 PhD/EdD, and 54 Doctor of Medicine degrees. Degrees are awarded through nine colleges:

- Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources
- Business Administration
- Education
- Engineering
- Health and Human Sciences
- Reynolds School of Journalism
- Liberal Arts
- Medicine
- Science

Additionally, Cooperative Extension is a non-degree-granting college. Several schools exist as sub-units of the colleges, including the Schools of Nursing, Public Health, and Social Work in Health and Human Sciences; the School of the Arts and the School of Social Research and Justice Studies in Liberal Arts; and the Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering in the College of Science. Further organizational specialization is provided through a myriad of centers and programs. The Academy for the Environment is a recent addition that coordinates the institution’s multiple and interdisciplinary strengths in environmental studies. The University also works with The National Judicial College, a separate non-profit organization located on the University’s campus, and the Desert Research Institute, a separate institutional member of NSHE, to augment degree opportunities, especially at the graduate level.

Statewide Outreach

As the state’s land-grant institution, Nevada is mandated by the state constitution to offer instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts (engineering), government, and mining. Its agricultural, liberal arts, and mining programs spawned the earliest academic colleges at the University, later followed by education, engineering and business in the 1950s, medicine in the late 1960s, journalism in the 1980s, and human and community sciences in the 1990s. The University of Nevada Cooperative Extension was created in 1914 as part of the agriculture college, a
result of the federal Smith-Lever Act, and then made into an independent college in 1993.

Beyond its main campus, the University boasts programs and activities in all 17 counties of the state. It has more than 700 employees outside the Reno area, most of them in Las Vegas. The University of Nevada School of Medicine is a vital component of the University, with campuses in both of Nevada’s major urban centers, Las Vegas and Reno, and a health network that extends to much of rural Nevada. The University plays a critical role in the promotion of health throughout the state through its Schools of Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health.

The University also has responsibility to maintain a number of statewide programs that provide service and research support to constituents across the state. These programs include, among others, the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station, the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, the Nevada Small Business Development Center, the University of Nevada Oral History Program, the Center for Basque Studies, the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, the Nevada Seismological Laboratory, and the Nevada Center for Ethics and Health Policy.

### Student Demographics

Roughly two-thirds of the University’s students come from northern Nevada, including almost half, or 48 percent, from the University’s home county, Washoe County. Another 13 percent of its students come from the Las Vegas area (Clark County). The University attracts students from all 49 other states, totaling 16 percent of the student population (more than half of whom are from California), and has 697 international students (4.2 percent) from 39 foreign countries. The most rapidly growing group of undergraduates is from Las Vegas: more than 500 came as new freshmen in fall 2005, an increase of more than 100 from the previous fall. About one-sixth of the student population is made up of students of color, and more than 55 percent of all students are female.

The average high school grade point average for entering freshmen is moving upward and is currently 3.36, compared to 3.20 prior to implementation of the Millennium Scholarship five years ago. Entering freshmen average a composite score of 22.4 on the ACT and 1059 on the SAT (526 Verbal, 533 Math), the latter is up from 1043 prior to the Millennium Scholarship program; a scholarship program specifically designed to enhance the college persistence rate of Nevada high school students.

The tuition for Nevada resident undergraduates is among the lowest in the western United States and reflects the Board of Regents’ and state legislature’s policy to provide access to as many Nevada high school graduates as are qualified. For example, the resident undergraduate tuition and fees total $2,850, which is lower than all but one of 13 western states. Non-resident undergraduate tuition and fees total $11,524 which is at the median for the western states.

### Faculty Demographics

The faculty of the University is exceptionally well-qualified, with 94 percent of tenured or tenure-track faculty and 79 percent of the full-time faculty holding the highest degrees attainable in their respective fields. More than 50 percent of the faculty have been hired during the past 10 years, reflecting the initial retirements of the “baby boomer” generation of faculty and general growth of the University. Faculty-initiated research grants and contracts have increased 600 percent during the past 15 years, a result of attracting world-class faculty members.

At present, 37 percent of the University’s 875 full-time academic faculty members are female, with 15 percent comprised of people of color. The University’s administrative faculty includes 53 percent women and 16 percent people of color.
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Preparing for Reaccreditation

Groundwork for the reaccreditation self-study began in February 2005, when the University sent six people to the NWCCU workshop on accreditation. In August 2005, then University President John Lilley and Provost John Frederick, appointed Eric Herzik to direct the University’s reaccreditation effort. In consultation with the Provost, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Bill Cathey, and in meetings with key campus governing groups including the Faculty Senate and Staff Employees’ Council, a plan for organizing the self-study was developed largely following guidance from the NWCCU workshop sessions and in line with specific conditions on the University campus.

The self-study process was fairly decentralized with the ultimate goal of emphasizing openness to and input from the campus community. One of the first documents created as part of the self-study process was an accreditation overview (CD ES 1.1: Accreditation Overview). The overview, which was distributed at multiple campus meetings and on the University’s accreditation webpage, briefly outlined the purpose of accreditation and the scope of the NWCCU standards. It also noted that the end product was to be an “evidence based assessment...that affords the campus an opportunity to accurately, candidly, and directly identify the strengths, weaknesses and achievements of the institution.” The overview stressed “[T]here must be considerable faculty, staff and even student involvement with the preparation of the self-study.” Accompanying the overview was a calendar (CD ES 1.2: Accreditation Calendar) outlining various “due dates” for completion of key milestones of the self-study. Campus forums and how academic units would be integrated into the process were also outlined.
During the 2005 fall semester chairpersons were named to head the data collection and writing of the nine standards in the NWCCU Handbook. An overall Steering Committee consisting of the Standard Committee Chairs and other key individuals (i.e. the campus Accreditation Liaison Officer, Director of University Assessment, Director of Institutional Analysis) was formed. This group began meeting on a regular basis (about every three weeks) in January 2006. In February 2006 a second group attended the NWCCU workshop sessions in Seattle. Also in fall 2005, the Director of Reaccreditation met with multiple campus groups and constituencies to outline the accreditation self-study process and solicit input on how to achieve the widest possible involvement from the campus. Feedback from these meetings led to several additions to the process and the increased involvement of key individuals and groups (i.e. the Nevada Faculty Alliance) in the process.

Each Standard Chair formed a working committee. These Standard Committees varied in their size and approach to the tasks — a variation that matches the vast differences in topical matter and length of the nine NWCCU standards. The University had a slight advantage in that all colleges and academic departments (and like administrative units) had developed comprehensive strategic plans in the previous 18 months. College-level strategic plans were also under yearly review by a newly established University Planning Council (UPC). Academic units developed Assessment Plans and were to be filing Assessment Reports on the implementation of these plans during this same time frame. Thus, there was an existing body of unit-level analyses available for each committee. These unit analyses were then augmented by specific data gathering efforts and compilation of reports conducted by each Standard Committee throughout the 2006 calendar year.

In addition to the focused activity of each Standard Committee, the accreditation process conducted two campus-wide activities designed to engage and solicit input from the entire campus community. Beginning in spring 2006, a series of five forums was hosted that focused on key issues linked to the NWCCU Standards. The forums were formally moderated by Professor Michael Havercamp, who was the Chair of Standard Nine “Institutional Integrity.”

A campus-wide survey was also implemented in September-October 2006. The self-study effort revealed that the University has developed considerable resources for generating data of specific outputs and outcomes. However, parts of nearly every NWCCU Standard also seek more subjective indicators of performance. (An example of such subjective measuring is found in the very first element in Standard 1.A, which asks if the institution’s mission and goals are “widely understood” by the campus community.) This more subjective and evaluative data is virtually non-existent on campus as no regular, comprehensive or methodologically structured attitudes survey had ever been conducted. Working with the Office of University Assessment (OUA) a set of survey questions and methodology was developed. Four distinct campus constituencies were identified: Academic Faculty; Administrative Faculty; Faculty with limited or non-traditional teaching duties (largely those in the School of Medicine, Libraries, and Cooperative Extension); and Staff. All groups were asked a set of common questions relating to key parts of University governance, policies, mission and climate. Each group was also asked questions that were unique to their particular roles on campus. Whenever possible, question wording matched national survey items (such as the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute’s faculty survey) so that broader comparisons could be made. The survey administration was web-based and anonymous. Indeed, very little standard demographic information was collected to further safeguard anonymity. Hard copy surveys were delivered to those individuals (approximately 350) who did not have ready access to the web. In total, 1,467 responses were recorded. The response rates by category were: Academic Faculty (55.3%); Administrative Faculty (56.4%); Medicine/Library (37.7%); Staff (44.8%); with an overall response rate of 49.2 percent.
The campus survey provided a wealth of information across multiple topics in the NWCCU Standards. The survey also directly addressed issues that were very salient immediately prior to its implementation concerning campus climate. (These campus climate issues are discussed in more detail in Standard Nine.) As plagues any survey, the responses are a “snapshot” that are influenced by the specifics surrounding the timing of the survey’s implementation. Still, the perceived value of the survey may be reflected in its widespread use in the Standard reports and the recommendation by three standards that UNR conduct such campus assessments on a regular basis.

Each Standard Committee was responsible for the drafting of a specific report addressing the elements of its NWCCU Standard. Drafts were posted on the accreditation webpage for campus review (beginning in December 2006 and running through May 2007) as well as being made available for review by specific committees and administrators. Drafts were reviewed for consistency and style by a team from the reaccreditation office. However, the steering committee decided early on that more formal editing designed to produce a “single voice” or mandated style might negate the work done over the previous 18 months by the separate standard committees. Thus, the standards show some variation in tone as befits the complexity and diversity of the campus that produced them. The general format of the document is that each Standard element is addressed in order. Documents are referenced in text with abbreviations to the type of document as listed in the NWCCU Handbook. A list of documents is presented at the end of each Standard. Documents were prepared in both electronic and hardcopy format whenever possible.

Institutional Context: Addressing the 1997 Accreditation Report

The 1997 evaluation committee highlighted two areas in which the University of Nevada, Reno needed to make marked improvement: assessment and advising. These two items were subject to a focused interim study in 2002. In both areas the University has made significant changes that address the scope, content and spirit of the evaluation.

In terms of assessment, the 2002 interim report noted significant progress had been made in assessment and that the University should continue to press for full implementation of the University Assessment Plan. (The assessment plan is found in RD GU 2.1.c: University Assessment Plan). As noted in Standard 2.B, “The University continues to take these recommendations seriously and agrees that ongoing outcomes assessment is an integral part of ensuring educational excellence. To that end, UNR has made a philosophical commitment to a comprehensive assessment plan and has backed that commitment with resources and action.”

Beginning in 2000, the Office of University Assessment (OUA) was formally strengthened with the hiring of a full-time Director. OUA has since added two additional full-time professional staff, a .5 FTE programmer and a full-time administrative assistant. Additional resources were directed to implement a high-quality alumni survey and employer survey. The OUA and Institutional Analysis each expanded their data processing and analysis capabilities.

The University has also vigorously pursued the completion of assessment plans with defined Student Learning Outcomes for all academic programs. The plans alone are not enough as units are further required to make annual reports as to the progress and outcomes of their assessment plans. At the time of the self-study, 202 of 207 units had submitted plans (the remaining programs were largely new degree programs) and 152 units had submitted annual reports. In the past three years the University has also expanded its participation in multiple national
survey efforts — i.e. NSSE, FSSE — while also developing focused assessment studies across all parts of the curriculum such as writing and math competency linked to the University Core Curriculum. While work remains to be done, the University is creating a culture of assessment and backing that commitment with resources to meet the goals articulated in the NWCCU Standards. A more comprehensive analysis of the University’s assessment effort is discussed in detail in Standard 2.B.

Advising has seen a similar commitment of resources and cross-campus activity. In response to the 1997 evaluation report, the University created the Academic Advising Center. The Center is staffed by a director and 3.5 advisors (with one open position in June 2007) who handle general advising questions and all advising for undeclared students, students in the Bachelor of General Studies degree program, and students on “academic disqualification.” In addition, each college has a coordinator or director of advising who informs and coordinates the efforts of departmental and other program advisors and communicates directly with students who have declared majors within the college.

The director of the Academic Advising Center chairs the Academic Advising Advisory Board (AAAB). This group, through regular meetings and a Listserv, provides information to the individuals involved with the distributed advising in the colleges and academic departments. In addition, many advising issues are communicated to academic affairs and student services professionals through the Academic Affairs and Student Services Council (AASSC). Program, college, and Academic Advising Center faculty and staff participate in recruitment drives and advising sessions at both in-state and out-of-state locations. All entering freshmen are automatically blocked from enrollment until an advisor lifts this restriction. After review of this program, mandatory advising has been extended to all students through their second semester of registration. Academic advising is discussed more fully in Standard 2.C.5. In addition to direct advising, the University provides a range of student support services to provide a multifaceted and cross-disciplinary approach to advising. (These elements of student services support are discussed more fully in Standard 3.D.10.) Again, while work and improvement remains to be completed, the University of Nevada, Reno has devoted concentrated effort and resources to address the concerns raised in the 1997 accreditation review.

Institutional Context: Major Organizational Changes Since the 1997 Accreditation Report

The University of Nevada, Reno is a very different institution from what it was at the last accreditation review which occurred in 1997. The institution has undergone major reorganizations; instituted significant policy changes in the areas of strategic planning, faculty review and executive decision-making; and experienced considerable turnover in upper-level administration. Most of these changes unfolded over a five-year-period — 2001 to 2005. The pace of change, perhaps not unexpectedly, resulted in a certain amount of campus uncertainty and unrest. Key changes that are discussed in various sections of this self-study (and particularly in Standard One, Standard Six and Standard Nine) included:

- Adoption of a Provost system of upper-level administration. The rationale for adoption, based on analysis contained in the 1997 Accreditation Self-Study, was to centralize decision-making “so that the chief academic officer…would have final authority over financial allocation decisions…to insure that academic planning is incorporated into institutional priority-setting and funding, and
that the results are, in turn, frankly assessed…” (See CD 1.4: Institutional Self-Study Report, October 1997, page iii).

- **Adoption of University Strategic Planning.** Perhaps no single activity captures how UNR has changed since the last accreditation site visit than the implementation of strategic planning. Where the previous process was at times bifurcated and very decentralized, the new strategic planning process funneled information through a centralized and quite small University Planning Council (UPC) chaired by the Provost. (Strategic Planning is discussed in detail in Standard 1.B.)

- **Reorganization.** Major campus units were reconstituted after review and upon recommendation by the UPC. These were major changes including the splitting of the largest college — Arts & Science — into separate colleges of Liberal Arts and Science. Other key reorganizations included folding the Mackay School of Mines into the new College of Science; the separation of the Core Curriculum from Arts & Science into a University-wide administrative entity; separating communications from development and centralizing all communication duties under a new Vice President for Marketing and Communications; creation of new schools dedicated to enhance cross-disciplinary activities in the Arts and Environment; departmental reorganization within the College of Education; and shifting of units between the College of Engineering, Mackay School of Mines and the College of Science. In many of these cases there was significant and at times vocal opposition. The extent and pace of change, coupled with opposition in multiple parts of the University, led to serious questioning of how responsive a more centralized decision-making system was to faculty and staff input.

- **Executive turnover.** In 1999 long-time University President Joseph Crowley announced his retirement after a tenure of 23 years as President of the University. Following a national search, Dr. John Lilley was named to be the 14th President of the University of Nevada, Reno in 2001. The styles of the two presidents were markedly different and resulted in the major organizational changes noted above. President Lilley's tenure was relatively brief as he exited in December 2005. President Crowley returned to serve as Interim President until the hiring of Dr. Milton Glick who assumed office in August 2006. In addition to the presidential succession, there was turnover of Vice Presidents in the Office of Administration and Finance, Development (twice), Vice President for University Relations, Vice President for Research, and Vice President for Health Sciences.

- **Policy Changes.** The Lilley years also saw major changes to several university policies and practices. These included numerous changes in budget processes and allocations of resources including new and existing faculty lines. A key change involved the merit and annual review policy. This is one of the most sensitive of issues for faculty and the changes, while now generally thought to be positive, were announced suddenly and then modified during the review process. Other major changes occurred in faculty effort reporting and measuring of workload (both discussed in Standard Four).

While these and other changes addressed issues that needed to be addressed or concerned personnel change that any institution can experience, communication about the changes and by some of those involved was often problematic. This led to an institutional context that had distinct effects on campus climate, especially in 2005 just as the accreditation self-study was commencing. As Standard Nine explains, two separate efforts addressing campus morale were undertaken in 2005 and 2006.
Meeting NWCCU Eligibility Requirements

The following report demonstrates that the University of Nevada, Reno complies with the NWCCU eligibility requirements. In summary the institution’s compliance is shown as follows:

1. **Authority.** The University of Nevada is established by the Constitution of the State of Nevada, which provides at Article 11, Section 4 that the University shall “… be controlled by a Board of Regents whose duties shall be prescribed by Law.” The University of Nevada, Reno is specifically authorized to operate and award degrees by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) elected Board of Regents. (See: Standard 6.A)

2. **Mission and Goals.** The University has a clearly defined mission statement that articulates specific goals for the institution. The mission statement has been approved by the NSHE Board of Regents. The mission statement enjoys widespread support across all segments of the campus community and the University devotes its resources to the accomplishment of the mission. (See: Standard 1.A)

3. **Institutional Integrity.** The University of Nevada, Reno operates under a suite of policies that provide for the fair treatment of individuals. University policies specifically prohibit discrimination and emphasize openness and the protection of due process rights. (See: Standard Nine and Standard Four)

4. **Governing Board.** The Board of Regents for the Nevada System of Higher Education is the governing board for all public higher education institutions in Nevada. The 13 Regents represent geographically defined districts that are equally apportioned by population and are elected to six-year terms of office. Regents’ policy provides members have no pecuniary interest in contracts made on behalf of the University. (See: Standard Six)

5. **Chief Executive Officer.** The President of the University of Nevada, Reno is its chief executive officer. The President serves full-time and any individual selected to be President must be approved by a public vote of the Regents. (See: Standard 6.C)

6. **Administration.** The University provides a vast array of administrative support services to help achieve the institutional mission and meet the needs of students, faculty, staff and the community. (See: all standards)

7. **Faculty.** The University employs a core of full-time faculty which is more than adequate to meet the obligations of the institution’s missions and goals. Faculty are recruited, hired, reviewed and retained through established and open procedures detailed in University policy documents. Faculty have a central role in University governance including overall university planning. Faculty play a primary role in curriculum development and review. Workload of faculty is determined by both Regent policy and institutional reviews that are responsive to the abilities of the faculty and needs of the institution and its students. (See: Standard Four)

8. **Educational Program.** The University offers a wide range of degree options at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Program review processes — both for new and existing programs — insure that all programs are consistent with the institution’s mission and have appropriate resources for operation. A significant number of programs also hold specialized accreditation status where such national accreditation is available. (See: Standard Two)

9. **General Education and Related Instruction.** All baccalaureate degree programs require completion of a Core Curriculum that is multidisciplinary in scope. The Core Curriculum is based on a clearly articulated rationale. All baccalaureate and graduate degrees also require a substantial program of specialization or concentration. The University maintains a clearly articulated transfer
policy for individuals transferring from both within and outside the Nevada System of Higher Education. (See: Standard Two, and Standard 3.C)

10. Library and Learning Resources. The University of Nevada, Reno libraries provide substantial holdings that are supportive of the mission of the University. The University augments these holdings with significant technological support services that expand student and faculty access to research materials. (See: Standard Five)

11. Academic Freedom. Intellectual freedom, speech and independence of thought are encouraged and guaranteed through multiple policies at the University of Nevada, Reno. These policies are available in multiple formats (electronic and print) and outline specific procedural rights for faculty, staff and students. (See: Standard 4.A.7 and Standard 9.A.5)

12. Student Achievement. The University requires that all academic degree programs develop and make public student learning objectives. These learning objectives are part of larger assessment plans which are used to regularly and systematically assess student achievement and program effectiveness. Program requirements and recommended four-year degree plans are published in the University General Catalog. Assessment plans and assessment reports are available in a variety of formats and are accessible for all programs through the Office of University Assessment. (See: Standard 2.B and 2.C)

13. Admissions. The University General Catalog, admissions materials and webpage clearly describe the institution’s admissions policies. The University adheres to these policies. (See: Standard Three and Standard 1.A.5)

14. Public Information. The University of Nevada, Reno is committed to open communication of its mission, policies and goals. Catalogs, handbooks, bylaws, policies, procedures and the University position list and budget are available for campus and public review. Most of these documents and policies are available in both printed and electronic format. (See: all standards)

15. Financial Resources. The University of Nevada, Reno has a stable funding base that is adequate to achieve its mission and goals. The University maintains a balanced budget and a manageable level of debt. (See: Standard Seven)

16. Financial Accountability. The University maintains its fiscal records in accordance with NSHE policies and Nevada and federal law and regulations. Financial records undergo a regular, external and independent auditing process. (See: Standard Seven)

17. Institutional Effectiveness. The University maintains multiple processes linked to strategic planning, program reviews, assessment and annual personnel reviews to continually and systematically evaluate institutional effectiveness. (See: Standard One and Standard 2.A and 2.B)

18. Operational Status. The University has operated continuously since 1874. The institution has more than 16,000 students currently pursuing institutional programs.

19. Disclosure. The University agrees to disclose to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities any information required to carry out its evaluation and accreditation functions.

20. Relationship with the Accreditation Commission. The University of Nevada, Reno accepts the standards and related policies of the NWCCU and agrees to comply with those standards and policies as stated or as modified in accordance with NWCCU policy. The University understands and accepts that the findings of the NWCCU may be publicized.
Executive Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

The University of Nevada, Reno’s reaccreditation self-study report addresses each element in each of the nine standards required by the NWCCU. Specific policy statements are also addressed as warranted. At the end of each standard report a series of summary strengths, challenges and recommendations is offered. (In Standard Two, because of its larger and more diffuse scope, these items are offered at the end of individual subsections B-H.) The complete listing of these summary strengths, challenges and recommendations can be found in CD ES 1.3: Standard Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations. The following are more general and integrative strengths, challenges and recommendations that arise from the self-study process.

Strengths: Executive Summary

• The University has built and continues to build a superb academic faculty, dedicated to teaching and distinguished for research, scholarship, and creative activity. Departments and colleges hire faculty of the highest caliber, and the process of promotion and tenure is rigorous. Institutional support for faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity across the disciplines has increased substantially. Indeed, per capita external funding and publication rates match or exceed most any listing of peer institutions. This has strengthened UNR’s recruitment of new faculty, afforded them tools for early professional success, and enhanced the scholarly activity of veteran faculty.

• The University Core Curriculum is a central part of the undergraduate experience. The Core, which had far more modest faculty support and involvement noted in the 1997 accreditation self-study, now enjoys strong institutional and faculty support. For example, the campus accreditation survey of Academic Faculty reveals that nearly 85 percent of faculty believe that the Core Curriculum is an important aspect of the undergraduate experience. A broad range of quality faculty members from across the University teach in all core areas. The Core enjoyed increased support through an administrative reorganization. This administrative change has increased efforts to strengthen all parts of the curriculum and assessment of the program’s effect on undergraduates.

• Since the University’s last reaccreditation, the infrastructure for supporting institutional, program, and course assessment has improved dramatically. An Office of University Assessment (OUA) has been created to support, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Analysis, the Excellence in Teaching Program and other units, the collection and use of data for planning and instructional improvement purposes. As a result of these structural changes, outcomes assessment has come a very long way at UNR since its last full accreditation. Just as program-level assessment is an ongoing process striving for continuous improvement, so is the University’s assessment process seeking to be more efficient and effective. The University has shown a definite commitment to assessment and assessment is now a regular part of the University’s curricular and administrative culture.

• The University has a vibrant and progressive student services program that uses strategic and “futures” focused thinking designed to anticipate student needs for the development and implementation of programs and services. Assessment based decision-making resulted in the building of the Joe Crowley Student Union, the doubling of the number of mental health counselors, and the allocation of one-half million dollars to merit-based scholarships. The establishment of ACCESS, Living and Learning Communities, and the Millennium Academic Persistence Program also demonstrate the ability to incorporate assessment findings in a timely fashion to meet the needs of students.
• Based on an assessment of student needs and best practices, the University has vastly improved its scholarship awards process. The University has established scholarship policies guaranteeing a four-year renewal pending satisfactory progress each year. There are objective and clearly communicated award criteria in the awarding of funds from the general scholarship fund.

• The Kennedy Index has recognized UNR Athletics as best in the nation two years in a row in providing opportunities for women.

• A comprehensive undergraduate advising program that includes mandatory advising for all incoming and continuing first-semester freshmen, identified undergraduate advisors in each college/program, Degree Audit Reports with comprehensive and varied advising notes for various stages of program completion, and an advising center that assists undecided students and students who are transitioning from one college/major to another.

• Shared governance and academic freedom have long been among the University’s core principles. Faculty participate in planning and decision-making at every level, departmental, college, University — and even have formal input at the system level. Staff involvement is also formally structured at every level of the University (although perhaps less so at the system level). The responsiveness and strength of shared governance was especially evident in the last five years as the campus wrestled with wide-ranging changes of administrative structures, personnel and policy. While not always a smooth process, there are ample examples of policy modifications and changes influenced by the action of faculty and staff. Faculty and staff governing bodies such as the Faculty Senate, Staff Employees’ Council, and Graduate Council are important and respected parts of institutional decision-making. The Nevada Faculty Alliance, while not a formal part of University governance, adds another important voice for faculty on campus. Indeed, survey data indicate faculty feel they should be even more involved with campus decision-making. Student involvement is also formally structured through the Associated Students of the University of Nevada and the Graduate Student Association.

• The University remains committed to its land-grant mission of outreach and maintains a statewide presence in instruction, research and general programmatic support. Extended Studies and Cooperative Extension reach thousands of people across every Nevada county thereby increasing the University’s potential to positively impact Nevada’s citizens. The Medical School and Nursing program operate health programs that benefit thousands of Nevadans. University outreach is generally a cooperative effort, with groups within the University, such as faculty and administration, and groups outside the University, such as the local business, government, and K-12 educational communities involved.

• University financial management practices are conducted in a professional manner and regularly reviewed through independently conducted audits. The institution has developed a blend of centralized fiscal oversight with decentralized budget management at the college and major appropriation areas level. The result is that in times of both fiscal prosperity and fiscal challenge, the University maintains a firm financial base and an impressive AA- bond rating.
Challenges: Executive Summary

• The most pressing challenge to the University is the need for increased and improved space. Existing instructional space cannot accommodate projected enrollment growth, and is rapidly reaching capacity use. Existing classrooms with fixed technology do not meet the demand for large and small classroom requests. Lack of adequate research and creative studio space is negatively impacting the University’s ability to compete for grants, contracts, and new faculty. Indeed, the shortage of quality research space has led to a recent downgrading of the University’s F&A rate. Regents policy expectations that campus expansions and oftentimes even major remodels must have matching private funds strains campus resources given the age of buildings on the Reno campus compared to other system members. This can lead to situations where priorities shift to meet donor availability rather than more objective campus instructional and research space needs.

• Hiring of temporary instructors, who teach primarily lower-division courses and especially foundational courses in Math and English, are funded mainly with temporary salary savings. This has proven to be less stable than the demand for lower-division classes from an increasing student population. Departments with major duties in the Core Curriculum often bear the brunt of this instability in funding. Any funding process must also recognize the differential demands for staffing experienced between units that can meet demands with large lecture classes and those that require more focused and instructor-intensive approaches. The University has made major efforts to provide an adequate and stable funding base, but the right mix of policy options is still being formulated.

• The challenge in the next phase of strategic planning is to balance the greatly enhanced information and assessment abilities of the University with a process that better integrates the entire campus community. The previous strategic planning process was a comprehensive but at times cumbersome effort. Strategic planning helped focus University priorities and use of data, but tipped the balance of collegial decision-making such that faculty and staff often felt they did not have a real voice in the process.

• The University has an excellent and dedicated cadre of classified staff. However, staffing levels have not kept pace with campus growth in both students and research. This leads to an extra burden carried by existing staff. The problem is made worse as salaries in the state classified system are often not competitive locally.

• Funding for technology expansion and replacement does not meet the demands of a modern campus. While initial technology investments are generally well-planned, technology replacement is far more problematic as no reliable funding base for technology upgrades or replacements exists. The Board of Regents, recognizing the vital need in this area, has secured additional state funding but more is needed.

• There is a need to better define the roles of the system administration and campus administration. While the two entities have a generally strong and cooperative working relationship, there is a need to better standardize interpretation of policies and bylaws, and to establish better timelines for policy review.

• External reviews have indicated that the quality of graduate education varies with two root causes contributing to lower quality: (1) inadequate graduate-level curricular offerings and (2) faculty resources that are stretched too thin.
Recommendations: Executive Summary

- To address the key challenge of limited physical space, especially with increasing levels of enrollment, faculty, and significant increases in research and creative activities requiring specific facilities, the obvious recommendation is an increase in capital resources. However, the University does not directly control this aspect of resource development and any meaningful increase in the campus’ facilities requires extensive work with NSHE, the Nevada legislature and private donors. Still, the University’s research mission has already been hampered by lagging facilities (with a lowered F&A rate) and instructional space is also near capacity.

- The University, in addition to pressing for increased capital resources, should also seek to make fullest use of existing resources. A key area for expansion would be to increase instruction delivered in alternative formats, and reward faculty who successfully teach in alternative formats. Examples include expanding online courses to reduce or flatten the demand for classroom space; supporting faculty willing to invest in migrating existing instruction to web-based formats by providing technical support and a reward structure (e.g., consider an award for outstanding instructor using alternative delivery); and increasing online student support services to match those available on campus.

- A related recommendation is to better employ the resources and expertise of Extended Studies for offering both non-credit and credit programs. In particular, the Graduate School should work with both academic units and Extended Studies to explore ways to effectively increase quality off-campus graduate education opportunities. Extended Studies has staff expertise and experience to develop alternative formats for delivery, media presentation and outreach with which academic programs should be encouraged to partner to expand curricular options. Policy changes allowing for cost sharing of fees need to be explored so that credit granting programs can be more efficiently developed under the aegis of Extended Studies.

- A revised strategic planning process should be developed that makes greater use of already existing governance structures, including the Faculty Senate (especially for new unit proposals); University Courses and Curriculum (new program proposals); Academic Leadership Council (and especially Deans) and the President’s Council for general resource planning; and greater involvement from Staff in the policy development process. The University needs to engage in a campus discussion of key metrics for change that departments and various administrative units are then charged with accomplishing. This revised process can build on the basic analysis produced over the past six years but needs to avoid centralizing action into a single entity such as the UPC. Development of the process must be a collaborative effort headed by the institution’s President. Toward this end, the President has held town hall meetings with multiple campus constituencies to seek input on the means by which the University’s priorities can best be set and measured.

- Reallocate resources within the base budget to cover a greater portion of salary expenditures for temporary instructors, especially those teaching in support of lower-division and foundational courses. The University could also explore expanded hiring of lecturers (longer-term and permanent) to support key teaching areas in the liberal arts and sciences. Support for instruction has been a major effort of the University and this remains an area for policy action as student enrollment continues to increase.

- The University needs to augment its considerable capacity of generating “hard data” reports and analysis with a more regularized assessment of opinions from
the entire campus. The campus-wide survey conducted as part of the accreditation process was the first such opinion survey of all faculty and staff. Indeed, this first campus-wide survey was spawned in part by a failure to systematically measure and consider issues of campus climate due to an over-emphasis on supposedly more rational and objective planning goals and measures. Follow-up surveys, done in conjunction with issues and concerns generated from the Faculty Senate and the Staff Employees’ Council, should be undertaken on a regular basis. The campus might also explore participation in such national survey assessments as the UCLA HERI faculty survey.

- Increase the Student Technology Fee to $10 per credit to provide additional funds for technology enhancements. This increase should be fully discussed with and ultimately supported by students. However, the requirements for instructional technology and support of this technology are increasing exponentially. An increased Student Technology Fee could help fund broader support for departmental or college computing needs as well as the specialized instructional technology labs across campus.

- The President and upper-level administrators within UNR should work with their NSHE counterparts to clarify administrative processes that improve efficiency and ensure improving two-way communication. The role of legal counsels and document and policy review processes should be better clarified.

- Increased commitments should be made to address effective graduate student recruitment such as the need to maintain a competitive number of recruiting fellowships, competitive funding packages, and the services of a graduate student recruiter. Academic departments need to regularly assess the whole of their graduate programs to insure that adequate resources exist to fully support programmatic offerings.
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**List of Acronyms**

The following abbreviations are used in this self-study to reference supporting documentation found in each standard report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Required Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Suggested Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Chapter Documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Standard Two, documents are also designated by the element to which they are linked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GU</th>
<th>General Requirements and Undergraduate Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Graduate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The following abbreviations/acronyms are used in this self-study:**

- **A&R**: Admissions and Records
- **AAAHC**: Accreditation Association of Ambulatory Health Care
- **AAAB**: Academic Advising Advisory Board
- **AABC**: Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges
- **AAC**: Athletics Advisory Committee
- **AACRAO**: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
- **AARTS**: Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools
- **AASSC**: Academic Affairs and Student Services Council
- **AAUN**: Athletic Association of the University of Nevada
- **AAUP**: American Alliance of University Professors
- **ABET**: Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (Inc.)
- **ABHE**: Association for Biblical Higher Education-Commission on Accreditation
- **ACCESS**: Access to College with Counseling and Educational Support Services
- **ACE**: Academic and Career Exploration
- **ACICS**: Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools
- **ACT**: American College Testing (Service)
- **ADA**: Americans with Disabilities Act
- **AISTI**: Alliance for Innovation in Science and Technology Information
- **AP**: Advanced Placement
- **APEC**: Applied Economics (and Statistics)
- **API**: Asian and Pacific Islander
- **ArcIMS**: Interactive Map Server
- **ASSC**: Academic and Student Services Council
- **ASUN**: Associated Students of the University of Nevada
- **ATS**: Association of Theological Schools (in the U.S. and Canada)-Commission on Accrediting
- **AVP PBA**: Assistant Vice President for Planning, Budget and Analysis
- **BA/BS**: Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science
- **BART**: Basic Algebra Readiness Test
- **BCC**: Black Culture Cooperative
- **BCH**: Biochemistry
- **BCLC**: British Columbia Lottery Corporation
- **BCSSE**: Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement
- **BGS**: Bachelor of General Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOR</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/R</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2K</td>
<td>Continuity 2000 (Spectrum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABNR</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIS</td>
<td>Campus Advanced Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Council for Advancement of Standards (in Higher Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSN</td>
<td>Community College of Southern Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Compact Disc OR Chapter Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>Cohort Default Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU</td>
<td>Continuing Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Core Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEA</td>
<td>Council for Higher Education Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRP</td>
<td>Cooperative Institutional Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITI</td>
<td>Collaborative IRB (Institutional Review Boards) Training Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSE</td>
<td>A class-based National Survey of Student Engagement instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEP</td>
<td>College-Level Examination Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>Board of Regents Handbook, Title 2 – Nevada System of Higher Education CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>Cost-of-Living Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDA</td>
<td>Center for Research Design &amp; Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>College Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.v.</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWP</td>
<td>Core Writing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARS</td>
<td>Degree Audit Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARSWeb</td>
<td>Computer software program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARWin</td>
<td>Computer software program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Downunder Convenience OR Downunder Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETC</td>
<td>Distance Education and Training Council-Accrediting Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Disability Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Desert Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>Digital Video/Versatile Disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Doctor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Education OR College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>Environmental Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVI</td>
<td>Environment for Visualizing Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePAWS</td>
<td>Computer software program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSCoR</td>
<td>Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-searches</td>
<td>Electronic searches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIG</td>
<td>EPSCoR (Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research) Science Information Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXS</td>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A</td>
<td>Facilities and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>Frequently Asked Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Faculty Athletics Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFELP</td>
<td>Federal Family Educational Loan Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISAP</td>
<td>Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Frequency Modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSC</td>
<td>Fleischmann Planetarium and Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC</td>
<td>Facilities Resource Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Fire Science Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>Facilities Services Design (and Construction Standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSE</td>
<td>Faculty Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBC</td>
<td>Great Basin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCO</td>
<td>Grants and Contracts Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>Graduate Student Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWLA</td>
<td>Greater Western Library Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Health Education (School of Public Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECC-SHECC</td>
<td>Higher Education Capital Construction-Special Higher Education Capital Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Hewlett Packard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV</td>
<td>Interactive Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACUC</td>
<td>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPSR</td>
<td>Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELC</td>
<td>Intensive English Language Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGT</td>
<td>International Game Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMS</td>
<td>Student Information System used to manage and award financial aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Library</td>
<td>Information Technology/Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFRG</td>
<td>Junior Faculty Research Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR</td>
<td>Journalism OR School of Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTSU</td>
<td>Jot Travis Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Kindergarten through 12th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMAD</td>
<td>Knowledge Management and Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNPB</td>
<td>Public Television Station supported by UNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUNR FM</td>
<td>Public Radio Station supported by UNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>Liquid Crystal Display (a flat-panel display device)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibQUAL</td>
<td>An extensive user-survey tool (Association of Research Libraries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK+</td>
<td>An expedited interlibrary loan service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOA</td>
<td>Letter of Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOB</td>
<td>Letter of Appointment with Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Math Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Master of Arts/Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP</td>
<td>Millennium (Scholar) Academic Persistence Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATLAB</td>
<td>Matrix Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Doctor of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJS</td>
<td>Master of Judicial Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSAIC</td>
<td>Company name OR an intercultural initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Middle States Association (of College and Schools)-Middle States Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACAC</td>
<td>National Association of College Admissions Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFA</td>
<td>(Association of International Educators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA-HLC</td>
<td>Northern Central Association (of Colleges and Schools)-The Higher Learning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>National Collegiate Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC-CHE</td>
<td>New England Association of School and Colleges-Commission on Institutions of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC-CTCI</td>
<td>New England Association of School and Colleges-Commission on Technical and Career Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetID</td>
<td>Network Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NevadaNet</td>
<td>Interactive video sites state-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFA</td>
<td>Nevada Faculty Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNAIHEC</td>
<td>Northern Nevada (American) Indian (Higher) Education Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRES</td>
<td>Natural Resources and Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDI</td>
<td>National Spatial Data Infrastructure (Clearinghouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSHE</td>
<td>Nevada System of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSHE CODE</td>
<td>Nevada System of Higher Education Code (Title 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWCCU</td>
<td>Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>Online Computer Library Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHRP</td>
<td>Office of Human Research Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISS</td>
<td>Office of International Students and Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPA</td>
<td>Office of Sponsored Projects Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPTF</td>
<td>Outreach Strategic Planning Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>Office of University Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12</td>
<td>Preschool through 12th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Performing Arts Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ</td>
<td>Position Description Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>Personal Identification Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-AST</td>
<td>Designator for Undeclared Transfer Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-ASX</td>
<td>Designator for Undeclared Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI</td>
<td>Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Rape Aggression Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCUF</td>
<td>Renewable Contingent Upon Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Required Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Required Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Really Simple Syndication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAC</td>
<td>Student-Athlete Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS</td>
<td>Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Scholarly Activities Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Prevention and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Scholastic Aptitude Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAB</td>
<td>Student Events Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>Staff Employees’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDS</td>
<td>Students and Educators for Environmental Development and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVIS</td>
<td>Student Exchange and Visitor Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Student Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>(Student Services Assessment &amp; Research) Strategic Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPWB</td>
<td>State (of Nevada) Public Works Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAC</td>
<td>Start Thinking About College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMCC</td>
<td>Truckee Meadows Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACS</td>
<td>Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools-Accreditation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO</td>
<td>Name of federal program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UALC</td>
<td>Utah Academic Library Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAM</td>
<td>University Administrative Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAN</td>
<td>University Credit Across Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCC</td>
<td>University Courses and Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCSN</td>
<td>University and Community College System of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA HERI</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCE</td>
<td>University of Nevada Cooperative Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>University Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPT</td>
<td>University Promotion and Tenure (Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States (of America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAC</td>
<td>University Studies Abroad Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAF</td>
<td>Vice President for Administration and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPR</td>
<td>Vice President for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>Western Athletics Conference OR Writing Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASCACCJC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASCACSCU</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebCT</td>
<td>Software for online course delivery system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNCC</td>
<td>Western Nevada Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUE</td>
<td>Western Undergraduate Exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Standard 1.A — Mission and Goals

The institution’s mission and goals define the institution, including its educational activities, its student body, and its role within the higher education community. The evaluation proceeds from the institution’s own definition of its mission and goals. Such evaluation is to determine the extent to which the mission and goals are achieved and are consistent with the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements and standards for accreditation.

1.A.1 The institution’s mission and goals derive from, or are widely understood, by the campus community, are adopted by the governing board, and are periodically reexamined.

The University’s Mission Statement reflects the institution’s history as both a land-grant university and, for many years, the sole provider of higher education in the state. The Mission Statement begins:

The University of Nevada, Reno is a constitutionally established, land-grant university. The University served the state of Nevada as its only state-supported institution of higher education for almost 75 years. In that historical role, it has emerged as a doctoral-granting university which focuses its resources on doing a select number of things well. The University of Nevada, Reno offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs, including selected doctoral and professional studies, which emphasize those programs and activities which best serve the needs of the state, region and nation. By fostering creative and scholarly activity, it encourages and supports faculty research and application of that research to state and national problems.

Following the general statement above, the Mission Statement includes three sections that provide more specific performance measures and goals. The Mission Statement is also linked to separate documents outlining the institution’s values and commitment to diversity (RD 1.1: Mission Statement of the University). Indeed, these documents are integrated to the extent that the entire collection of documents is generally referred to as the University’s Mission and Values Statement.

The current Mission Statement was approved in 1986 by the Board of Regents for the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN now NSHE) and was amended in 1993 when two provisions relating to diversity were added to the sections that provide more specific performance measurements and goals. As part of the University’s 1997 decennial accreditation review there was discussion whether a formal review of the Mission Statement was needed. No specific recommendation emerged especially as the report of the 1997 site visit team noted that ‘representatives of the BOR [Board of Regents]

Table 1.1
Campus Accreditation Survey: Support for University Mission
(Percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University mission and goals reflect what UNR should do as an institution. n=1244</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University mission and goals reflect what UNR does as an institution. n=1244</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My position and/or job support the mission and goals of the University. n=1247</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the committee met, seem to look upon the two-year planning cycle as sufficient” in establishing the proper course and goals for the institution (CD 1.1: Evaluation Committee Report, 1997, p. 3). Thus, the University of Nevada, Reno’s Mission Statement has not changed for some time and is unlikely to change in any fundamental way given the long history of the institution.

However, specific meanings of goals and priorities linked to the Mission Statement have changed periodically. Indeed, as described in Standard 1.B, the actual outcomes expected from the University’s Mission Statement have become more formally defined through the institution’s strategic planning process which commenced in 2001. These strategic goals are reviewed both on campus and by the Board of Regents.

The University’s Mission and Values Statements enjoy widespread support across the campus. As part of the accreditation process a campus-wide survey was conducted that specifically assessed to what extent the campus community was aware of the content of the Mission and Values Statement and whether the Mission and Values Statements captured what the University both should be doing and is actually doing (CD 1.2: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006). As Table 1.1 notes, more than 86 percent of the campus community respondents agree or strongly agree that the University mission and goals reflect what UNR should do as an institution and nearly 71 percent agree or strongly agree that the Mission Statement accurately reflects what UNR does as an institution. (There is actually less “disagreement” with the Mission Statement goals than even these numbers imply as nearly eight percent of respondents “Do not know” whether the stated goals are what UNR should do as an institution and 12 percent of respondents do not know whether the stated goals reflected what the University was doing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.2</th>
<th>Campus Accreditation Survey: Support for University Values (Percentage of Respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University values are appropriate for the institution. n=1239</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University strives to achieve its described values. n=1222</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The values of the University are reflected in its actions. n=1232</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My position and/or job support the values of the University. n=1244</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps more significantly, 89 percent of respondents from across campus agree or strongly agree with the statement “I feel my position and/or job supports the missions and goals of the University.”

Similarly high levels of support are observed when members of the campus community evaluate the values contained in the University’s Values Statement. As Table 1.2 shows, 86 percent of the campus community respondents feel the “University values described in the statement are appropriate,” 71 percent believe the University strives to achieve these values, and nearly 69 percent believe the values are reflected in University actions. Again, disagreement with these evaluations is reduced further as between eight to 10 percent of respondents report they “do not know” to any given question about University values. In line with the assessment of how the University mission and goals align with their job, nearly 88 percent of respondents from across campus also agree or strongly agree with the statement “I feel my position and/or job supports the values of the University.”
1.A.2 The mission, as adopted by the governing board, appears in appropriate institutional publications, including the catalog.

The Mission and Values Statements, along with the Diversity Statement, appear in the front section of the University catalog: “About the University of Nevada” (RD 1.2: University General Catalog, 2007-2008). These same statements can be accessed with a direct link on the University webpage in the section “About Nevada” (www.unr.edu/content/about/). As part of the accreditation process a campus-wide forum focusing on the Mission and Values Statements was held. The Mission and Values Statements (along with the Diversity Statement) were sent via email to the entire campus community as part of that process.

1.A.3 Progress in accomplishing the institution’s mission and goals is documented and made public.

The Mission Statement includes three sections that identify specific goals that the University seeks to achieve. The goals include statements concerning undergraduate and graduate degree programs, student recruitment, faculty research, cultural diversity, curriculum development and community outreach. (See document RD 1.1 for specific statements of goals contained in the Mission Statement.) The institution employs a number of publicly accessible reports and processes to measure performance.

There are multiple reports on achievement of key goals contained in the University’s Mission Statement. The Student Academic Skills Center Data Book (RD 1.3) and the Faculty Workload Report (RD 1.4) both provide summary information about students and faculty. The Student Academic Skills Center Data Book is published each fall by the Academic Skills Center based on data from Institutional Analysis and the University’s interactive Data Book archive. The report is readily available for all students and interested individuals through the UNR webpage. It includes operational information about the University of Nevada, Reno including:

- Student demographics and enrollment information
- Student credit hours and FTE
- Classes and instruction
- Graduation and degrees granted
- Personnel
- Finance and facilities

The Faculty Workload Report is designed for reporting aggregated information representing the entire institution. There are two sections: “Aggregated Instructional Activity” and “Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity.” The Workload Report is required by NSHE. It is prepared annually for internal use at UNR and sent to the Regents, as mandated, every other year. The Instructional Reporting section covers measures of organized and individualized instruction for all state supported instructional activity (including remedial education which is no longer state-supported). The Out-of-Classroom section covers 27 selected variables of research, creative activity, scholarly service, and outreach activities engaged in by institutional faculty. The Workload Report is not put in the public domain by either the University or NSHE, although there is no prohibition for such posting. However, as a document reported to the Regents it is available for review by the public and media upon demand. It is also publicly discussed at relevant BOR meetings.

In addition to these over-arching reports, the University produces others that assess specific components or goals found in the Mission Statement. Some reports are produced on a regular basis and some on a more ad hoc or as requested schedule. The Office of Institutional Analysis conducts a wide range of studies (SM 1.1: Bibliography of Reports, Institutional Analysis) accessible through the University webpage. Other examples of this type of reporting include three annual reports (RD 1.5, 1.6, 1.7) produced by the Office of the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, and available on the University’s website.
- Diversity Report 2005-2006
- Student Diversity and Goals Report 2006
- Annual Report on Faculty Demography 2006

The first details the activities of the Presidential Diversity Committees. The second covers student demography, replete with a longitudinal table going back to 1988, and examines students by race/ethnicity and college. The third report measures faculty demography. In the area of diversity, the University also submitted a major report to the BOR, NSHE in 2005: **RD 1.8: Diversity Report to the Committee on Diversity and Security, September 2005**. This report is a compilation of measures concerning diversity at the University and was requested in September 2005.

Student and curricular issues are further measured and reported through the University’s participation with the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), the Freshman College Study Survey administered through the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), and information captured through admission reports from the College Board (SAT) and the American College Testing Service (ACT Freshman Class Profile). Beginning in 1998 the University also began conducting regular surveys of alumni (**RD 1.9: Alumni Survey**) and employers of UNR graduates (**RD 1.10: Employer Survey**). Each of these survey instruments provides multifaceted measures of key components of institutional performance regarding the goals and values articulated in the University’s Mission Statement. (Specific findings from these instruments are reported in multiple sections of the self-study.) Curricular effectiveness and changes are the primary focus of the Office of University Assessment (OUA). Each of the institution’s degree programs is to have an Assessment Plan and to provide a yearly report, which are then publicly posted on the OUA webpage. The assessment process is described in Standard 2.B.

Elements of curricular change, resource allocation and interdisciplinary programs are covered in the strategic planning process of the University (discussed below). Mandated program reviews (discussed in Standard 2.A) and specific external accreditation reports are additional ways the University’s performance and progress is specifically measured and reported. The University’s physical resources are contained in a formal Master Plan (**SM 1.2: University Master Plan**) and through various reviews conducted by Facilities Services. An example of such a review is the “Facilities Condition Audit” completed in February 2007 (**SM 1.3: Facilities Condition Audit**).

In addition to these formal reports made on both a regular and on request basis, University officials make regular reports about various aspects of University actions and progress at meetings of the Board of Regents.

**1.A.4 Goals are determined consistent with the institution’s mission and its resources — human, physical and financial.**

Linking specific programmatic activities to the Mission Statement is clearly articulated in University strategic planning documents. This linkage is made clear in the opening of the University’s President’s first report on strategic planning, “Our Best Effort for Nevada: President’s Written Report on Strategic Planning for 2001-02” submitted May 31, 2002 (**RE 1.1: Our Best Effort for Nevada: President’s Written Report on Strategic Planning for 2001-02**). The report begins:

> Well into its second century, the University of Nevada, Reno has a proud tradition as the state’s land-grant university and flagship institution. Over the years it has steadily improved and expanded its outreach to the state by fulfilling its tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service. This mission has expressed itself in different ways over time, through various organizational structures, but its core has remained consistent throughout, as it does today...As it pursues that mission in the coming decade, the university seeks, as it has always done, to improve both its performance and its reputation as an institution.
The document, which became the foundation for the whole strategic planning process, goes on to outline specific strategic priorities, goals and strategies for achieving these goals tempered by recognized fiscal and physical constraints. The opening section of the document makes this connection clear.

Improving quality is relatively easy in a world of unlimited resources. However, we are facing an economic climate in which our state appropriation is unlikely to keep pace with our most basic needs, much less permit tangible enhancement...the university must meet its growing needs through a variety of means including private fundraising, community partnerships, and research funding...we must not only seek new sources of funding, but must also be willing to reallocate resources within the university to optimize the use of our present resources.

1.A.5 The institution’s mission and goals give direction to all its educational activities, to its admissions policies, its selection of faculty, allocation of resources, and to planning.

With respect to EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, we believe all programs of study, research and outreach activities pursued by the institution are consistent with UNR’s mission and goals. Indeed, the question is not whether current programs are consistent with the mission and goals, but rather what programs may be missing or under-performing due to resource constraints. There are multiple sources of evidence to buttress the belief that the institution is meeting this portion of the standard. As noted and discussed in other sections of this report (Standard 1.A.3 and Standard 2.A) all academic programs at the University are required to conduct periodic reviews that are reported to the Board of Regents. Ongoing curricular review is part of the University Assessment process (discussed in Standard 2.B). New programs must be reviewed and approved by a process that includes input from multiple levels of College and University review. The process for new program approval includes verification of appropriate resource support — human, financial, physical and research/library (this process is described in Standards Two and Three). New programs must also be approved by the Board of Regents. Thus, all programs face multiple levels of review and multiple measures of program appropriateness linked to the University’s mission and resources.

With respect to ADMISSIONS, a specific mission of the University is to “Assure that all students, either upon entering the university, or upon admission to degree programs, have acquired basic verbal, oral, computational, analytical and computer skills.” UNR backs this intent with a range of student support services (see Standard Three) and made the Core Curriculum, which covers the skills mentioned above, a strategic priority of the University (see Standard 1.B and Standard 2.C). However, the University operates in a public environment where access to education is generally governed by political bodies that limit the direct control the institution has in terms of defining its own admission policies. For years UNR operated with an “open admissions” policy where minimal requirements, if met, generally assured a student entry to the institution. Beginning in 2002 the University adopted an increasingly better defined and stringent set of admissions requirements. To be admitted to an undergraduate degree program as a regular freshman student, an applicant must be a graduate of an approved or accredited high school and satisfy a set of pre-college high school courses. Students must have a 2.75 (weighted/unweighted) GPA in the academic courses in order to be admitted to the University of Nevada, Reno. The academic courses include: English, Math, Social Scie-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.3</th>
<th>Campus Accreditation Survey: Faculty Attitudes About Admissions (Percentage of respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students entering UNR are academically well-prepared. n=375</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR should raise its admissions standards. n=376</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ences and Natural Sciences. A weighted GPA takes into account the extra difficulty of honors, AP or IB classes. Test scores on traditional national exams — SAT, ACT — are not required, but are used for placement in Core writing and math classes. Starting fall 2008, NSHE will require a student to have a minimum 3.0 (weighted/unweighted) GPA in the academic core for admission. Students transferring must have a minimum 2.5 GPA in all their transfer coursework. (Admissions requirements and procedures are featured prominently on the University’s webpage and in RD 1.2: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, pp. 34-42.)

Even with increasing admission standards, 40 percent of students entering the University need remedial coursework in English and 36 percent are required to take remedial coursework in math. Limited control of the admissions process may be a major contributing factor to a lower than desired retention rate of students, which was 76.2 percent in 2000 and is still at 75.9 percent in 2006. (Retention programs are discussed more fully in Standard Three. Data concerning admissions and retention are found in RD 1.11: Retention Report.) Faculty and administrators have sought to increase admissions standards with some success. But this is an area where the University — linked to its very public nature — faces a trade-off in being accessible yet also more rigorously monitoring student preparedness prior to admission. The University should not surrender its hard-won progress on increasing admissions standards as this should become part of an effort to increase retention and graduation rates. As Table 1.3 indicates, a large majority of faculty do not think that students entering UNR are well-prepared and that UNR should raise its admission standards.

The University clearly makes student achievement of basic skills a priority. The Core Curriculum is a central part of this effort. As data in Table 1.4 illustrate, faculty believe the Core Curriculum is effective in preparing students to better understand and function in a complex world.

The range of skill sets in the Core and the overall value of the Core as an important aspect of the undergraduate experience receive strong support from faculty. The positive impressions of the Core are also backed by a recent study conducted by the Office of Institutional Analysis which showed a positive contribution of the Core on student cognitive growth and attitudes toward diversity (RD 1.12: Diversity and Educational Benefits). At the same time, though, the majority of faculty does not believe that even by the time students reach the upper-division level they write well or possess good analytical/critical thinking skills. Yet University faculty may be “harder graders” than are the alumni and employers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.4</th>
<th>Campus Accreditation Survey: Core Curriculum (Percentage of respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Core Curriculum is effective in achieving its goal of preparing students to better understand and function in a complex world. n=361</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of skill sets encompassed in the core is appropriate. n=361</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core is an important aspect of the undergraduate experience. n=366</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper division students write well. n=367</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper division students have good analytical/critical thinking skills. n=370</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surveys of those employers hiring UNR alumni (RD 1.10: Employer Survey) are far more positive about the skill sets of UNR graduates. As Table 1.5 shows, more than 50 percent of employers say UNR graduates are “very prepared” in terms of writing and “critical thinking skills,” and 90 percent say UNR graduates are either “very prepared” or “somewhat prepared” in these areas. Perhaps most telling, more than 77 percent of employers feel Nevada graduates are either better prepared or equally prepared as “recent graduates from other institutions.” (This number goes to more than 90 percent when categories of “not applicable” or “don’t know” are removed from the analysis.)

Alumni are also more positive about the improvements in their skills after attending UNR. Again using survey data, nearly 90 percent report a positive impact on both their “ability to write effectively” and to “think critically” as a result of the UNR Core Curriculum (RD 1.9: Alumni Survey).

Admissions policies thus present a complex picture when linked to the University’s Mission. We must maintain a fairly open admissions process as determined by the governing board and state legislature. The institution directly addresses the mission goal of insuring that students have “acquired basic verbal, oral, computational, analytical and computer skills,” but the exact level of achievement varies by who is being asked to assess it. Specific recommendations for addressing the potentially conflicting goals and perceptions of University admissions and the University’s Mission are presented below.

**SELECTION OF FACULTY** is discussed in detail in Standard Four. The strategic planning process increased emphasis on linking hiring to strategic goals of departments, colleges and the University. This, in turn, increased the linkage of faculty hiring and the University’s Mission to the extent that strategic goals refined the specific meaning of Mission goals. Specific examples of linking hiring to Strategic goals are given in the Strategic Planning Implementation Report 2001-2006, pages 18-19 (RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006). Even when faculty hires are not as clearly linked to particular strategic priorities, the Mission Statement emphasizes faculty research and outreach as priorities. All tenure stream hires are selected with an expectation that they will meet standards of teaching, research and service. Indeed, to be tenured, academic faculty must be rated “excellent” in either teaching or research. (See Standard Four for a more detailed discussion of faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure.) The University also hires a large number of temporary and non-tenure stream faculty specifically to address curricular needs or to fill specialized research and/or clinical needs. Clinical Faculty in particular are clearly linked to the University’s Mission focus on outreach.

### Table 1.5
Employer Survey: Preparedness of UNR Graduates
(Percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat Prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat Unprepared</th>
<th>Very Unprepared</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNR graduates are prepared to carry out writing tasks. n=1371</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR graduates are prepared to think critically, including analyzing and evaluating information. n=1391</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate UNR graduates compared to recent graduates from other institutions. n=1391</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALLOCATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES is another area where the linkage between such decisions and the University’s Mission Statement was strengthened by strategic planning. Objective 4 of the University’s Strategic Plan — “ENABLE” — specifically addresses how targeted areas should receive allocation of funding and, where appropriate, changes in administrative procedures. (See RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006, especially pages 27-47.) There is a clear intent to match the University’s Mission Statements to strategic planning priorities and funding. The ultimate success of that effort is subject to some interpretation as discussed in Standard 1.B.

Outreach activities, often directly linked to the University’s land-grant mission, also receive specific funding through direct appropriations. This is most apparent in the School of Medicine, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR) and College of Health and Human Sciences (HHS) as well as in the activities of the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension. Specific financial resources are also directed at state-wide programs such as Oral History and Basque Studies in the College of Liberal Arts.

Requests for program enhancements, programs seeking specialized funding as part of the University’s federal priorities, and requests for capital improvements are all reviewed and prioritized through various processes (discussed primarily in Standards Seven and Eight).

Linking PLANNING to the University’s Mission was the over-arching goal of the strategic planning process. This is discussed in Standard 1.B.

1.A.6 Public service outreach is consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution.

Public outreach is an integral and longstanding element of the University’s mission as a land-grant institution. From campuses in Reno, Las Vegas and Elko, and offices in nearly every county, the University’s “outreach spans agriculture, business and economic development, health care, the environment and other quality of life issues” (CD 1.3: University Webpage on Outreach). The cited link provides descriptions of a number of ongoing outreach activities.

Outreach activities were specifically addressed as part of the strategic planning process. In fall 2002, an Outreach Strategic Planning Task Force (OSPTF) was created to “identify current outreach activities, recommend ways to encourage future Outreach activities in the context of university strategic planning, and develop a university plan to administer, coordinate, and deliver Outreach activities in response to societal needs” (RE 1.3: Outreach Strategic Planning Final Report, p. 1). The OSPTF developed a series of recommendations and strategic initiatives in response to their charge. The OSPTF also created the first comprehensive record of outreach activities conducted by the University. The scope of the University’s Outreach is impressive and the record is reflected in the multi-page table crafted by the OSPTF (RE 1.4: Compendium of Outreach Activities). Outreach is a central part of the University’s Mission and is a major and ongoing part of University activities.

1.A.7 The institution reviews with the Commission, contemplated changes that would alter its mission, autonomy, ownership or locus of control, or its intention to offer a degree at a higher level than is included in its present accreditation, or other changes in accordance with Policy A-2 Substantive Change.

The University has not undergone any changes that would alter its mission, autonomy, ownership, locus of control or other substantive changes in accordance with Policy A-2.
Standard 1.B — Planning and Effectiveness

The institution engages in ongoing planning to achieve its mission and goals. It also evaluates how well, and in what ways, it is accomplishing its mission and goals and uses the results for broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation. Through its planning process, the institution asks questions, seeks answers, analyzes itself, and revises its goals, policies, procedures, and resource allocation.

Perhaps no single activity captures how UNR has changed since the last accreditation site visit than the implementation of strategic planning. The specific form of strategic planning was “implemented in 2001 according to the guidelines set forth in the President’s Strategic Planning Framework issued in August of that year” (RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006, p. 1). In form and outcome UNR’s strategic planning process vigorously meets all elements of Standard 1.B highlighted above. However, the process is also subject to multiple concerns about institutional self-governance among faculty and staff.

The form and vigor of the strategic planning process was clearly a central part of the changes brought to campus by the newly appointed President, John Lilley, in 2000. However, part of the groundwork for revising UNR’s institutional planning process was laid in the 1997 Accreditation Self-Study which recommended major changes for institutional planning. The 1997 Self-Study noted that academic planning was too separated from the financial allocation process. The recommendation was to centralize the process “by means of an Academic Provost structure within the administration, so that the chief academic officer…would have final authority over financial allocation decisions.” The goal was “to insure that academic planning is incorporated into institutional priority-setting and funding, and that the results are, in turn, frankly assessed…” (CD 1.4: Institutional Self-Study Report, October 1997, page iii). President Lilley adopted the recommendation for a Provost system and initiated a far more centralized process for setting institutional goals, establishing assessment measures and for linking resources to selected goals. Where the previous process was at times bifurcated and very decentralized, the new strategic planning process funneled information through a centralized and quite small University Planning Council (UPC) chaired by the Provost.

1.B.1 The institution clearly defines its evaluation and planning processes. It develops and implements procedures to evaluate the extent to which it achieves institutional goals.

As noted, in 2001 the University implemented a campus-wide process of evaluation, goal-setting, reorganization and resource allocation under the rubric of strategic planning. The process produced a University Strategic Plan which was both informed by and then gave direction to plans generated at all levels of the University. The “planning horizon” was targeted for a six-year period. Upon completion of that horizon (2006) the University would commence its decennial reaccreditation with NWCCU. Based upon data and recommendations generated by the reaccreditation process a second round of strategic planning would commence in 2007.

While this section is written in the past tense and largely describes how the process was initiated, the process (and most all indicators noted) continued as planned and described through 2006. The strategic planning process has been summarized at length in RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006. It must be stressed, though, that the accreditation document is itself part of the planning process and from this document revisions in the process will develop.

The process began with release of a “Strategic Planning Framework” in August 2001 (RE 1.5: Strategic Planning Framework). This initial document broadly described the process, specifically designating that “the process will be guided by the executive vice president and provost of the university, aided by a broadly representative University Planning Council (UPC) to be appointed by the president after consultation”
with a range of internal campus constituencies. The planning process was to specifically consider “how the university’s statewide land-grant mission of outreach in teaching, research, and service should interact and how they will be emphasized.” The analytic framework utilized a traditional SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threat) approach. The emphasis was on data-based indicators and assessment with “conclusions unsupported by data discouraged.”

Data generation and analysis began “at the department or equivalent unit, and, from that level, plans will be submitted to colleges or equivalent units. From that second level, plans will be submitted to the University Planning Council.” Directions about types of data and requests were detailed. Data, plans, and other suggestions for change would be examined and conclusions generated by the UPC. The President reviewed the actions of the UPC to make “the final determination of actions to be taken that will result in a university wide plan.” This process was followed and President Lilley presented the University’s Plan on May 31, 2002: Our Best Effort for Nevada: President’s Written Report on Strategic Planning for 2001-02” (RE 1.1).

Follow-up documents further specified the types of data and performance indicators that guided the planning process. A calendar for submission of materials was announced and workshops describing the process conducted. All plans were to address three general categories: Context for Planning (both institutional and discipline specific); Critical Evaluation of Current Status (utilizing a SWOT analysis); and Resource Priorities (specifically discussing resource allocation, reallocation and reorganization). Under each of these general categories specific data, analytical studies, assessment and evaluation measures, as well as budget scenarios were detailed. A listing of “Possible Performance Indicators,” as well as instructions covering formatting was included in the “Implementation Instructions” that accompanied the roll-out of strategic planning (RE 1.6: Planning Instructions 2001).

The specific documents outlining the new strategic planning process were followed with multiple campus forums and meetings that further defined the planning process. The University Strategic Plan enunciated a set of institutional performance indicators by which institutional progress could be assessed. (Much of this is summarized in RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006, and in the other documents cited in the various sections of 1.B.) As might be expected with the implementation of such a comprehensive campus-wide program, not every element of explanation or evaluation unfolded smoothly. As discussed in 1.B.3, there was some confusion as to how plans were to be evaluated and how information was communicated both to and from the UPC.

1.B.2 The institution engages in systematic planning for, and evaluation of, it activities, including teaching, research, and public service consistent with institutional mission and goals.

The initial charge of strategic planning was to thoroughly and objectively assess how the tripartite emphasis on teaching, research and service could most effectively be linked to the basic thrust of UNR’s mission as both a public and land-grant institution. The indicators of context, current status and performance cited above (RE 1.6: Planning Instructions 2001) provided the creation of a systematic data set that could both analyze particular units and be roughly comparable across units. Based upon their review of these multiple indicators, all units were specifically asked to address “Where should the unit ‘be’ in 2007? What opportunities for new programs and initiatives should be pursued?” The unit plans were thus dynamic documents designed to accomplish particular end goals.

The University’s Strategic Plan presented in May 2002 identified five Objectives and Strategies: Educate, Explore, Engage, Enable and Enhance (RE 1.1). Each of these goals was followed by multiple strategies and tactics, backed by specific indicators that would measure progress. The Objectives and Strategies were based on “several themes that emerged…from the strategic planning process.” These themes are listed in Table 1.6.
These themes and the following Objectives and Strategies demonstrate that the planning process is designed to systematically plan for enhanced performance in teaching, research and outreach backed by evaluative criteria linked to the institution’s mission.

1.B.3 The planning process is participatory involving constituencies appropriate to the institution such as board members, administrators, faculty, staff, students, and other interested parties.

The strategic planning process was certainly intended to be participatory and clearly included all parts of the institution. As part of the strategic planning instructions, a listing of programs and units expected to develop strategic plans was sent to the campus community that outlined which units were expected to participate (RE 1.7: Strategic Planning Units 2001). The list is comprehensive, but even this list was not exclusive as emerging programs or faculty with ideas for programs were invited to send forward their ideas and proposals.

The specific form by which units sought input in drafting their own plans was determined by the units themselves. The information flow was upward — going from specific departmental or like units, through Colleges or like units, to the UPC and then to the President.

While the process was designed to be participatory with an upward flow of information, in practice it was very centralized and less participatory than hoped. As Table 1.7 notes, nearly half of respondents in the campus accreditation survey disagreed with the statement that they “were able to contribute to the strategic planning process in a meaningful way” and only 35 percent agreed with the statement. Approximately half of respondents felt the process was “clearly described” but there were communication problems in other areas of the process. For example, nearly equal percentages of respondents agreed, disagreed or did not know when asked if funds have been allocated to priorities identified in the plan. A plurality of respondents (45 percent) felt strategic planning “made the University better.” There is clear evidence of a defined process and units produced very detailed plans. However, there is also evidence of a disconnect in terms of how participatory or effective the process was as viewed by the campus community. This disconnect has multiple sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.6</th>
<th>Themes Guiding the Strategic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the student experience through strengthening academic programs, encouraging a culture of diversity on campus, providing significant co-curricular experiences, and enhancing the campus environment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on our academic strengths to create new cross-disciplinary opportunities and to improve the national and international visibility of our programs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the outcomes of all our activities so that we know our strengths and weaknesses and can take effective steps to improve our performance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating our story so the public can know and share in our successes; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating support from a variety of sources so the University can continue to flourish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.7</th>
<th>Campus Accreditation Survey: Strategic Planning (Percentage of respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university strategic planning process is clearly described. n=1278</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic plan clarifies the priorities of the University. n=1269</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to contribute to the strategic planning process in a meaningful way. n=1264</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has been allocated to priorities identified in the strategic plan. n=1259</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic planning process has made the University better. n=1266</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The change in process was so extensive that departments and colleges were unsure what they were to produce. While instructions were released, in many forums explaining the process the President specifically failed to address questions. Instead, President Lilley encouraged units to “give us your best judgment” and to “reach for the moon.” Even with specific budget parameters contained in the instructions many departments struggled to balance requests to “reach for the moon” with a more tempered “this will never be funded” attitude. As a consequence, some departments produced aggressive plans. When their ideas and resource requests appeared to be ignored — or worse, not even read — the result was disillusionment and cynicism with the whole process.

• The “winnowing” process — where ideas were first suggested at the lowest levels of the organization and then edited through to the President — created a sense that most ideas and departments were being ignored. While the process started at the department level, it was the Level 2 College or similar unit plan that went to the UPC. Thus, many specific requests were lost. This had a later ramification when departments were asked for updates. Items that departments felt had been ignored were sometimes jettisoned with wholly new “strategic goals” set in their place — all based on the same analysis of context and data.

• It was unclear how the UPC made decisions. For example, the scope of reorganization that emerged in the President’s plan was not clearly seen in the documents that came forward. This had the appearance of a pre-determined outcome and undermined trust in central administration and campus morale (see Standard Nine). At times ideas emerged without any seeming input from those who would be most affected.

• There was little feedback from the UPC, especially to departments. The UPC attempted to address this problem in year three when they asked for review of all departmental/unit plans. However, the UPC was simply overwhelmed and failed to respond to the departments. This further undermined confidence and trust in the process.

• There was poor communication about how plans at all levels were actually funded or put into effect. While the six-year summary of the process notes clear allocations of resources linked to the broad objectives contained in the University plan, much of this was not obvious at the time of the decision.

Thus the planning process had two tracks: there was a fairly direct process that produced analysis, plans and ongoing assessments of these plans. However, there is a perceived lack of certainty as to the effect. This perception of effect reflects problems in the participatory nature of the process. Future efforts need to be more flexible, less cumbersome and more responsive in terms of communicating with all campus constituencies about the process by which priorities are set and funded.

1.B.4 The institution uses the results of its systematic evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve its instructional programs, institutional services, and activities. AND

1.B.5 The institution integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify institutional priorities for improvement.

There are multiple examples of how the strategic planning process led to organizational changes and funding priorities designed to improve instructional programs, institutional services and activities. The planning process also makes explicit institutional priorities targeted for improvement. For example, the first strategic goal of the University plan (EDUCATE) focused on a range of strategies designed to “improve the quality of its teaching, of student learning, and of the student experience” (RE 1.1, p. 4). In most cases these strategies had stated target goals or linked goal development to data driven analysis. Strategy 1C is aimed at strengthening the Core Curriculum “based on data acquired through assessment.” In this area the Core Board
initiated assessment of two foundation areas — the Writing Program and Core Mathematics. For writing, the assessment efforts included development of a rubric that used trained readers to evaluate writing artifacts from randomly selected student portfolios. In math, the assessment used in-class NSSE/FSSE style surveys. From the assessment efforts the math sequence has been expanded and other curricular changes have been implemented. The overall administration of the Core Curriculum was also altered to address the goal of providing “full-time administrative attention to the Core Curriculum content, staffing, enhancement, and program assessment.” In comparison to conditions found during the 1997 accreditation, the Core now has a full-time director, specific budget authority and, as the survey data presented in Table 1.4 indicates, the support of the vast majority of faculty.

Similar examples can be found in each of the other strategic goals of the University plan. In some cases specific goals are being addressed or have been achieved. Across the range of goals, strategies and tactics the University offers specific measurement of progress in RE 1.2: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006. The implementation report verifies that substantial and continuous planning and evaluation is conducted that addresses identified University priorities.

1.B.6 The institution provides the necessary resources for effective evaluation and planning processes.

This is a far more difficult element to address as no clear set of criteria define “necessary resources.” All units engaged in planning have access to the multiple reports generated by the University (for examples see 1.A.3 and 1.A.4 above). The types of data required for planning were elaborated in various instructions previously cited in 1.B. Thus, units had the necessary measures and access to data to produce these measures for individual unit analysis. However, any costs — fiscal or personnel — in generating planning documents were borne by the individual units from their existing resources; resources that in many cases were already over-extended.

1.B.7 The institution’s research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning. AND

1.B.8 The institution systematically reviews its institutional research efforts, its evaluation processes, and its planning activities to document their effectiveness.

Strategic planning is an ongoing process. The process is “front-loaded” in creating plans that are to guide decision-making through a six-year time frame, but the plans are to be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. (Various updates are provided in the supporting documents to the Self-Study Report which contains a copy of the strategic plans produced by all units of the University subject to strategic planning.)

As noted, University data and evaluation (institutional research) are also regularly updated, reviewed and linked back to the strategic plans. Plans are updated and modified as necessary based upon the evaluation and assessment processes. The University also conducts on-going analysis of topics concerning selected parts of our mission and goals enunciated through the strategic planning process. Specific examples of these efforts are detailed in SM 1.1: Bibliography of Reports, Institutional Analysis.

The University has also made a major commitment, following the 1997 institutional accreditation and the 2002 interim site visit, to enhance the area of Program Assessment. The assessment regime in place at UNR is discussed in detail in Standard 2.B. Program Assessment is constant and designed to provide feedback to programs to enact program modifications or continuance as indicated from the data generated from unit assessment plans.

1.B.9 The institution uses information from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate evidence of institutional effectiveness to its public.

The University utilizes a variety of modalities to communicate issues of institutional planning and programming with both internal and public con-
stituencies. Several of these modalities are covered in the reports mentioned in 1.A.4. Performance indicators and most any policy changes pursued by the University must be submitted to the Board of Regents. As an elective body, such policy changes must be duly noted for public review and comment. Most reports — and especially summary indicators such as the UNR Data Book — are on the University webpage which is open to the public. The Office of University Assessment posts all program assessment plans on a public website and linked to the accreditation process all departments have been asked to post their assessment plans in areas that have ready public access. Specific reports from Institutional Analysis and those of the Special Assistant for Diversity are also available via the web.

With the implementation of strategic planning, the President’s annual “State of the University” address has specifically highlighted points of the planning process. This speech is available in multiple formats and is open to the public and press. An even more specific “scorecard” of communication about planning and evaluation processes is found in the annual report of the University Planning Council which is posted on the UNR webpage.

A key objective of the University’s strategic plan is to ENGAGE the public. A specific strategy (strategy 3A of the University Strategic Plan) under this objective is to communicate better with the external community. Toward this end the University reorganized its communications programs into an Office of Marketing and Communications (see also Standard 9.A.3). Several actions were taken to communicate more effectively with the external community, including addition of staff, especially staff responsible for covering and disseminating academic news stories from assigned colleges; refocusing the Silver and Blue magazine and broadening its distribution; developing new web-based publications for both internal and external audiences; and promoting speaking opportunities for University leaders at community events.

**Standard One Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations**

**Strengths: Mission and Planning**

- The University Mission Statement enjoys broad-based support from the campus constituencies and nearly all campus employees feel their position contributes to the accomplishment of the goals of the University.

- The University mission of outreach is backed by an extensive range of activities undertaken by all parts of the University.

- The University has made clear progress in developing a variety of data-based evaluation and assessment reports, which are not only tools for measuring particular activities on the campus but have also been integrated into the planning and decision-making processes of the University.

- The University has greatly increased its emphasis on data-driven planning and priority setting.

**Challenges: Mission and Planning**

- The strategic planning process was a massive and at times cumbersome effort. The effort reversed a highly decentralized system and greatly centralized decision-making. Strategic planning helped focus University priorities and use of data, but tipped the balance of collegial decision-making such that faculty and staff often felt they did not have a real voice in the process. The challenge in the next phase of strategic planning is to balance the greatly enhanced information and assessment abilities of the University with a process that better integrates the entire campus community.
There was an apparent disconnect between the goals of the strategic planning process and perceptions of what actually emerged from that process. There was no real mechanism for assessing campus perceptions in the planning process.

Recommendations: Mission and Planning

- A revised strategic planning process should be developed that makes greater use of already existing governance structures, including the Faculty Senate (especially for new unit proposals); University Courses & Curriculum (new program proposals); Academic Leadership Council (and especially Deans) and the President’s Council for general resource planning; and greater involvement from Staff in the policy development process. The University needs to engage in a campus discussion of key metrics for change that departments and various administrative units are then charged with accomplishing. This revised process can build on the basic analysis produced over the past six years but needs to avoid centralizing action into a single entity such as the UPC. Development of the process must be a collaborative effort headed by the institution’s President.

- While the University’s Mission Statement enjoys widespread support, the Faculty Senate, in conjunction with the Staff Employees’ Council, ASUN and GSA should periodically review the document. The purpose of this review would be to assess and report on University performance in relation to achieving specific objectives of the University Mission Statement.

- Programs enhancing student recruitment, retention and graduation need to be further strengthened and supported. This will need to be a multifaceted effort that includes programming and policy changes.

- The University needs to augment its considerable capacity of generating “hard data” reports and analysis with a more regularized assessment of opinions from the entire campus. The campus-wide survey conducted as part of the accreditation process was the first such opinion survey of all faculty and staff. Follow-up surveys, done in conjunction with issues and concerns generated from the Faculty Senate and the Staff Employees’ Council, should be undertaken on a regular basis. The campus might also explore participation in such national survey assessments as the UCLA HERI Faculty Survey.

- To enhance communication of University policy outcomes and resource allocations the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee should be reconstituted and refocused. With a more clearly articulated mission, this committee could facilitate better coordination and communication between groups/individuals central to the Planning and Budget process on campus.
Supporting Documentation Standard One

Required Documentation (RD)

RD 1.1 Mission Statement of the University
RD 1.2 University General Catalog, 2007-2008
RD 1.3 Student Academic Skills Center Data Book
RD 1.4 Faculty Workload Report
RD 1.5 Diversity Report 2005-2006
RD 1.6 Student Diversity and Goals Report 2006
RD 1.7 Annual Report on Faculty Demography 2006
RD 1.8 Diversity Report to the Committee on Diversity and Security, September 2005
RD 1.9 Alumni Survey
RD 1.10 Employer Survey
RD 1.11 Retention Report
RD 1.12 Diversity and Educational Benefits

Required Exhibits (RE)

RE 1.1 Our Best Effort for Nevada: President’s Written Report on Strategic Planning for 2001-02
RE 1.2 Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006
RE 1.3 Outreach Strategic Planning Final Report
RE 1.4 Compendium of Outreach Activities
RE 1.5 Strategic Planning Framework
RE 1.6 Planning Instructions 2001
RE 1.7 Strategic Planning Units 2001

Suggested Materials (SM)

SM 1.1 Bibliography of Reports, Institutional Analysis
SM 1.2 University Master Plan
SM 1.3 Facilities Condition Audit

**Chapter Documents (CD)**

CD 1.1 Evaluation Committee Report, 1997

CD 1.2 Campus Accreditation Survey 2006
   There are four separate surveys:
   - CD 1.2a Academic Faculty Survey
   - CD 1.2b School of Medicine Cooperative Extension Survey
   - CD 1.2c Administrative Faculty Survey
   - CD 1.2d Staff Survey

CD 1.3 University Webpage on Outreach

CD 1.4 Institutional Self-Study Report, October 1997
Standard Two — Educational Program and Its Effectiveness
Standard Two — Educational Program and Its Effectiveness ....................................................................................................................... 2.1-2.54

2.A – General Requirements ........................................................................................................................................................................... 2.1-2.6
2.B – Educational Program Planning and Assessment ................................................................................................................................. 2.6-2.17
2.C – Undergraduate Program ......................................................................................................................................................................... 2.17-2.24
2.D – Graduate Program .............................................................................................................................................................................. 2.24-2.26
2.E – Graduate Faculty and Related Resources ........................................................................................................................................ 2.26-2.29
2.F – Graduate Records and Academic Credit ....................................................................................................................................... 2.29-2.32
2.G – Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities .................................................................................................................. 2.32-2.39
2.H – Non-credit Programs and Courses .................................................................................................................................................... 2.39-2.41
Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs ............................................................................................................................................................. 2.42
Policy 2.5 Transfer and Award of Academic Credit ................................................................................................................................. 2.43-2.44
Policy 2.6 Distance Delivery of Courses, Certificate, and Degree Programs .................................................................................................. 2.44-2.47
Supporting Documentation for Standard Two ........................................................................................................................................... 2.48-2.54
Standard Two — Educational Program and Its Effectiveness

Standard 2.A — General Requirements

This section describes and evaluates the resources that support the University of Nevada, Reno’s educational programs. It reviews program activities that are being carried out and how program activities link to the University Mission.

2.A.1 The institution demonstrates its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning by providing sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its educational programs and to facilitate student achievement of program objectives whenever and however they are offered.

The considerable resources developed by the University of Nevada, Reno to support its teaching and learning activities are in keeping with its mission as a land-grant research institution. These University resources include: academic/administrative faculty, classified staff, administration resources, a physical plant and fiscal assets. In fall 2006, the University employed more than 1,700 academic and administrative faculty to provide education for 16,663 students. In addition, several hundred part-time faculty (Letters of Appointment) provide instruction, clinical and other specialized educational services. The outcome of faculty resources is a 19.5 to 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) student to FTE faculty ratio (The 19.5 to 1 ratio is based on: (Full time & part-time students / 3) ÷ (FT and PT faculty / 3). Staff resources include approximately 1,362 classified and more than 400 student employees who provide services within academic departments and programs and serve in a variety of support activities (RD GU 2.2.a: University Data Book).

The University is constructing new buildings and working to renovate existing facilities. However, these physical resources will be challenged by future growth (see Standard Eight narrative). The central University campus covers about 218 acres with an inventory of 79 buildings (not including agricultural and cooperative extension acreage and facilities), most of which are located within the main campus area. These buildings contain classrooms, laboratories, auditoriums, offices, and student meeting rooms. In addition, the University maintains the facilities shown in Table 2.1.

New buildings erected within the last two years or currently under construction include The Knowledge Center, Joe Crowley Student Union, the Redfield Campus, and the Cooperative Extension Lifelong Learning Center in Las Vegas. Standard Eight gives fuller descriptions of the University’s physical resources. Although the physical resources are currently sufficient to meet the needs of instructional programs, physical resources are not fully adequate with respect to research space. Pressure on research space was amply demonstrated during the recent (2006) Facilities and Administrative (F&A) rate negotiations, which resulted in a reduction in that rate from 45 percent to 40 percent. Given the corresponding growth in research activity, additional strains on research facilities are self-evident.
2.2 The goals of the institution’s educational programs, whenever and however offered, including instructional policies, methods, and delivery systems, are compatible with the institution’s mission. They are developed, approved, and periodically evaluated under established institutional policies and procedures through a clearly defined process.

The University conducts a program review process to align program goals and learning objectives with the institution’s mission. This process provides opportunities for programs to review their accomplishments, examine their strengths and weaknesses, and develop plans to improve their effectiveness. Program review conclusions and recommendations impact the University planning processes as well. The Board of Regents requires that all existing programs at the University regularly undergo program review, usually every 10 years, although the University has varied these reviews to fall in a 7 to 10 year window (RD GU 2.5.b: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 14, Planning, Program Review, Articulation and Enroll).

A master program review schedule has been developed in consultation with the deans of the various colleges to conform to Board of Regents’ policy. The process is directed by the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost under the supervision of the Vice Provost for Instruction and Undergraduate Programs. Program review looks at all of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs administered by an academic unit. They also examine service courses, centers, and other unit responsibilities not typically called programs. In most cases, but not always, the programs’ administrative unit will be an academic department. As discussed more fully below in section 2.B.1 the University substantially revised Program Review Guidelines in 2004 (CD GU 2.1: Program Review Guidelines) based largely on results from assessment studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Getchell Library (Main), Savitt Medical Library, and De La Mare Library (Mining) Ansari Map Library, Life and Health Sciences Library, Physical Sciences Library, W.M. Keck Earth Sciences and Mining Research Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>Nye Hall, Argenta Hall, Canada Hall, Juniper Hall, Lincoln Hall, White Pine Hall, and Manzanita Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>University Village Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Facilities</td>
<td>KNPB Channel 5 and KUNR FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arenas</td>
<td>Mackay Stadium (seating over 31,000) and Lawlor Events Center (seating over 11,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>Fleischmann Planetarium and Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Facilities</td>
<td>The Dowmunder Café and Food Court and Overlook Café are the larger dining commons. Supporting facilities include Northside Café, Barista Brothers Coffee Cart, DC Store, Las Troyes Mexican Express, and The Union Wolf Perk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Nightingale Concert Hall, Redfield Proscenium Theatre, and Black Box Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>Anderson Health Science, Howard Health Science, Manville Medical Science, Nellor Biomedical Science, Savitt Medical Science, and Area Health Education Centers in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Facilities</td>
<td>Nevada Terawatt Facility, Chemistry Research Facility, Multicharged Ion Research Facility in the Physics Department, Palmer Instructional Facility, Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station (including facilities such as Main Station Farm and Newlands Research Center), Tahoe Center for Environmental Sciences, and University Center for Environmental Sciences and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>County Extension offices in each of Nevada’s 17 counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Facilities</td>
<td>Nevada Fire Science Academy in Carlin, Nevada and Redfield Campus in South Reno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The self-study performed by the program faculty constitutes the most important step in a review. In addition, external reviewers provide feedback from a broader perspective and provide guidance to the program and the administration. At the end of the visit, the external review team provides a verbal outline of the external review report and the major topics to be addressed. The final external review report includes commendations as well as recommendations (RD GU 2.1a: Program Review Manual, p. 20).

In addition to the formal program reviews, various programs are separately accredited by disciplinary bodies. To achieve accreditation these programs conduct self-studies that meet standards articulated by the governing body. A list of separately accredited programs at the University is found in CD GU 2.2: UNR Specialized Accreditation Programs.

2.A.3 Degree and certificate programs demonstrate a coherent design; are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, synthesis of learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes; and require the use of library and other information sources.

All degree and certificate programs must be approved before implementation. To be approved, the proposing department or college follows a carefully described review process that begins at the program level and ends with approval from the Board of Regents. The multilevel review process helps ensure that each degree has satisfactory depth and breadth and an appropriate sequence of courses. In addition, under University policy, all programs must assess learning outcomes and require the use of the library and/or other information sources. Assessment plans are a required component for the University Courses and Curriculum Committee, as well as reviews by the specialized accreditation bodies (RD GU 2.1a: Program Review Manual, p. 1; RE GU 2.2.a: University Courses and Curriculum Committee Manual Index Procedures).

2.A.4 The institution uses degree designators consistent with program content. In each field of study or technical program, degree objectives are clearly defined: the content to be covered, the intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry to be acquired; and, if applicable, the specific career-preparation competencies to be mastered.

The University offers undergraduate, and advanced degrees in accordance with the University General Catalog 2007-2008. Each academic program includes the University core, major requirements, and options for advanced and bachelor’s degree, minors, electives and certificates within a minimum of 128 semester credit hour requirement for graduation.

Degree programs demonstrate coherent design; reflect appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, and focus on a synthesis of learning and the assessment of learning outcomes. Degrees are designed based upon concepts relating to program content. All programs contain clear objectives, curriculum, and graduate competencies and Student Learning Outcomes that are drawn from relevant national standards and accreditation body regulations. All degree programs are required to publish a recommended four-year course of study (RE GU 2.6.a: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Recommended Four Year Schedules, pp. 93-357). The enforcement of prerequisites further link the parts of the curriculum in a sensible sequence.

2.A.5 The institution provides evidence that students enrolled in programs offered in concentrated or abbreviated timeframes demonstrate mastery of program goals and course objectives.

Variations to the University’s semester schedule include a summer session with a three week mini-term (some mini-term classes extend into the first summer session term), and two five-week sessions. Summer session begins in mid-May and ends the second week in August. A Wintermester session was introduced in January.
2007, consisting of a three-week term with classes meeting five days a week. Classes offered during the winter or summer terms are taught in abbreviated time frames. The number of instruction hours must be the same if the same credit is granted, whether a class is taught during a semester or in an abbreviated term. Students enrolled in these concentrated courses must demonstrate mastery of the program goals and related course objectives within that time frame.

2.A.6 The institution is able to equate its learning experiences with semester or quarter credit hours using practices common to institutions of higher education, to justify the lengths of its programs in comparison to similar programs found in regionally accredited institutions of higher education, and to justify any program-specific tuition in terms of program costs, program length, and program objectives.

The University operates on a semester-based calendar with 15-week terms in fall and spring followed by a week of final exams. University schedules are consistent with practices in most other higher education institutions with credits assigned to learning experiences directly related to the length of courses. For example, a typical three-credit course requires 45 50-minute classroom sessions. Tuition costs are similar within all graduate and all undergraduate programs at the University. (Tuition rates of the Master’s Degree in Justice Studies and the Medical School are exceptions and have historically been higher.)

Some colleges charge additional fees to cover costs above those of other academic disciplines. The University President implements this policy up to a maximum of $50 per course. As is common for some specialized courses, additional fees may be assessed for extraordinary cost items such as individual instruction (e.g., private music lessons). Additional fees over $50 must be approved by the Board of Regents (RD GU 2.5.c: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 17, Fees and Expenses, Section 19).

2.A.7 Responsibility for design, approval, and implementation of the curriculum is vested in designated institutional bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. The faculty has a major role and responsibility in the design, integrity, and implementation of the curriculum.

The University’s faculty has primary responsibility for the design, approval, and implementation of the curriculum. The University maintains three levels in the design, approval and implementation of the curriculum. Departments or programs initiate new curricula and any changes to or deletion of existing curricula. After approval by the department faculty, College Curriculum Committee and Dean, and University Courses and Curriculum Committee, they are forwarded to the Provost. The Provost’s Office may also route proposals to the Graduate Council or the University Core Curriculum Board, as appropriate, for approval as part of the graduate and core curricula, respectively. Course proposals are reviewed not only as entities, but also within the context of their program impact. (i.e., degree, major, minor, etc.) (RE GU 2.2.a: University Courses and Curriculum Committee Manual Index Procedures).

The University Courses and Curriculum Committee (UCCC) now consists primarily of associate deans responsible for curriculum from all colleges plus representatives from key academic service areas. However, before proposals reach the UCCC they have been reviewed by faculty at the departmental and college level. (Standard 4.A.2 discusses the review process and faculty issues related to curriculum review in more detail.) A request approved by the UCCC is added to the University curriculum database. Because the University’s general catalog is updated and published online each year, printed copies are available but not widely disseminated.
2.A.8 Faculty, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.

The faculty has primary responsibility for designing instructional and learning processes for their courses. All faculty submitting a new course or updating an existing course must submit a Library Assessment form for use by the library staff in preparing support for the new or revised course. Subject Specialists in the Library review the availability of materials and the level of support that can be provided for each faculty member.

Librarians work with individual departments to purchase books, journals, software, and/or other non-print materials needed for classes and to provide individualized and college specific training for new and/or returning students. A full description of the academic support services provided by the library appears in Standard Five.

2.A.9 The institution’s curriculum (programs and courses) is planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling.

The Office of Admissions and Records works directly with departments and programs scheduling courses, identifying optimal times to facilitate student accessibility, and the efficient use of physical resources. Substantive decisions about courses and sequencing of courses is the province of departmental and program faculty. Departments and colleges planning upcoming courses generally must conform to optimum time schedules managed by Admissions and Records so that students are not precluded from taking course A because course B overlaps course A’s time frame. This time schedule is especially helpful for undergraduates during prime instructional hours.

In spring semester 2006, the University acquired a web-based scheduling software, Astra Schedule, to minimize overlaps and conflicts. Astra Schedule, which is also used to schedule events in campus facilities (rooms and grounds), allows users to view the schedule and submit a request for a room. Faculty can request changes in the schedule, but student learning needs receive the highest priority. Graduate programs receive greater flexibility in course scheduling. From time to time, courses and programs are offered in special time slots (e.g., weekend classes) or by other delivery methods (e.g., distance education) to meet the needs of nontraditional learners. These arrangements typically are employed when students cannot access regularly scheduled classes.

2.A.10 Credit for prior experiential learning is awarded only in accordance with Policy 2.3 Credit for Prior Experiential Learning.

The University of Nevada, Reno does not award credit for prior experiential learning. Students can, with the approval of their academic advisor, the chairman of the department, the dean of the college in which the student is registered and Office of Admissions and Records, challenge a course for credit by taking an examination in the identified course. If the student passes the examination, a grade of Satisfactory (S) is typically awarded. An exception is if the course is required in a student’s major or minor. Then a letter grade from A to F is given with the advanced written approval of the academic advisor (RD GU 2.5.d: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Credit for Nontraditional Learning, pp. 38-42).

2.A.11 Policies, regulations, and procedures for additions and deletions of courses or programs are systematically and periodically reviewed.

Additions and deletions of courses and programs are governed by policies adopted by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee. Courses and programs are approved initially through procedures discussed under 2.A.3. Once they are created, courses and programs are reviewed regularly as described in Standard 2.A.2. The associate registrar reviews class offerings and provides departments with lists of courses
that have not had enrollment in the previous five years, to ensure the currency and contribution of courses’ coherence of programs. Department chairs are notified, and have an opportunity to reinstate the courses on the basis of a written rationale through a streamlined curricular review process.

2.A.12 In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, institutional policy requires appropriate arrangements to be made for enrolled students to complete their program in a timely manner and with a minimum of disruption.

Academic units eliminating a degree, major, or other program must consult the appropriate dean(s) regarding the feasibility of the elimination. After review by appropriate departmental and college committees, the proposer(s) forward the NSHE Proposal for Elimination of Programs to the Office of the Provost for consideration by the New Program Pre-Proposal Committee.

Items to be addressed are:

1. Title of program to be eliminated.
2. Reason for proposed elimination of the program.
3. If the plan to phase out the program will impact students, a description of how enrolled students’ needs will be addressed.
4. Impact of elimination on faculty and staff and the related academic programs.

After review and recommendation by the New Program Pre-Proposal Committee, the proposing department will receive a memorandum from the Provost’s Office outlining how it should proceed. The appropriate dean forwards to the Provost’s Office the final proposal and any necessary University Courses and Curriculum Committee memos. If appropriate, the Provost’s Office will seek review and recommendations from the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and/or University Courses and Curriculum Committee. After receiving final recommendations, the President will determine if the final proposal will be forwarded to the NSHE Academic Affairs Council and the Board of Regents for approval. Degree, major, or program eliminations also require approval by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, which will be sought concurrently with NSHE Academic Affairs Council and Board of Regents approval. Upon notification of approval by the Board of Regents and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (RD GU 2.1.b: University Administrative Manual, 6.042), the Provost’s Office will send a confirming memo to the department, with copies to the following: the appropriate college dean, Office of Admissions and Records, Planning, Budget and Analysis, the Graduate School (if applicable), the Vice Provost, Office of University Assessment, and the President’s Office.

Standard 2.B — Educational Program Planning and Assessment

Educational program planning is based on regular and continuous assessment of programs in light of the needs of the disciplines, the fields or occupations for which programs prepare students, and other constituencies of the institution.

2.B.1 The institution’s processes for assessing its educational programs are clearly defined, encompass all of its offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated into the overall planning and evaluation plan. The processes are consistent with the institution’s assessment plan as required by Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment. While key constituents are involved in the process, the faculty have a central role in planning and evaluating the educational programs.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) full accreditation report to UNR in 1997 made clear that much work needed to be done in the area of assessment, particularly to insure that each program develop and implement a program-level, outcomes-based assessment plan. The subsequent 2002 interim report noted significant progress had been made in assessment and that UNR should continue to
press for full implementation of the University Assessment Plan (RD GU 2.1.c: University Assessment Plan). The University continues to take these recommendations seriously and agrees that ongoing outcomes assessment is an integral part of ensuring educational excellence. To that end, UNR has made a philosophical commitment to a comprehensive assessment plan and has backed that commitment with resources and action. Key achievements include strengthening the Office of University Assessment (OUA), reallocating resources to assessment and facilitating institution-wide understanding of student outcomes assessment. The first full-time director of the OUA was hired in 2000, since that time two additional full-time professional staff, a .5 FTE programmer and a full-time administrative assistant have been added. This action, which upgraded the office from a .5 FTE director and some graduate assistants, represents a serious philosophical and monetary commitment. The University provided additional resources needed to implement the University Assessment Plan. The inclusion of a high quality alumni survey and employer survey are two important elements added to the assessment process (RD GU 2.1.d: Alumni Survey; RD GU 2.1.e: Employer Survey). The rationale for these surveys, along with projected costs (they were not included in the budget at that time), was presented to the UNR President and Provost who concurred with the need to have such data and who agreed to provide supporting funds to develop and continue the surveys.

An important product of creating a robust assessment office has been the development of a clear assessment mission at UNR. The Office of University Assessment mission, as set forth in an early version of the strategic plan (CD GU 2.3: OUA Strategic Plan), is to:

a. Provide leadership for academic and student affairs programs to improve student learning;
b. Provide consultation in the development of plans for the assessment of institutional effectiveness and general education;
c. Provide training and technical assistance for the development and implementation of program assessment plans;
d. Promote the establishment of means to sustain assessment activities to assure continuous program improvement.

Pervasive elements of the OUA mission are continuous program improvement and that the program is the key unit of change in making improvements. The OUA is committed to supporting academic and student services programs in design and implementation of student outcomes assessment and in the use of assessment results as key contributors to program improvement. The University Assessment Plan, developed with the support of a campus-wide Assessment Advisory Committee (CD GU 2.4: Assessment Advisory Committee), continues to guide UNR’s comprehensive outcomes assessment. Successful implementation of the Plan requires a faculty culture that understands and supports assessment. Facilitating this culture has included:

- Developing an infrastructure that includes a network of assessment coordinators from each program (CD GU 2.5: Program Assessment Coordinators by College);
- Meeting with colleges, departments, the Faculty Senate, the academic leadership counsel and other groups to explain and promote assessment;
- Providing professional development opportunities through workshops, consultations, web sites, newsletters, enhancement grants and faculty attendance at assessment and professional development meetings;
- Collaborating with two area community colleges to create an annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference as a forum for faculty to both learn about assessment and share their assessment experiences with colleagues (CD GU 2.6: Northern Nevada Assessment Conference Program 2003).
Integrating Assessment
Implementation of the University Assessment Plan began just prior to the onset of the University’s comprehensive strategic planning initiative. Although work on the strategic plan is ongoing, the University’s Strategic Plan, clearly shows the integration of student outcomes assessment with institutional planning (CD GU 2.7: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006). Of the five major objectives listed in the President’s Report, outcomes assessment is referenced in three of them: Educate, Engage and Enable. Consistent with integrating assessment into the strategic plan, the University reallocated resources to support assessment infrastructure and activities as described earlier.

An important way assessment data are being integrated across the University, albeit at the program level, concerns the high percentage of academic programs in the Colleges and Schools of Business, Education, Engineering, Nursing and Journalism, and other programs in the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science, that voluntarily seek accreditation in their respective disciplines. Specialized accrediting bodies increasingly are articulating standards for assessing student outcomes. Currently, 14 such accrediting bodies review UNR programs (CD GU 2.2: UNR Specialized Accreditation Programs). Consequently, program-level assessment data, as well as alumni and employer survey data, have proved very useful to programs, departments and colleges. Assessment data also are incorporated into analyses being done by the Office of Institutional Analysis. For example, selected findings from the 2003 and 2005 administrations of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (RD GU 2.2.d: NSSE UNR 2005 Benchmark Report; RD GU 2.2.e: NSSE UNR 2003 Benchmark Report) were included in Institutional Analysis student retention studies (CD GU 2.8: UNR Retention Study Executive Summary).

Recent changes in some institutional policies and procedures reflect the integration of assessment into planning and decision-making. The Board of Regents requires periodic program reviews of nearly all University programs. A total revision of Program Review Guidelines was completed in 2004 (CD GU 2.1: Program Review Guidelines). The new guidelines place far greater emphasis on outcomes relative to inputs. Consistent with this emphasis is the new requirement for each program to report on its assessment plan and findings, and to demonstrate how the program has analyzed and used assessment results for program improvement. Another example is the recent revision of applications for proposed new programs. The University Courses and Curriculum Committee now asks for information about outcomes assessment plans (CD GU 2.9: Program Proposal Form).

2.B.2 The institution identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes.

Program Focus
Assessment helps the University respond to calls for accountability ranging from parents to employers to accrediting agencies. However, assessment serves a second, and perhaps more important purpose — it helps UNR become better. To ensure effectiveness of assessment as a tool for continuous improvement, UNR has focused its efforts on assessing student outcomes at the program level. Programs obtain data via implementation of their assessment plans and from the alumni, employer and other University-conducted surveys. UNR views the program as the key unit of improvement for several reasons; its faculty:

- Have the greatest knowledge of and control over its curriculum or services;
- Make key decisions affecting student performance and assessment;
- Control the collection, analysis and use of most pertinent data;
- Are motivated to do well and to improve;
- Are collectively relatively small and nimble enough to make changes efficiently.
This program-level focus is validated by the requirement of many regional and specialized accrediting agencies which now want evidence of published program outcomes, of how those outcomes are assessed and of how assessment data have been used to improve the program’s ability to achieve its outcomes. The emphasis on the program as the key unit of assessment is described in the University Assessment Plan (RD GU 2.1.c: University Assessment Plan).

Program Assessment Plans

Every undergraduate and graduate degree-granting program listed in the University General Catalog, along with key campus-wide student service programs and the Advising Center, is charged with developing an outcomes assessment plan, implementing the plan and annually reporting a summary of its assessment results, including program improvements that have been made or are planned. Following the standardized model approved by the Assessment Advisory Committee (CD GU 2.4: Assessment Advisory Committee), the first program assessment plans were submitted in 2002, with submission of assessment reports beginning the following year. Currently, 97 percent of programs have developed and submitted assessment plans, many of which have been revised one or more times. Table 2.2 shows the completion status of program assessment plans by college. Program assessment plans and four years of program assessment reports are available for review (RD GU 2.1.c: University Assessment Plan).

For the sake of clarity, consistency and ease of reporting, programs are asked to use a common paradigm or template to design their plans. The templates for submitting assessment plans (CD GU 2.10: Assessment Plan Template) and assessment reports (CD GU 2.11: Assessment Report Template) are available online for completion and editing by the designated assessment coordinator for each program. The Office of University Assessment has provided numerous workshops and consultations to assist programs with completing their assessment plans and offers step-by-step directions on the OUA website (CD GU 2.12: Assessment Model Web). Chart 2.1 shows the University-wide progression of programs completing assessment plans and reports.

The ‘N’ at the top of each column in Chart 2.1 represents the number of programs from which assessment plans and reports are expected, while the numbers in the column segments show compliance. As shown in Chart 2.1, the number of submitted program assessment plans and reports has grown substantially over the past four years, while the number of programs submitting plans has decreased by more than half. Currently, only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2 Assessment Plans Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Advising — under Provost's Office
five programs have yet to complete an assessment plan. While numerous factors affect this progress, it is the hope and belief that assessment is continuing to be better understood and carried out by faculty, which is a condition contributing to a shift in University norms toward a culture of assessment.

Mid-Program and End-of-Program Assessments

For graduate and undergraduate majors, the assessment plan in their respective programs, each of which is unique, determines when, how and on what outcomes students are assessed. Regarding general education, as described more extensively in section 2.C of this report, a great deal of time, thought and effort has been invested in designing assessments to monitor student performance throughout the Core Curriculum.

The Core Curriculum has three potential opportunities to track and assess student learning in writing and critical thinking skills. All students are required to take English, Core Humanities, and a Capstone course. Recently, Jane Detweiler, Core Writing Director, created and implemented a writing and critical thinking assessment of English 102 students. Phil Boardman, Core Humanities Director, was impressed with the writing assessment model and is basing the Core Humanities student assessment model after said writing model. The final assessment point is the Capstone experience.

All Capstone courses require students demonstrate writing and critical thinking skills; therefore all students have at least one assignment by which to exhibit growth in these areas and can be linked to previous works in Core Writing and Core Humanities. By implementing a quasi-portfolio technique we can track student progress and confirm student improvements. Given the relative newness of this assessment technique at UNR, there has not been enough time to track students from their first year through their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No Submissions</th>
<th>Plans Only</th>
<th>Plans &amp; Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2.1
Assessment Plans Status – Number of Submitted Reports & Plans for University Programs by Year
senior year to show improvement. The creation and implementation of portfolios as a method to measure student success is the direction the Core is working towards. Other specific efforts, more fully described and cited in section 2.C, contributing to a comprehensive assessment include:

- Developing an effective framework for a comprehensive assessment plan;
- Triangulating reflective assessments within Core skill areas (e.g., writing, critical thinking) by surveying students (NSSE), alumni and employers;
- Tasking the Core Curriculum Board with reviewing and revising all outcomes;
- Surveying faculty to clarify diversity-related outcomes and to clarify the status quo regarding capstone outcomes;
- Working with math faculty to clarify faculty expectation vis-à-vis student expectations and performance;
- Evaluating components of math, science and social science courses to better understand how course structure and pedagogy may be adjusted to achieve Core outcomes in larger classes likely to be required to accommodate the University’s growing enrollments.

Alumni and Employer Surveys
Feedback from program alumni and their employers helps inform program improvement. Combined with authentic outcome results collected by degree programs, these data help programs determine how well students have acquired the knowledge and skills intended by the faculty. Additionally, survey data inform the program about the preparation of their graduates to succeed in their chosen professions. Assessment staff worked closely with the Assessment Advisory Committee and the Center for Applied Research (now the Center for Research Design & Analysis — CRDA) through several iterations of the alumni and employer instruments and telephone interview methodology.

The finished instrument (RD GU 2.1.d: Alumni Survey) includes items related to employment (B), education since graduation (C), impact of general education (D), and items for alumni to rate the quality, career preparation, program difficulty, advisement, and faculty-student interaction within their major (E). Each degree program also was invited to submit five closed-end items that would be asked only of that program’s graduates. At present, 87 degree programs have chosen to do so. With permission, the alumni’s immediate supervisor also is surveyed via a telephone interview. Approximately 45 percent of the employed alumni give permission. Most items are closely related to general education competencies, however several provide feedback regarding employers’ satisfaction (Q3), perception of preparedness (Q5), and the University’s educational achievements overall (Q6). The design of the alumni survey, which began in April 2002, is to interview all graduates (not a sample) approximately one year post graduation and again at three and five years post graduation. The alumni survey’s initial response rate (60 percent) has remained relatively consistent. The OUA obtained contact information for 60 percent of graduates (CD GU 2.13: Alumni Survey Response Rates) and 90 percent of those graduates completed interviews. Only one alumni survey item asked about overall alumni satisfaction. When asked, if given the opportunity to do it over, more than 90 percent said they would still choose to attend UNR over another institution. The Reno Chamber of Commerce asked the OUA to give a summary presentation of alumni survey findings at Directions 2006, a conference of the northern Nevada business community (RD GU 2.2.b: Alumni Survey Information Presentation).

### Table 2.3
**Employer Survey Key Findings**

| Our graduates are well prepared in a wide set of general education skills, from writing and speaking to use of technology and working in diverse groups. |
| Generally high levels of satisfaction with the graduate – 83 percent were very satisfied. |
| Only 5 percent of our graduates are less prepared compared to graduates of other institutions. |
| Most (63 percent) consider a UNR degree as a positive factor when considering potential new hires. |
The employer survey (RD GU 2.1.c: Employer Survey), a telephone interview of the alumnus’ immediate supervisor, includes sections with items pertaining to the University’s preparation of alumni at the time they were hired. The survey has resulted in 85 percent of immediate supervisors contacted completing an interview. The resulting data (RD GU 2.2.c: University Employer Survey Immediate Supervisor Responses August 2000-May 2004 Graduates) include the findings depicted in Table 2.3.

All University-wide data from the alumni and employer surveys are published on the Assessment website. In addition, data that compares a college, department, or degree program to University-wide frequencies is available to the provost, deans, chairs, and program-level assessment coordinators who have permission through the website’s login feature.

**National Surveys**


- Partially as a result of NSSE data reporting on faculty feedback to students on their performance, our undergraduate biology program initiated issuing progress reports to all their majors.
- Were able to use NSSE data pertaining to general education in combination with similar items on the alumni and employer surveys to triangulate, and subsequently, corroborate subjective assessment of the Core Curriculum.
- With permission of the NSSE national office, UNR administered a modified version of the instrument as part of an evaluation of the efficacy of two significantly different approaches to teaching a heavily subscribed introductory psychology course.
- NSSE data are being used by Engineering and others as supportive evidence in their specialized accreditation applications.
- With the knowledge of the NSSE national office, development of a class-based NSSE instrument (CLASSE) directed by Judith Ouimet, is underway by the Assessment Office (CD GU 2.14: Assessment Measures Articles). Thus far the instrument has been used in several courses in math, psychology and physics. Preliminary results indicated this instrument may be very useful in providing instructors with data-based insights that will enable pedagogical and targeted course improvements.
- Selected NSSE data have been studied as predictive variables in a retention model developed by the Office of Institutional Analysis (CD GU 2.8: UNR Retention Study Executive Summary).

Based on both the 2003 NSSE-FSSE Comparisons Report selected findings and the 2005 NSSE-2006 FSSE Comparison Report, UNR shows congruence as well as differences between student behavior and faculty perceptions (RD GU 2.2.f: UNR FSSE NSSE 2003 Comparison Report; RD GU 2.2.g: Selected 2003 NSSE FSSE Findings; RD GU 2.2.h: 2003 NSSE-FSSE Comparisons Selected Findings Presentation; RD GU 2.2.i: FSSE 2006-NSSE 2005 Comparison Report). Some interesting findings were that students, more than faculty, indicated the University emphasized spending significant amounts of time on academic work and more students than faculty indicated that students ask questions and participate in class discussions. More students than faculty reported that feedback on academic performance was not
prompt. Additionally, more students report participating in both community service and volunteer work or internships than faculty thought was the case. As an outcome of these findings, several modification were undertaken (RD GU 2.2.j: Selected Use of NSSE Data at UNR). We believe these data, particularly findings where significant gaps exist between similar items on NSSE and FSSE results, hold greater potential for program improvement than UNR has been able to realize to date. When deciding whether to administer FSSE for the second time, a meeting was convened of the college associate deans and obtained their commitment to study the results for appropriate action.

2.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.

Designing and implementing outcomes assessment often is a thoughtful and labor-intensive process, yet UNR is mindful that enhancing student performance through improvement of the education enterprise is the fruit of these labors. Assessment serves both program improvement and program accountability; goals that increasingly overlap. UNR’s system of program-based assessment is designed to conform with academic year cycles and, consequently, programs annually are asked to review their assessment findings, reflect the implications vis-à-vis their assessment plans and then submit a report summarizing what they learned about their students’ performance and program changes they made or they are planning. The program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as defined in the Assessment Plan Model (CD GU 2.12: Assessment Model Web) are unique for each of the programs, making it difficult to know how larger groups of students are performing, e.g., all engineering graduate students or all university undergraduates. On the annual report, programs were asked to report (sometimes estimate) how their students are performing by reporting the percent of students who fully meet, substantially meet and substantially fail to meet each of the program’s SLOs.

These results, which the OUA maintains in a database, can be aggregated by various student populations; Chart 2.2 shows University-wide results for graduates and undergraduates by year. While not a precise metric, it helps UNR to understand how students are performing in their majors and its validity should improve as programs refine their assessment data collection, analysis and reporting systems. These annual program reports help determine how programs, both individually and collectively, are using assessment for evidence-based program improvement. Programmatic change, in most cases, is evolutionary as opposed to revolutionary. Improvements often come in the form of “fine tuning” and are not necessarily ex-
pected every year from each program. Neverthe-
less, as faculty review and discuss actual per-
formance data for their collective majors, some-
times employing tools such as curriculum map-
ping, the reported consequence has been pro-
gram modifications on a fairly large scale. Of
the 411 annual assessment reports received
through spring 2006, 43 percent described im-
provements that had been made and 37 percent
indicated planned program changes. What kinds
of improvements? A few, such as adding op-
tions for new minors and for a non-thesis mas-
ter’s degree, have been large, while many
changes have focused on courses:

- Adding new courses and reviving former
courses;
- Changing course learning objectives,
textbooks, syllabi and content;
- Changing course structure and pedagogy.

Other changes have included:

- Better training for graduate teaching
assistants;
- Improving curriculum alignment;
- Supporting discipline-based accreditation
requirements;
- More focused, consistent and accessible
student advising;
- Designing and implementing online, senior
exit examinations;
- New procedures, revised exams and rubrics
to help evaluate graduate students.

The following are examples of how some pro-
grams are engaging in continuous improve-
ment by incorporating assessment data in decisions to
make modifications to various aspects of the ma-

Chemistry (undergraduate and graduate)
Assessment results often lead to “fine tuning”
specific areas of a program’s curriculum. Occa-
sionally, however, the changes are more far
reaching. In such instances assessment data are
usually just one of several factors prompting and
informing the change. The chemistry department
has made such changes both to the undergradu-
ate and graduate degree programs. The under-
graduate curriculum was augmented in two
ways:

First, careful consideration of our minor in
Chemistry has led to the UNR approval of two
new minor options. These are the Analytical-
Organic option and the Biophysical-Organic op-
tion and were instituted after careful delibera-
tion, with the expectation of attracting more stu-
dents to the Chemistry minor by specifying
clearly two specific sets of courses of relevance
to chemistry-related careers. Also, in response
to the demands of the life sciences, a new two-
semester organic chemistry course sequence
(Chemistry 241-242, Organic I & II) was cre-
ated and UNR-approved. Enrollment has grown
from approximately 60 to double that number in
fall 2005 thus attesting to its popularity. This
new one-year course continues to undergo evo-
lutionary changes and should develop its own
niche by 2007.

Two significant program improvements also
were added to the graduate programs:

It became clear during the early stages of as-
sessment that it would be valuable to add a new
(Plan B) non-thesis M.S. degree. This was cre-
ated by the faculty and recently approved and is
now in the 2005-2006 catalog. The clientele in-
clude high school teachers and others who seek
an M.S. degree absent advanced laboratory
training. Full implementation and assessment of
this new degree await further evaluation based
on enrollees. Additionally, at the M.S. and Ph.D.
levels, the organic division is implementing a
program of study for organic students wherein a
full year of graduate organic synthesis is ac-
commodated in the first year of study. This is de-
signed to strengthen the students’ knowledge of
reagents, transformations and design.
Geological Science and Engineering (graduate)

Programs were encouraged to involve their faculty in developing program assessment plans. Faculty review and reflection on assessment results are particularly vital to program improvement. In some cases, such as the Geology graduate programs, the result has been structural change. The department Curriculum Committee decided to reinstate the position of graduate director, which for the previous decade had been filled by the departmental chair. A position of graduate coordinator had been established to assist the chair in tracking student progress and to work individually with students to resolve problems that arose, but it became apparent that it would be more effective and efficient for the coordinator to assume a full director role with signatory authority over programs of study, progress reports, and notices of completion. Also in 2004, the curriculum committee updated the Departmental Guidelines for M.S. and Ph.D. Programs in Geological Sciences to reflect current practices and policies. The updating process initiated many useful conversations among the faculty regarding graduate exam requirements, procedures, and requirements for programs of study; information is now provided to all students via a handbook. The following year an Annual Progress Report was developed to be used by each student. “The first year, the form was extremely successful, and even spurred several students to hold committee meetings so that they could report on their progress.”

Resource Economics (graduate)

In contrast to broad or structural changes, more often reviewing assessment results lead programs to strengthen a specific curriculum area. The most important student learning outcome in the Resource Economics graduate program is: Understand the economic principles underlying producer and consumer behavior. Our core courses, APEC 710 and APEC 720, are intended to introduce graduate students to the theory and tools necessary for successful completion of their graduate studies. Through assessment however, we found over years 2004 and 2005 that the coordination and the content of the microeconomic theory sequence APEC 710 and APEC 720 were confusing students and were not entirely successful at developing key concepts.

The ability of students to develop analytical and problem solving abilities appeared to the faculty to have reached a plateau. Consequently, the microeconomic sequence has been substantially changed; a common text book has been adopted and the newly assigned instructors are working closely together to coordinate the topics covered. Initial indications are that these changes are providing students with a better foundation in microeconomic theory as evidenced by improved performance on preliminary examinations.

The annual assessment reports from this program demonstrate an important principle of the University assessment plan — ongoing assessment with continuity from year-to-year. Regarding the same Student Learning Outcome cited above, their 2004 assessment report states: As indicated in the last report, we substantially modified our economic theory core sequence (APEC 710/720) for the 2003/04 academic year. The material covered in these courses is now in line with material taught at nationally ranked upper division programs in economics and applied economics. In addition, we added the use of mathematical software (Mathematica) to complement these courses to accelerate and facilitate the learning process. These modifications were generally well received by both students and instructors. Furthermore, in reaction to preparatory shortcomings prior to entering our program mentioned in the last report, we allocated more weight to prior training in economic theory in the assessment of application material submitted for 2003-04, and identified remedial coursework needed in certain cases. As a result, the incoming cohort for this past academic year was overall well prepared for these courses.
Human Development and Family Studies (undergraduate)

Another specific program modification again illustrates the value of faculty discussion and negotiation, but also shows the utility of student assessment using qualitative methods. Although the productive use of assessment data to improve their program is shown here, it was not all smooth sailing. This program faculty has transcended a largely negative attitude toward outcomes assessment to emerge as a program that has an engaged faculty and has become a campus leader in assessment. Along the way, the program developed a comprehensive online exam for seniors. It continues to use that exam, evaluates their program alignment through curriculum mapping and obtains student input via focus groups, internship evaluations and reflections from alumni. Data from these assessments indicated a problem with the internship that included sites limited to child-focused programs (not meeting the needs of students with gerontology and other focus areas) and problems with learning objectives that were too limited or inadequately taught (not sufficiently preparing students for upper-division courses.) Faculty reflected on these findings in light of the curriculum map they had developed in which course objectives were matched to overall program learning outcomes. As a result: a standard syllabus was developed that aligned its objectives with program outcomes. Additionally, materials were prepared for advisors to help students understand the rationale for the internship objectives; a revised course design, using an Instructional Enhancement Grant from the University, was developed to include online and practice components by incorporating a series of modules and two additional internship placements were developed in gerontology and family studies.

Disability Resource Center (DRC)

The assessments conducted by student affairs programs seek to understand how the services provided benefit DRC students. While often a challenging undertaking, these assessments are leading to program improvements. The DRC incorporates a student satisfaction survey, the results of which have lead to several specific program enhancements:

- Increase the range and number of students responding to the satisfaction survey by placing it online;
- Facilitate exam scheduling and proctoring by enabling staff to complete all scheduling via an online database;
- Improve student access to technology by adding an Assistive Technology Specialist to the DRC staff;
- Improve timely student access to alternative textbooks by developing an online database to monitor and track the textbook procurement process.

Standard 2.B Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

Strengths: Educational Program Planning and Assessment

- Since the University’s last reaccreditation, the infrastructure for supporting institutional, program, and course assessment has improved dramatically. An Office of University Assessment (OUA) has been created to support, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Analysis, the Excellence in Teaching Program and other units, the collection and use of data for planning and instructional improvement purposes.

- In ways described above, outcomes assessment has come a long way at UNR since its last full accreditation. Just as program-level assessment is an ongoing process striving for continuous improvement, so is the University’s assessment process seeking to be more efficient and effective. In doing so,
UNR will need to meet various challenges, three of which UNR is currently addressing.

**Challenges: Educational Program Planning and Assessment**

- Faculty need to be sufficiently engaged in the design and production of assessment plans, as well as the follow-up reports that reflect on progress.

- Although progress in faculty involvement is occurring, the majority of faculty need to be actively engaged in outcome assessment.

- The promise of utilizing assessment data to improve University programs has not been fully realized. Faculty need help in applying assessment data into the improvement of programs and courses.

**Recommendations: Educational Program Planning and Assessment**

- Strategies for improving the culture of assessment on campus continue and new strategies are being developed. UNR currently uses the Northern Nevada Assessment Conference, workshops, our website and word-of-mouth to communicate program activities and successes. UNR will pursue ways to make these venues more effective as it also searches for new opportunities.

- Given the anticipated growth in the number of large classes, it is recommended a focused and concerted effort to help faculty plan, teach and manage large classes be implemented. This effort could include faculty professional development courses introducing the use of new technologies, best teaching practices, effective use of teaching assistants, and the integration of assessment and evaluation techniques into the design and redesign of instruction.

**Standard 2.C — Undergraduate Program**

The undergraduate program is designed to provide students with a substantial, coherent, and articulated exposure to the broad domains of knowledge.

**2.C.1 The institution requires of all its degree and pre-baccalaureate programs a component of general education and/or related instruction that is published in its general catalog in clear and complete terms.**

All undergraduate programs at the University adhere to the basic tripartite structure recommended by the NWCCU. A general education “core” is integrated with study in major and minor areas providing a specific knowledge base and elective courses that permit students to pursue other intellectual interests.

The Core Curriculum is an outstanding component of undergraduate degree programs at the University. Introduced in 1989, the Core Curriculum provides a required, integrated, and broad-based liberal arts component to the undergraduate curriculum. The structure of the Core Curriculum requirements is described in the Core Curriculum section of the University General Catalog, 2007-2008. The Core Curriculum provides a required, integrated, and broad-based liberal arts component to the undergraduate curriculum. The structure of the Core Curriculum requirements is described in the Core Curriculum section of the University General Catalog, 2007-2008. The Core Curriculum provides a required, integrated, and broad-based liberal arts component to the undergraduate curriculum. The structure of the Core Curriculum requirements is described in the Core Curriculum section of the University General Catalog, 2007-2008. All undergraduate majors and programs identify the Core Curriculum in the degree requirements and in the recommended course schedules published in the catalog. (RE GU 2.6.a: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Recommended Four Year Schedules, pp. 93-357).

At the lower division, the Core requires 3-6 credits of mathematics and 3-6 credits of writing, 6 credits of natural science, 9 credits of Core Humanities, and 3 credits each of social sciences and the fine arts. In addition all students must satisfy a 3-credit Diversity (at the 200-level or above) and a 6-credit Capstone requirement.
Many Capstone courses, which are defined as “senior” experiences, also have Diversity status (RD GU 2.5.e: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, The University Core Curriculum, pp. 90-92). Thus, the Core requires a minimum of 33 credits, assuming a possible enrollment in one combined Capstone-Diversity experience, and may take as many as 45 credits depending on the natural science courses chosen. Table 2.4 summarizes these key components.

2.C.2 The general education component of the institution’s degree programs is based on a rationale that is clearly articulated and is published in clear and complete terms in the catalog. It provides the criteria by which the relevance of each course to the general education component is evaluated.

The University rationale for the Core Curriculum acknowledges that a university education is not just to prepare students for careers, but also to develop a personal identity, an understanding of cultural and natural/physical environments, and an understanding of one’s role as a local, national and world citizen. Basic skills such as writing and computational/scientific reasoning are also emphasized by core classes. The scope of and rationale for the Core Curriculum are clearly presented in the University General Catalog, 2007-2008 and attention is paid to the sequencing of core classes within a typical undergraduate course of study (RD GU 2.5.e: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, The University Core Curriculum, pp. 90-92).

As the discussion in “Assessment Issues and the Core Curriculum” explains, the Core Curriculum program has received much care and attention through a continuous process of evaluation and reevaluation stretching from the late nineties to the present time (CD GU 2.15: Assessment Issues and the Core Curriculum). While some of these changes have resulted in structural/organizational changes to the program, there are many assessment inspired changes dealing with course content and the future direction of course assessment activities. For example, the Core Math and Natural Science Subcommittee as a first step, collected syllabi and lab reports to readdress whether Core Natural Science courses were adequately addressing course SLOs and reinforcing quantitative skills developed in other courses. In another example, core social sciences faculty began to redefine their mission and vision statements in 2003 and are currently moving forward with 2007 “town meetings” to further develop curriculum and assessment plans.

### Table 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Component</th>
<th>Course(s) Required</th>
<th>Credits needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>CH 201, CH 202, CH 203</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>One to two classes</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>ENG 101, ENG 102</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Two Classes</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>One Class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>One Class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone (General or Major)</td>
<td>Two classes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>One class (selected courses count as satisfying diversity and capstone requirements simultaneously)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.C.3 The general education program offerings include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, mathematics, and the social sciences. The program may also include courses that focus on the interrelationships between these major fields of study.

Table 2.4 summarizes the broad range of disciplinary components contained within the Core Curriculum. Foundational skills in areas such as writing and mathematics are promoted in the Core Writing and Math curricula. Students are encouraged to use either or both of these skills in
subsequent areas of the Core. For example, the social sciences curricula include opportunities to reinforce writing skills, and most economics classes have math pre- or co-requisites and reinforce a subset of the quantitative reasoning skills developed in Core Math. The natural sciences have math pre- or co-requisites and require writing as part of the laboratory experiences.

The Core adheres to the concepts of both Writing (WAC) and Math Across the Curriculum (MAC). All Core courses are expected to include a writing component with “significant” writing required in the senior Capstone classes. Promotion of WAC has been included in the mission of the Writing Center. The Writing Center offers writing-centered workshops to promote writing assignments in classes and programs that have traditionally not used writing assignments.

Core Humanities plays a substantial role in writing across the University’s curriculum. Anecdotal data suggest that students identify the Core Humanities sequence with rigor and a high work load. The reading and writing required probably contribute significantly to development of writing skills. As Standard One (refer to Table 1.4) notes, faculty strongly believe that the “range of skill sets in the core and the overall value of the core is an important aspect of the undergraduate experience.” Standard One also cites a study provided by the Office of Institutional Analysis showing the positive attitudinal and cognitive benefits of the core curriculum for students (refer to RD 1.12).

The Natural Science courses, which have a strong quantitative literacy component, support math across the curriculum. The stated prerequisite for enrollment in Core natural science classes is completion of the Core Math requirement or to be co-enrolled in the pre-calculus sequence, MATH 126, 127, or 128. In addition students who have achieved Math placement scores allowing them to place directly into Calculus I, MATH 181, may also enroll in the Core natural science classes.

The capstone courses focus particularly on the interrelationships between these fields of study.

These capstone courses, recommended for students’ senior year, deal with ethical and substantive issues, problems and themes that affect the world community. They may also offer students an opportunity to analyze different cultures and traditions, or examine issues relating to science and society (RD GU 2.5.e: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, The Core Curriculum, pp. 90-92).

2.C.4 The institution’s policies for the transfer and acceptance of credit are clearly articulated. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution ensures that the credits accepted are comparable to its own courses. Where patterns of transfer from other institutions are established, efforts to formulate articulation agreements are demonstrated.

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) has pursued student transfer rights aggressively. The first step was the introduction of a system-wide Common Course Numbering project. Beginning in the late 1990s, department representatives from the system institutions (UNLV, UNR, TMCC, CCSN, WNCC and GBC) met to discuss curricular similarities. Criteria were developed to identify courses that were essentially the same. These courses now have the same prefixes and numbers and similar course descriptions. Courses and curriculum procedures at each institution now include steps to prevent duplicate use of prefix and course numbers as new courses are added.

In addition to common course numbering, a system policy document has been adopted recently defining student rights for intra-system transfer (RE GU 2.7.a: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, NSHE Transfer Rights, pp. 37-38). This document was discussed in detail by the system Articulation Board whose members represent general education programs and student services at all NSHE institutions. A selection of degree programs has developed formal “2+2” agreements, and all programs are required by the system to have “major-to-major” articulation agreements. Most recently a reverse transfer policy has been drafted and approved. The UNR
Transfer Center has, since 1996, published — and continues to publish — articulation information on the transfer center website (RE GU 2.7.c: University’s Transfer Center Website www.unr.edu/stsv/tcenter/).

Transfer policies for students outside of NSHE institutions are discussed in detail below under Policy 2.5 Transfer and Award of Academic Credit (Admission to Transfer Students).

2.C.5 The institution designs and maintains effective academic advising programs to meet student needs for information and advice, and adequately informs and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

The last accreditation report in 1997 pointed out major deficiencies in two areas: assessment and advising. The campus responded with the creation of the Office of University Assessment and the Academic Advising Center. These offices report through the Vice Provost for Instruction and Undergraduate Programs. In 2004, a task-force reviewed advising of specific populations of students, including the growing number of undeclared students. Undeclared students are identified in the Student Information System (SIS) databases by the codes PM-ASX, and PMAST. PM-AST indicates undeclared transfer students and PM-ASX indicates the rest of the undeclared population. In both cases the “AS” is historical, indicating that previously all undecided students had the College of Arts and Science as their academic home. As a result of the task-force deliberations, the Academic Advising Center is now responsible for advising the PM-ASX undeclared population. In addition, they have responsibility for advising students in the Bachelor of General Studies program and students on “academic disqualification.”

Each college has a coordinator or director of advising who informs and coordinates the efforts of departmental and other program advisor(s) as well as communicating with students who have declared majors within the college. The director of the Academic Advising Center, Dr. Nancy L. Markee, chairs the Academic Advising Advisory Board (AAAB). This group, through regular meetings and a “list-serve,” provides information to the individuals involved with the distributed advising in the colleges and academic departments. In addition, many advising issues are communicated to academic affairs and student services professionals through the Academic Affairs and Student Services Council (AASSC).

Program, college and Academic Advising Center faculty and staff participate in recruitment drives and advising sessions both in-and out-of-state. Entering freshmen are automatically blocked from enrollment until an advisor lifts the restriction. After review of this program, mandatory advising has been extended to all students through their second semester of registration.
Trained advisors in the Academic Advising Center offer high-quality services. The quality of distributed advising at the program level is less well known. It is encouraging that 62 percent of undergraduate and graduate degree recipients rated the quality of academic advising they received as “good” or “excellent.”

NSSE 2005 data, depicted in Table 2.5, indicates that student perceptions of academic advising are slightly lower than at selected peer institutions, about the same as at other Doctoral-Extensive institutions, and also lower than the whole NSSE survey population.

A survey administered specifically for this accreditation self-study, the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006, suggests that those responsible for the undergraduate advising function are well informed and prepared. University faculty responded, by a 59 percent to 14 percent margin, that they felt well prepared and informed about academic advising responsibilities (CD GU 2.16: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006, Academic Faculty). An even more direct measure of the progress the University has made in the area of advising comes from survey data collected through the Office of University Assessment. The Office of University Assessment, in two separate surveys conducted in 1996 and 2006, asked undergraduates directly about the quality of their University advisors. As Table 2.6 demonstrates, respondents are far more positive about the knowledge and effectiveness of advisors in 2006 than were respondents in 1996. Respondents are also far more willing “to recommend my advisor to other students” in 2006 than in 1996.

While the overall picture of advising shows marked improvement from the last NWCCU site visit, anecdotal evidence suggests that the quality of advising and “customer service” at the department level can be variable. For example, because there are no policies about who should be advising students, this role is assumed by a gamut of employee categories. While most departments rely primarily on faculty for advising, some programs delegate advising to graduate students and others assign primary advising responsibility to administrative assistants. Some programs require regular advising, and others leave it to the discretion of the student. Enrollment management practices and the ever-improving Degree Audit Report System (DARS) provide a “safety net” for students. DARS has now become a useful resource for students, and an effective advising tool for faculty.

The University and NSHE continue to explore ways to encourage continued improvement in the quality and effectiveness of advising. Advising excellence, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, is now recognized and rewarded by Regent and University advising awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig a</th>
<th>Effect Size b</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig a</th>
<th>Effect Size b</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig a</th>
<th>Effect Size b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advise</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05 *** p< .001 (2-tailed)

b Effect size = mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation
Furthermore, a large number of academic advising initiatives have been instituted to provide a multifaceted and cross-disciplinary approach to advising. These programs include: required freshman advising, MAPP the Millennium Scholar Academic Persistence Program, the Las Vegas Pilot Retention Program "702", Academic Intervention Programs, Freshman Start, the First-year experience courses, the Writing Center, the Math Center, and the Academic Skills Center. More information on these programs and their impacts can be found in the discussion in Standard 3.D.10.

Until fall 2006, the University offered remediation in writing (ENG 098) and mathematics (MATH 096). The Millennium Scholarship could be used to pay for remedial credits until fall 2005 when the Nevada legislature implemented changes to Millennium eligibility and use. Remedial courses are now offered through Extended Studies. Students may count the remedial semester credits towards the 12 required to maintain Millennium Scholarship eligibility, but they do not count for college credit.

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) has published a policy on remedial credit which is reprinted in the University General Catalog, 2007-2008. This policy holds that all degree-seeking students who place in developmental/remedial coursework must take the prescribed sequence of courses until remediation is completed. Beginning fall 2007, students requiring remediation must complete all required coursework prior to completion of 30 college-level credits unless otherwise authorized by the institution (RE GU 2.8: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 16, Student Admission, Registration, Grades, Examination, Section 1).

Students are placed initially on the basis of ACT and/or SAT scores. ACT scores of 21 and 22 place students into MATH 120 and MATH 124 respectively. Thus, there is no one measure of need for remediation. Discussions at the System level are exploring new guidelines for cut-off scores defining remediation need.

Alternatively, students can take placement tests, offered by the department of mathematics and statistics, and administered by the Mathematics Center. The Basic Algebra Readiness Test (BART) tests proficiencies appropriate for enrollment in MATH 120 and MATH 124 (to be MATH 126, fall 2007). Additionally, students can attempt to place into MATH 128 by taking the Math 128 Readiness Test.

Prerequisites have been slowly enforced over the last three semesters. For example, all students must have completed Core writing before enrolling in the Core Humanities classes, and all students must have completed or be co-enrolled in

**Table 2.6 Advising Center Survey Data on Advising: 1996 and 2006**

(Percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996 Survey percent responding &quot;very satisfied&quot; or &quot;satisfied&quot;</th>
<th>N=609</th>
<th>2006 Survey percent responding &quot;very satisfied&quot; or &quot;satisfied&quot;</th>
<th>N=640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My advisor provides accurate information about courses I need to take to complete major</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor provides accurate information about courses I need to take to complete outside the major</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend my advisor to other students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.C.6 Whenever developmental or remedial work is required for admission to the institution or any of its programs, clear policies govern the procedures that are followed, including such matters as ability to benefit, permissible student load, and granting of credit. When such courses are granted credit, students are informed of the institution’s policy of whether or not the credits apply toward a degree.
the Core Math courses before enrolling in Core Natural Science classes. Students must enroll in Core writing and math courses only through placement by standardized test scores, UNR placement tests in writing and math, or prior curricular experiences.

2.C.7 The institution’s faculty is adequate for the educational levels offered, including full-time faculty representing each field in which it offers major work.

The faculty is more than adequate for the educational levels offered in each area of study. Faculty hiring is linked to strategic goals of departments, colleges and the University, as well as, to the mission of the University as a whole. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to meet high standards of research, teaching and service and, indeed, must rate as “excellent” in either teaching or research to merit tenure (refer to Standard 1.A.5 and 4.A.5). The appropriateness of the professional qualifications of faculty is also addressed in various sections of Standard Four.

2.C.8 In an effort to further establish an institution’s success with respect to student achievement, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities shall require those institutions that offer pre-baccalaureate vocational programs to track State licensing examination pass rates, as applicable, and job placement rates.

Not applicable

Standard 2.C Summary: Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations

Strengths: Undergraduate Program

• A broad range of quality faculty members from across the University teach in many core areas.

• Interdisciplinary offerings provide students with a unique opportunity to learn about fine arts and humanities.

• Institutional and faculty support for the core remains strong. For example the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006, Academic Faculty Survey, reveals that nearly 85 percent of faculty believe that the Core Curriculum is an important aspect of the undergraduate experience (CD GU 2.16: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006, Academic Faculty).

Challenges: Undergraduate Program

• Resources to support the offering of the Core Curriculum must keep pace with the future growth in university enrollment.

• The Core Curriculum program must continue to improve communication of core curriculum objectives to faculty and students.

Recommendations: Undergraduate Program

• Although assessment concerns have been a major focus of program planning for many years, steps need to be taken to insure that assessment occurs in all program areas of the Core Curriculum.

• Completion of assessment plans for the core.

• Explore other interdisciplinary areas such as the fine arts, natural sciences and social sciences for course additions.

• Using assessment to focus on the continued success of students in foundational courses.
• More effective communication of student learning outcomes (SLOs) to students and faculty.

Standard 2.D — Graduate Program

2.D.1 The level and nature of graduate-degree programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

Consistent with the mission and goals of the University, the institution offers the professional degree in medicine and 110 graduate degree programs. Of these 43 are at the doctoral level and 77 at the master’s level (RD GP 2.2.a: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Graduate Degrees Offered, p. 325). The degrees at both levels (Master’s and Ph.D) span the range of social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences including several interdisciplinary programs such as Cell and Molecular Biology and Environmental Sciences and Health. At the master’s degree level, there are a number of professionally oriented degrees such as Master of Social Work, Master of Public Health, Master of Public Administration, Master of Business Administration, Master of Arts in Teaching English, Master of Arts in Teaching History, Master of Arts in Teaching Mathematics, Master of Fine Arts and Master of Music. The professional degree in medicine is under the auspices of the School of Medicine and not the Graduate School.

Using data about graduate students from the UNR Employer Surveys conducted by the Office of University Assessment, 87.2 percent of employers report being “very satisfied” with UNR graduate students whom they have hired and another 9.9 percent “somewhat satisfied.” The same survey data shows 79 percent of employers rate graduate students hired from UNR as either “better prepared” (19 percent) or “equally prepared” (62 percent) as graduates from other institutions; 58 percent of employers rate a graduate degree from UNR as a “positive factor when considering employment.” (The data on employer attitudes comes from the general University survey of employers pooled between August 2000 and May 2004. This data is found in RD GU 2.1.e: Employer Survey.)

2.D.2 Programs of study at the graduate level are guided by well-defined and appropriate educational objectives and differ from undergraduate programs in requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capabilities.

The degree requirements for the master’s degree and doctoral degree provide guidance in assuring that programs of study reflect greater depth and increased intellectual/creative demands on the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (thesis option)</td>
<td>• 24 credits acceptable course work (600-700 level);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 6 credits of thesis (700 level);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 18 credits (including thesis) at 700 (graduate only level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (non-thesis option)</td>
<td>• 32 credits of acceptable course work (600-700);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 credits at 700 (graduate only level);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A professional paper/project is required in lieu of the thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>• 72 credits (48 in course work; wherein 24 credits may be transferred from an earned master’s degree);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 24 credits of dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the level of the course work and the required thesis or professional paper/project challenge students appropriately.

Course work in 600-level graduate courses, which are usually offered simultaneously with 400-level undergraduate courses, must provide far more depth and intellectual challenge than the undergraduate components. The University Courses and Curriculum Committee has provided guidelines for such courses (CD GP 2.1: Supplemental Instructions for 400/600 Courses). However, the extent to which these are implemented and enforced is unknown, and data from exit surveys of graduate students have
indicated that 27.8 percent did not feel that the 600-level courses were graduate-level caliber (RD GP 2.3.a: Graduate Exit Interviews).

On the whole, alumni data gathered August 2000 — May 2004 support the overall intellectual quality and challenge of graduate degrees with 87.2 percent of graduate program alumni rating the overall quality of their programs as “excellent” (40.7) or “good” 46.5 percent. Academic advising at the graduate level was rated as either “excellent” (41.6 percent) or “good” (32.9 percent) by 74.5 percent of respondents. More than 66 percent of respondents rated their programs as either “very difficult” (11.2 percent) or “somewhat difficult” (55.4 percent) (RD GP 2.3.b: Graduate Alumni Survey August 2000-May 2004).

2.D.3 When offering the doctoral degree, the institution ensures that the level of expectations, curricula, and resources made available are significantly greater than those provided for the master’s and baccalaureate level programs.

The Graduate School section of the catalog outlines the greater expectations and curricula requirements for doctoral degrees compared to master’s and baccalaureate-level programs (RD GP 2.2.b: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Doctoral Degree Admissions Criteria, p. 327). In general, the greater research expectation for doctoral students differentiates them from baccalaureate or master’s degree students. The research expectation, of course, increases the demand for human resources with the need for one-on-one dissertation mentoring.

Most program support comes from individual programs — including graduate assistantships, mentoring and access to specific research facilities. The Graduate School provides additional program support and specific operational support for interdisciplinary doctoral programs. Resources are generally adequate and programs are well-structured to meet the needs of graduate students. Data from the graduate student exit survey show that nearly 90 percent of graduate students either agreed (47.1 percent) or strongly agreed (43.8 percent) with the statement that the content of “the courses I took were appropriate for my graduate education.” More than 73 percent agreed (41.8 percent) or strongly agreed (32.7 percent) that “courses were offered frequently enough to meet my degree needs” (RD GP 2.3.a: Graduate Exit Interviews). In the Alumni survey, more than 86 percent of graduate students felt that student-faculty interaction was either “excellent” (52.9 percent) or “good” (33.7 percent) (RD GP 2.3.b: Graduate Alumni Survey August 2000-May 2004).

Graduate-level offerings are dictated to some extent by faculty resources. Thus, the 400/600 dual courses maximize efficiency. However, with increasing growth in graduate education, the University must offer more graduate-only curricula. Therefore, it is recommended that (a) the University undertake a full examination of the 600-level offerings to insure that graduate-level work reflects greater depth and complexity, not merely more requirements than upper-division students enrolled in the same course, (b) all graduate programs annually review their curricular offerings to insure the availability of both sufficient graduate-only (700-level) course work and the faculty resources to support graduate education, including research mentorship, and (c) institute memorandums of agreements between interdisciplinary graduate programs and respective departments to assure that course work will be available for graduate students.

To further address the issue of faculty resources, program reviews and strategic planning should look at the possible closure of programs without a critical mass of either students or supporting faculty. They should also examine the possibility of combining programs in related disciplines into more synergistic interdisciplinary programs to more efficiently use available faculty resources. In addition, University proposals should identify faculty resource needs before new programs are initiated.

To ensure adequate technology access, the Graduate School needs to work with the information technology on campus to assess upcoming needs and current adequacy on a regular basis. They should look in particular at access for
work station computers versus computer labs and the availability of discipline-specific software for graduate research. Many graduate programs also need an enhanced web presence. Research indicates that more and more students make their initial decisions regarding graduate programs via the web. Aggressive graduate recruitment will rely on accurate and timely information on engaging web sites.

**Standard 2.D Summary: Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations**

**Strengths: Graduate Program**

- Graduate education is an integral component of the University’s mission and goals.
- The principles that underlie graduate education are reflected in the graduate school policies and procedures.
- There are processes for the regular review of graduate programs and these reviews have, in large, validated the quality of faculty, curricula, and students.
- Student satisfaction with graduate program substance and mentoring is strong.

**Challenges: Graduate Program**

- External reviews have indicated that the quality of graduate education varies with two root causes contributing to lower quality: (1) inadequate graduate-level curricular offerings and (2) faculty resources that are stretched too thin.
- Technology access may be an issue.

**Recommendations: Graduate Program**

- The University should undertake a full examination of the 600-level offerings to ensure that graduate-level work reflects greater depth and complexity, not merely more requirements than upper-division students enrolled in the same course.
- All graduate programs should annually review their curricular offerings to insure the availability of both sufficient graduate-only (700-level) course work and the faculty resources to support graduate education, including research mentorship.
- Memoranda of agreements between interdisciplinary graduate programs and respective departments should be instituted to assure that course work will be available for graduate students.

**Standard 2.E — Graduate Faculty and Related Resources**

2.E.1 The institution provides evidence that it makes available for graduate programs the required resources for faculty, facilities, equipment, laboratories, library and information resources wherever the graduate programs are offered and however they are delivered.

All graduate programs are based on campus in that programmatic and curricular decisions are made by UNR faculty and all programs must meet the same standards of review whether specific instruction is delivered on-campus, off-campus or electronically. Programs that have a significant off-campus delivery component are also staffed by UNR faculty or UNR contract faculty. All programs receive funding through their designated college/department to support faculty positions, teaching assistantships, supplies, research facility access and support, and general operating costs, including clerical support.

Graduate students receive additional support through the Graduate Student Association’s programs focused on research and travel, medical hardship and child care hardship, computer loans, and financial crisis grants. The Graduate School provides a limited number of first-year recruitment fellowships and a dis-
sertation year award annually. Access dollars, as well as some designated scholarships, also provide support to graduate students.

Library holdings, based on evidence from external reviews and new graduate course approvals, are, for the most part, extensive enough to support graduate education. Specialized library holdings also support specific graduate programs, particularly in the geological sciences, life sciences and Basque study holdings. Library resources may, however, be inadequate in the biological sciences (biology, biochemistry, genomics, cell, developmental, physiology) for the following reasons: (1) biology requires a wide range of niche titles, (2) the medical school provides limited funding for basic science journals, and, (3) unlike individual courses, no documentation of adequate library holdings is required for the new programs that proliferated in the last 10 years.

2.E.2 The institution demonstrates a continuing commitment of resources to initiate graduate programs and to ensure that the graduate programs maintain pace with the expansion of knowledge and technology.

The University has approved 25 new graduate degrees and three graduate certificates in the last ten years (RD GU 2.3: Board of Regents Program Units Approval Sheet). To assure that resources are available to support a program, the review process includes the Provost office, Graduate Council, and the University Courses and Curriculum Committee. The process is generally described in 2.A.3. In addition to new degrees, ongoing curricular changes provide students with exposure to new knowledge and technology. The Graduate Council routinely reviews 20-30 new/revised course proposals per semester that reflect these initiatives. However, the allocation of new GA positions for new programs has lagged behind the initiation of new graduate programs. The reduction in the Facilities and Administrative (F&A) cost recovery for grants is likely to place an increasing strain condition of new and existing research facilities.

2.E.3 Institutions offering graduate degrees have appropriate full-time faculty in areas appropriate to the degree offered and whose main activity lies with the institution. Such faculty are related by training and research to the disciplines in which they teach and supervise research. AND

2.E.4 Faculty are adequate in number and sufficiently diversified within disciplines so as to provide effective teaching, advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, as well as to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, and development. Small graduate programs ordinarily require the participation of several full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education.

More than 850 graduate faculty are distributed across the graduate programs. Faculty can participate in more than one graduate program, providing the expertise needed for graduate advisement/research mentoring available to students (RD GP 2.2.d: Graduate Faculty www.vpr.unr.edu/gradfac/affaculty.asp). The general distribution of graduate faculty to a graduate program ranges from 5 to 73. The graduate faculty criteria established by the Graduate Council Bylaws require the appropriate terminal degree for the discipline/program, evidence of ability to mentor students in research or scholarly/creative endeavors, and evidence of ability to instruct at the graduate level. Departments and programs determine graduate faculty status. Graduate faculty are responsible for the graduate curriculum of their particular program. Data from graduate student exit interviews (RD GP 2.3.a: Graduate Exit Interviews) indicate positive satisfaction with academic advisement and student/faculty interaction. Departments recognize the important role the Director of Graduate Studies plays in student advisement and thus, in most cases, ensure that the faculty person holding this position is experienced in the University’s graduate education policies and procedures.
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2.E.5 In delivery of off-campus programs, full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education provide physical presence and participation in the planning, delivery, and assessment of the programs. AND

2.E.6 The institution that offers the doctoral degree has a core of full-time faculty active in graduate education at its main campus and at each off-campus location where doctoral programs are offered.

Off-campus graduate programming is at the master’s degree level, primarily in literacy studies, behavioral analysis, and business administration. These programs derive their curricula from the department they are associated with in consultation with the graduate faculty of that unit. For the most part, the delivery of these courses is covered by full-time University graduate faculty. The doctoral programs are all campus-based with a core faculty overseeing the doctoral program — curricula, qualifying and comprehensive examinations, etc.

Standard 2.E Summary: Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations

Strengths: Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

• The University has a diverse, well-qualified graduate faculty who are engaged in quality graduate education both with respect to on-campus and off-campus programs. Faculty hires in recent years have continued to add to the quality of the graduate faculty.

• The curriculum review process ensures that the Graduate Council serves as a quality assurance measure.

• The curriculum review process helps identify library resource issues should they arise.

• Systematic program review processes are in place for external review.

Challenges: Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

• Although clear criteria for determining graduate faculty status are operative, there is no continuing assessment to insure that all graduate faculty continue to exemplify the criteria, particularly in their research and scholarly activity.

• There is greater potential for off-campus graduate education.

• Annual assessment of graduate programs remains limited despite the process for initiating new graduate programs and the processes for external review (occurring approximately every seven years).

• The funding package for graduate students needs to be more competitive, and more recruiting fellowships are needed. There is a need for a position devoted to graduate student recruitment.

• Insuring that the individuals who serve as Directors of Graduate Studies are well versed in graduate education policies and procedures.

Recommendations: Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

• Departments/graduate programs should review their graduate faculty every three years and re-appoint only faculty who continue to meet graduate faculty status criteria. These recommendations would be forwarded to the Dean of the unit and the Graduate Dean for approval.

• The Graduate School should explore the possibility of adding a position to deal with annual graduate program assessment needs.

• The Graduate School should work with both the academic units and Extended Studies to explore ways to effectively increase opportunities for quality off-campus graduate education.
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- Increased commitments should be made to address effective graduate student recruitment such as addressing the need to maintain a competitive number of recruiting fellowships, competitive funding packages, and the services of a graduate student recruiter.

- The criteria for serving as the Director of Graduate Studies should be established and implemented for each graduate program.

- Proposals for new programs should include a specific assessment of the cost of library holding required to support the program.

- New graduate program proposals and graduate program reviews should recognize any increased needs for technology resources (e.g., software).

Standard 2.F — Graduate Records and Academic Credit

2.F.1 Graduate program admission policies and regulations are consistent with and supportive of the character of the graduate programs offered by the institution. These policies and regulations are published and made available to prospective students and enrolled students. AND
2.F.2 Admission to all graduate programs is based on information submitted with formal application such as undergraduate and graduate transcripts, official reports on nationally recognized tests, and evaluation by professionals in the field or other faculty-controlled evaluation procedures. AND
2.F.3 Faculty teaching in graduate programs are involved in establishing both general admission criteria for graduate study as well as admission criteria to specific graduate programs.

The Graduate Council establishes, and the Graduate School ensures that appropriate minimal graduate admissions criteria are in place. These are published in the graduate school section of the University General Catalog, on the graduate school webpages, and are routinely published in departmental materials (RD GP 2.2.c: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Graduate School Admission Requirements, p. 327).

In addition, departments/graduate programs may require additional and/or stricter admissions materials/requirements (writing samples, etc.) that are pertinent to their particular discipline. These requirements are published in the catalog under the graduate sections, on departmental materials, and on web pages of the department/program.

The Graduate School prepares an electronic packet of admissions materials and when these materials meet the minimum requirements for admission consideration, they are forwarded to the department/program for their evaluation and recommendation. Graduate faculty in the de-
partment/program review the materials and make admission recommendations which are then sent to the Graduate School for the final admission decision. Any changes to admissions requirements either in general or specific to a program requires review and approval by the Graduate Council, which is composed of graduate faculty from the colleges/programs.

2.F.4 Graduation requirements for advanced degrees offered by the institution are determined by the faculty teaching in the applicable graduate programs. At a minimum, the policies governing these graduation requirements include: the specified time period in which the degree must be completed; the number of credit hours that must be completed at the degree-granting institution, normally at least two-thirds of those required for the degree; the minimum number of graduate-level credits, normally at least 50 percent of those required for the degree; for the master’s degree, a minimum of one academic year of full-time study or its equivalent, with a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours; the number of graded credit hours that must be earned for the degree; the minimum standard of performance or acceptable grade point average, normally a B or its equivalent; the types of qualifying and exit examinations which the candidate must pass; the proficiency requirements the candidate must satisfy; and the thesis, dissertation, writing or research requirement which the candidate must satisfy.

Graduation requirements at the University, which address all of the above specified criteria, are published in the Graduate School section of the University General Catalog. The specific details regarding qualifying and exit (comprehensive) examinations are also described in this section of the catalog, as well as in many (but not all) departmental student handbooks, web pages and the departmental sections of the University General Catalog. These criteria are reviewed periodically by the Graduate Council (composed of appropriate graduate faculty representatives), as well as reviewed in part by the regularly conducted external reviews (RD GP 2.1: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Graduate School, pp. 325-335).

Communication of these requirements to students, staff and faculty remains a challenge, as there are always new entrants to each of these categories. Ongoing training needs to assure that criteria are both widely publicized and applied. Exit interview data indicates that students would like “graduation workshops.” This suggestion has resulted in a regular workshop sponsored by the Graduate School beginning in fall 2006. Communicating policy changes to the needed audiences (for example, the upcoming changes in the GRE general test) also pose challenges.

2.F.5 Transfer of graduate credit is evaluated by faculty based on policies established by faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education, or by a representative body of such faculty who are responsible for the degree program at the receiving institution. The amount of transfer credit granted may be limited by the age of the credit, the institution from which the transfer is made, and the appropriateness of the credit earned to the degree being sought.

The policies regarding transfer credit approved by the Graduate Council are published in the Graduate School section of the catalog. Appropriate graduate faculty submit requests for transfer credit evaluation to the Graduate School, where final approval is granted. The transfer policies address the number of transfer credits and the age of the credit. The Graduate School also considers the institution from which the transfer is made and the appropriateness of the credit earned to the degree being sought (RE GP 2.1: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Graduate School, Transfer Credits, p. 329).
2.F.6 Graduate credit may be granted for internships, field experiences and clinical practices that are an integral part of the graduate degree program. Consistent with Policy 2.3 Credit for Prior Experiential Learning, credit may not be granted for experiential learning which occurred prior to the student’s matriculation into the graduate degree program. Unless the graduate student’s faculty advisor structures the current learning experience and monitors and assesses the learning and its outcomes, no graduate credit is granted for current learning experiences external to the student’s formal graduate program.

The University does not offer credit for prior learning, and all internships, field experiences and clinical practice experiences are offered under appropriate graduate course work in the appropriate discipline. As such, courses are structured and supervised with learning assessed by appropriate graduate faculty in that discipline.

Standard 2.F Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

Strengths: Graduate Records and Academic Credit

- The University prescribes and adheres to minimum admission and graduation requirements that are widely publicized across the campus.
- Appropriate graduate faculty make admission decisions and recommendations for transfer credit and assess student learning in internships, field experience and clinical practice.

Challenges: Graduate Records and Academic Credit

- Ensuring that all new faculty, staff and students are aware of the policies and procedures for admissions, transfer credit, and graduation requirements across the colleges and departments. Students indicate the need in exit surveys for more timely graduation information.
- Providing appropriate infrastructure to graduate programs as they emerge and as they grow.

Recommendations: Graduate Records and Academic Credit

- Continue to offer training to graduate program directors, provide appropriate information in new student orientations and initiate every semester graduation workshops open for faculty, staff, and students.
- Explore the possibility of a separate graduate catalog or require that all graduate programs include in their graduate section specific information on (a) admission requirements, (b) degree requirements, including qualifying and comprehensive examination requirements and (c) any special requirements (intern-externships, etc.).
• Gather better data from new program proposals and from program review materials and use it to determine the resource needs for faculty, graduate assistants and technology in order to plan fiscally for the infrastructure needed to support expansion of graduate education.

• Prepare the required infrastructure for the online degree offerings that will increasingly characterize graduate education.

Standard 2.G — Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities

2.G.1 The institution provides evidence that all off-campus, continuing education (credit and non-credit), and other special programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals, and are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures.

Extended Studies (EXS) is central to the land-grant mission of the University of Nevada, Reno, extending the University’s resources and intellectual wealth near and far to a diverse population of all ages, interests and backgrounds. EXS has eight major areas of administrative responsibility (Table 2.8) for credit and non-credit academic courses and programs offered in collaboration with the University’s colleges and their academic areas. In addition to the eight programming units, Extended Studies also houses six administrative support units: administration, enrollment services, finance, human resources, information technologies and marketing. The overall structure of EXS is presented in RD CE 2.1: Organizational Chart Reporting Lines.

### Table 2.8
Extended Studies Administrative Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Learning/Summer Session/Evening Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Credit Across Nevada (UCAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Professional Development and Youth Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno Performing Arts Programs (PAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit, a collaboration with the School of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implemented through Extended Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischmann Planetarium and Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extended Studies is largely a self-funded unit. Revenues from credit and non-credit academic courses and programs fund the hiring of faculty (LOAs) and administrative personnel, and EXS program costs, operations and equipment.

The first academic credit outreach activities at the University of Nevada, Reno were conducted in the 1890s when President Joseph Stubbs provided lectures on German Life and Literature to people in Winnemucca and Carson City (CD CE 2.1: Annual Report 1983-1984, Continuing Education, p. 1). The continuing education unit of the University has undergone several name changes over the years including the College of the University Extension and, in the 1980s, the Division of Continuing Education. Currently, as a division under the Executive Vice President and Provost, it is named Extended Studies.

The University adopted a policy in 1981 that stated the Dean of Continuing and Distance Education (now the Vice Provost for Extended Studies) “has both the responsibility and the authority to administer all continuing education activities that occur under the University's imprimatur, whether the sponsor be an individual University employee, a department, a college or any other organizational component of the University” (CD CE 2.2: University Policy Bulletin #1, August 3, 1981). The centralization of
continuing education activities in 1981 was a positive step designed to help the University efficiently offer continuing education programs, embrace diverse community-centered programming, and adhere to the University's academic credit standards (CD CE 2.3: EXS Strategic Plan 2007).

The University also takes logical oversight and administration into account. For example, as a result of the recommendations of the University Planning Council, academic and administrative responsibility for three degree programs, previously under Extended Studies, were moved to other colleges and units. The Master of Judicial Studies (MJS) program was placed under the direction of the Graduate School. The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) program came under the control of the Director of the Core Curriculum. Administration of the bachelor’s degree in Construction Management was moved to the College of Engineering (CD CE 2.4: CXS to EXS UPC Planning Minutes, February 19, 2002).

Thus, the current structure of EXS addresses issues critical to its Nevadan constituents through the many outreach efforts of the eight units providing credit and non-credit program administration supported by six administrative units. These 14 units with a total of 141 employees are overseen by a Vice Provost reporting directly to the University Executive Vice Provost, and by an Associate Vice Provost.

Extended Studies does not offer academic degrees, academic certificates or licensure programs. Instead, EXS collaborates with the University’s academic colleges, schools and departments to extend their academic programs to off-campus venues or through distance education delivery methods.

Extended Studies also develops and offers an extensive number of non-credit courses, seminars, and certificate programs, many taught by University faculty, providing continuing professional development, management and leadership skills to working adults.

Extended Studies offerings are not always tied to specific courses offered by academic departments and may involve resource staff outside the University. In these cases, appropriate academic departments are asked to review the proposed educational activities in terms of subject matter content, staff credentials, and other indicators of quality.

In this role, Extended Studies has responsibility for:

- Analyzing markets and identifying trends that show potential for matching academic programs with market needs.
- Identifying specific populations whose educational needs can be served by access to Extended Studies/University academic program resources.
- Negotiating operating agreements with relevant academic units for the development, delivery, and support of programs.
- Providing the process and infrastructure necessary for developing technology-based/enhanced courses in the most appropriate delivery formats.
- Providing support services for faculty teaching Extended Studies Summer, Independent Learning, UCAN and non-credit courses.
- Developing and implementing full student services support for students in collaboration with campus-based student service units.
- Promoting and advertising EXS academic and non-credit professional development programs.
- Advocating and initiating institution-wide policies that promote and support the active involvement of faculty in distance education activities.
The following programs suggest the extent of some of EXS services:

Independent Learning, Summer Session, and Evening Studies Programs is one of the largest programming units within Extended Studies. Independent Learning began at the University in 1944 as Correspondence Study, and currently offers semester-based online courses, open enrollment online courses, and traditional print-based courses. Summer Session, which began at the University of Nevada, Reno in 1913, has always been self-supporting. It provides a fully functioning third semester. Wintermester and Freshman Start, implemented in 2006, helps retain students by allowing them to progress faster toward graduation.

Evening Studies began in 1997 as a formal and centralized effort to strategically market and schedule evening courses and degrees to the community in collaboration with academic departments. Approximately 13,770 students were enrolled in courses from all programs within this unit during the calendar year 2006.

Management, Professional Development and Youth Programs provides courses and programs that encourage the development of hands-on skills for immediate real-world application. These non-credit courses require no formal admission to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Classified Part-Time</th>
<th>Classified Full-Time</th>
<th>Administrative Faculty</th>
<th>Current Vacant Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL/SS/ES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (FAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (CLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAN</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (PRT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Subtotal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents Employee Count Source: EXS Human Resources 2006
the University. The youth programs, such as the highly popular KIDS University, serve as recruitment tools for traditional undergraduate programs. Approximately 12,587 students were served during 2006 (refer to Table 2.10).

### Table 2.10
Extended Studies Calendar Year Enrollments 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended Studies Unit</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Learning, Summer Session and Evening Programs</td>
<td>12,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintermester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Credit Across Nevada (UCAN)</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Professional Development and Youth Programs</td>
<td>12,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElderCollege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Camps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fire Science Academy</td>
<td>4,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischmann Planetarium and Science Center</td>
<td>47,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfield Campus</td>
<td>3,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Programs</td>
<td>15,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Music Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,007</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fire Science Academy (FSA), which began in 1972, became an Extended Studies unit in 2001. The FSA specializes in training emergency responders from private industry, governmental agencies and foreign organizations. Projections indicate that more than 5,000 students will train at the FSA in 2007, about 1,620 students above forecast (CD CE 2.5: FSA Strategic Plan 2006). FSA served 4,552 students from the United States and foreign countries during 2006 (refer to Table 2.10).

The Fleischmann Planetarium and Science Center (FPSC) has been on the University campus for more than 40 years. It offers star shows, SkyDome large-format films, an astronomical museum and exhibits, and a free public observatory. These opportunities offered to the general public have historically been of particular interest to K-12 schools. From January through December 2006, 47,101 people participated in FPSC programs (refer to Table 2.10).

Redfield Campus officially opened in south Reno in September 2005. Acting as a bridge to the community, the campus offers a comfortable and technologically sophisticated learning environment for existing and new credit and non-credit programs. Redfield Campus served 3,207 students in its first full year of operation in 2006 (refer to Table 2.10).

Performing Arts Programs (PAP) unit is a collaborative effort between Extended Studies and the University’s School of the Arts, including the annual Reno Jazz Festival. During 2004 and 2006, the Performing Arts Programs unit commissioned an economic impact study from the Nevada Small Business Development Center which revealed a $6,269,965 positive impact on both the campus and the local community (CD CE 2.6: Performing Arts Impact Study). The Performing Arts Programs unit, through the Performing Arts Series (PAS) brings world-class artists and performances to the Reno area. Approximately 15,544 people participated in programs offered through this unit during the calendar year 2006 (refer to Table 2.10).

Extended Studies designs, administers, and periodically evaluates its programs under established university procedures. Academic credit programs and courses are approved through academic departments and relevant college deans. Each Extended Studies unit annually prepares a strategic plan. In preparation for the reaccreditation self-study, each of the 14 operating units summarized its strategic plans in a brief report that included planned assessment activities (CD CE 2.7: EXS Assessment Tools Document).
Outreach Units Outside Extended Studies

In addition to Extended Studies there are several units that have continuing education and special learning opportunities oriented missions and activities. These units include:

*University of Nevada Cooperative Extension* — University of Nevada Cooperative Extension’s (UNCE) purpose is to conduct educational research, outreach and service programs pertaining to agriculture, community development, health and nutrition, horticulture, personal and family development, and natural resources in the rural and urban communities of Nevada (*CD CE 2.8: Nevada Revised Statutes 549.010 and Federal Laws*). UNCE’s motto, “Bringing the University to You,” exemplifies the essential outreach role of the land-grant university. The centrality of UNCE’s mission to the overall University mission is demonstrated by the University’s overall statement of mission and goals, which in part states: “In performing its mission the University of Nevada, Reno resolves to...provide community and public service programs through continuing education and cooperative extension” (*CD CE 2.9: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, The University: Mission and Goals*, pp. 17-18).

Applied research is conducted to gain new knowledge, solve practical problems, and meet specific community needs. Examples of educational program topics include 4-H youth development, healthy food choices, livestock quality assurance, pest and environmental management strategies, public policy education, food safety practices, horticultural diagnostics, water quality management, and leadership for collaborative decision-making. These programs are delivered via 19 county offices serving Nevada’s 17 counties. In 2006, UNCE reported 765,602 face-to-face contacts with Nevada citizens seeking the services of the college (*CD CE 2.10: Cooperative Extension 2005 Strategic Plan Update*, pp. 1-2).

UNCE has 223 full-time classified employees and professional staff distributed throughout Nevada’s 17 counties. In addition, approximately fifteen professional staff reside in other University colleges including Agriculture, Bio-technology and Natural Resources, Health and Human Sciences, and Education (*CD CE 2.11: UNCE Staff Directory*).

UNCE faculty systematically, formally, and continuously assess and document needs in their geographic area of responsibility. They utilize input from citizens, local organizations and groups as well as published information. Through careful analysis of information collected, faculty define the situation and separate symptoms from needs. Faculty establish measurable program objectives (outcomes/impacts), develop UNCE curricula (when appropriate and necessary), deliver educational programs, identify and assess program impacts. They formalize the process with long-term and short-term goals that provide a means of measuring success/impact. They use a planned, systematic approach to obtain evaluations of program presentations and overall impact. Faculty report program information and impacts (short-term, mid-term and long-term) for their programs, as well as for the classified staff and volunteers they supervise, and provide necessary information for administrative reporting. Progress related to program impact is reviewed annually during performance reviews and reported to the public in impact reports that are available on the web.

*Intensive English Language Center (IELC)* provides a full-time, non-credit intensive English program to international students and other limited English proficient students for both personal and professional achievement. This program also provides students a transition to academic programs within the Nevada System of Higher Education. Eighty-one students were enrolled in IELC programs spring semester 2006 (*CD CE 2.12: IELC Program Review*).

*University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC)* provides academic credit for international study abroad. USAC offers a variety of courses in the Liberal Arts and professions. In addition, some intensive language programs are offered at select sites. Programs are offered in 25 countries located in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Americas, and Australia.
2.G.2 The institution is solely responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. The institution conforms to Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited.

The University of Nevada, Reno maintains responsibility for the academic and fiscal elements of its instructional programs (CD CE 2.13: Provost, www.unr.edu/provost/) and conforms with Policy A-6. When outside organizations provide occasional non-credit programs for which the University is solely responsible, conformance with University academic and fiscal standards is maintained through a contractual agreement. Two types of contractual agreements are used by EXS’s Professional Development unit for facilitating non-credit programs administered by Extended Studies: (1) Broker Agreements — formalized agreements to purchase an outside vendor’s product for distribution through Extended Studies; (2) In-house contracts — a contractual agreement with an outside party in which Professional Development has sole responsibility for the content. All contractual agreements of the nature described above require the approval of the University attorney. The Grants and Contracts Officer (GCO) is responsible for preparing all official subcontract documents. The sub-agreements specifically state or incorporate by reference all applicable sponsor regulations, as well as those required by federal, state or local authorities. All assurances that are a requirement for the University must also flow to the subcontractor.

All sub-agreements are made in the name of The Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno and the sponsoring department. No verbal commitments will be given to the subcontractor until a properly executed sub-agreement has been completed (RE CE 2.9.a: University Administrative Manual, Contracts Policy, 500; RE CE 2.9.b: BCLC 2007 Contractual Agreement Sample).

2.G.3 Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities.

Each credit course is approved in advance of its offering by a series of academic offices, including the appropriate academic department, college/school dean, and graduate school dean (for graduate-level courses) (RD CE 2.3.a: Course Approval Form). The academic departments offering degree programs through Extended Studies must submit to the University Provost an off-campus degree program application for approval. The department must include provisions for student advising, library services, scheduling of courses and faculty, technical support, facilities usage, and tuition/budgetary arrangements (RD CE 2.3.a: Course Approval Form). Each Extended Studies unit assesses the quality of service delivery/administration of courses but assessment instruments regarding academic quality are done and appraisals are retained at the academic department level.
2.G.4  The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral organizational component of the institution’s organization.

As noted above, the University adopted a policy in 1981 that stated the Dean of Continuing and Distance Education (now Vice Provost for Extended Studies) “has both the responsibility and the authority to administer all continuing education activities that occur under the University's imprimatur, whether the sponsor be an individual University employee, a department, a college or any other organizational component of the University” (CD CE 2.2: University Policy Bulletin #1, August 3, 1981). This university policy remains in force.

2.G.5  Programs and courses offered through electronically mediated or other distance delivery systems provide ready access to appropriate learning resources and provide sufficient time and opportunities (electronic or others) for students to interact with faculty.

Extended Studies units, such as Independent Learning and UCAN, work with the University’s Getchell Library’s Distance Education Librarian to help insure that online and traditional correspondence students have remote access to library resources. In addition, the Information Technology Division has made a priority to hire an Online Course Support Specialist (CD CE 2.14: IT Strategic Plan Initiatives 2004-2007, www.it.unr.edu/stratplan10.asp). All courses, whether mediated electronically or delivered in another distance education format, must provide for office hours, either by phone, internet, or in-person, as stated on their course syllabi (CD CE 2.15: UCCC Format). Graduate courses in particular must address in the syllabi how increased opportunities for independent study or for interaction with the instructor(s) will be made available for graduate students (CD GP 2.1: Supplemental Instructions for 400/600 Courses).

2.G.6  There is an equitable fee structure and refund policy.

Tuition, fees, and refund policies for academic credit courses through UCAN are fashioned according to University policies for traditional academic credit courses (CD CE 2.16: Registration and Information for Academic Credit Courses). Independent Learning courses have a fee structure similar to traditional academic credit courses; web-based courses have additional web fees ranging from $25 to $55 (CD CE 2.17: Independent Learning Fees and Other Charges). The University has policies for additional fee charges for specific courses that are developed by the President according to Board of Regents policies (see Standard 2.A.6).

Academic credit courses that are offered through Extended Studies must follow the University policy for academic credit computation of fifteen contact hours for one credit hour. For CEUs, Extended Studies follows the University policy of 10 contact hours for one continuing education unit (RD CE 2.3f: CEU Course Approval Form Samples; RD CE 2.3.g: CEU Course Approval Procedures). See Standard 2.A.6 for further discussion of academic credit computation.

2.G.8  Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs or courses offered for academic credit are approved in advance by the appropriate institutional body and monitored through established procedures.

Each course offered for credit is approved in advance by a series of University academic offices including the appropriate academic department, college/school dean and the graduate school dean (for graduate-level courses). In addition, the academic departments offering degree programs through Extended Studies must submit to the University Provost an off-campus degree program application for approval (RD CE 2.3.a: Course Approval Form; RD CE 2.3f: CEU Course Approval Form Samples; RD CE 2.3.g: CEU Course Approval Procedures).
2.G.9 Credit for prior experiential learning is offered only at the undergraduate level and in accordance with Policy 2.3 Credit for Prior Experiential Learning.

Credit for prior experiential learning is not awarded at the University of Nevada, Reno.

2.G.10 An institution offering an external degree, degree-completion program, or special degree has clearly articulated policies and procedures concerning admission to the program, transfer of prior-earned credit, credit by examination (e.g. College Level Examination Program (CLEP) of the College Entrance Examination Board and the institution’s own examinations), credit for prior experiential learning, credit by evaluation, and residency requirements.

The University participates in the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) and Advanced Placement examinations (AP). Policies and procedures for earning such credit are described in the University General Catalog. Students may also earn credits through completion of high school International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations and through a narrow range of nontraditional learning options, such as special department examinations (RE CE 2.7: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, Credit for Nontraditional Learning, pp. 38-42). As stated above in Standard 2.A.10 and 2.G.9, credit for prior experiential learning is not awarded.

2.G.11 When credit is measured by outcomes alone or other nontraditional means, student learning and achievement are demonstrated to be at least comparable in breadth, depth, and quality to the results of traditional instructional practices.

Credit is not measured by outcome-based models and other nontraditional means. If awarding of credit moves in nontraditional directions in the future, faculty would need to direct EXS administration on how nontraditional credit awarding would be systematized and institutionalized.

2.G.12 Travel/study courses meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same instructional control as other courses and programs offered by the sponsoring or participating institution. Credit is not awarded for travel alone. The operation of these programs is consistent with Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs, and Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited.

Credit for travel/study abroad courses, offered through the University Studies Abroad Consortium office, is assigned in accordance with guidelines of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Each USAC course is individually articulated through UNR and other consortium universities and approved by faculty-led curriculum committees. University of Nevada, Reno policy is consistent with Policy 2.4.1 and discussed more fully below.

Standard 2.H — Non-credit Programs and Courses

Non-credit programs and courses, including those that award Continuing Education Units (CEU), are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. These offerings are characterized by high quality instruction with qualified instructors.

2.H.1 Non-credit programs and courses are administered under appropriate institutional policies, regulations, and procedures. Faculty are involved, as appropriate, in planning and evaluating these non-credit programs.

In performing its mission, the University has resolved to “provide community and public service programs through Extended Studies [continuing education] and Cooperative Extension”
(CD CE 2.9: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, The University: Mission and Goals, pp. 17-18). Non-credit courses offered through Extended Studies have the active involvement of University faculty. The Management, Professional Development and Youth Programs unit seeks course approval from academic departments, and where applicable, those offered for Continuing Education Units (CEUs) are approved by appropriate professional licensing boards. Both university and non-university faculty teach non-credit courses. Non-university faculty are selected for their professional credentials, prior teaching/training background, subject matter content and other indicators of quality. Faculty are involved in the conceptualization and development of the non-credit courses and programs that they teach (RD CE 2.3.e: Policies and Procedures for Institutional Approval; RD CE 2.3.f: CEU Course Section Approval Form Samples; RD CE 2.3.g: CEU Course Approval Procedures).

2.H.2 The institution maintains records for audit purposes which describe the nature, level, and quantity of service provided through non-credit instruction.

The Extended Studies Enrollment Services unit maintains most records for non-credit courses, the exception being the Fire Science Academy (FSA), for which records are maintained in Carlin, Nevada. The Extended Studies Enrollment Services unit also maintains the evaluations of all non-credit courses offered, excluding those of FSA which are also maintained in Carlin.

2.H.3 When offering courses that award Continuing Education Units (CEU), the institution follows national guidelines for awarding and recording such units which call for one CEU being equivalent to 10 hours of instruction and appropriate to the objectives of the course. (See Glossary, Continuing Education Unit, and Policy A-9 Non-credit, Extension, and Continuing Education Studies.)

Extended Studies, through the Management, Professional Development, and Youth Programs unit and the Fire Science Academy, offers a variety of workshops, conferences, and other educational opportunities for professional development and certification. In some instances, Extended Studies works with a specific professional licensing body on the provision of continuing education units (CEUs). The standard of one CEU for every 10 contact hours is followed as recommended by the NWCCU.

Standard 2.G and 2.H Summary: Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations

Strengths: Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities; and Non-Credit Program and Courses

- Extended Studies and Cooperative Extension reach thousands of people across every Nevada county thereby increasing the University’s potential to positively impact Nevada’s citizens. These units often rely on technologies such as the web and interactive video to enhance their reach.

- A majority of the continuing education, non-credit, and special learning activities programs are self-supported and, therefore, provide the University a powerful outreach return on modest investments.

- The University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC) and the Intensive English Language Center (IELC) provide means to nurture and enhance both the internationalization and the globalization of the University curriculum and the campus culture. Both programs operate under the standards of specialized accreditation bodies and the NWCCU.

- All continuing education, non-credit, and special learning activities programs operate on the basis of collaboration. Groups within the University, such as faculty and administration, and groups outside the University, such as the local business, government, and K-12 educational communities are involved.
Challenges: Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities; and Non-Credit Program and Courses

- University outreach efforts face a continuing challenge to remain informed, prepared, connected and responsive in order to lead the state in addressing some of its most compelling and rapidly changing problems.

- University outreach centers must continue to serve as positive and collaborative “agents of change” for the University in using technology and new teaching and learning strategies for students and faculty, both resident and non-resident.

- University outreach efforts must continue to contribute to an educational experience for students at a distance that will create for them a sense of community and institutional connection equivalent to that of a traditional student.

- The creation of “24/7/365” flexible and accessible learning opportunities require human, financial, and technological resources in greater supply. It remains an open question as to whether the University will be able to provide these technological resources to meet demands that will unquestionably grow in the future. For example, the growth of online learning opportunities may be limited by standard help desk office hours. Similarly, the challenge of providing “after hours” campus services, such as library, advising, counseling, health, and financial aid assistance, will factor in significantly in the creation of an extended campus community.

Recommendations: Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities; and Non-Credit Program and Courses

- Outreach planning should involve vigorous participation of internal and external constituencies. A strategic plan initiative on University outreach should be convened.

- The University outreach infrastructure must continue to address the core goal of serving the University’s external constituencies, while also providing a vehicle for the development of new pedagogical approaches and strategies.

- A strategic planning process, specifically addressing the educational experiences of nontraditional students, should be implemented to increase a sense of community and institutional connection.

- As new teaching methodologies become more accepted and the pressure on academic and student support services grows, a variety of financial and human resource issues will require student services, library, and technology professionals working in collaboration with continuing education, non-credit and special learning activities professionals (see Recommendations for Standard Three and Eight).
Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs

The University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC), consisting of 32 U.S. colleges and universities, provides academic credit for international study travel. The USAC Board of Directors, which is composed of representatives from the participating schools, provides input for USAC’s policies, procedures, and planning. USAC offers a variety of courses in the Liberal Arts and Professions. In addition, intensive language programs are offered at select sites (Policy 2.4 c). USAC controls the curriculum, faculty, housing, fieldtrips, finances, etc. Thus, these course offerings, which must strictly adhere to consortia university standards (Policy 2.4, Study Abroad Programs, Policy 2.4 l), constitute a collective extension of campuses for consortium members.

The program, which served 539 students in 2005-6 (CD CE 2.18: USAC Self-Study), is offered in 25 countries located in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Americas and Australia.

To be admitted, students must have at least a 2.5 GPA or better on a 4.0 system (Policy 2.4 d). Students, who complete any mandatory application processes online or through their home universities, are initially approved through their home universities (Policy 2.4 m). Application processing ensures that all student requirements such as housing, visas, travel arrangements, course registration and orientation are complete prior to departure. A detailed orientation also takes place immediately upon arrival at the program site (Policy 2.4 h, j). Proficiency requirements and language placement are in place for all language programs (Policy 2.4 f). USAC’s student policies are made accessible through their website and through catalog publications (Policy 2.4.g) (CD CE 2.19: USAC 2007 Summer Programs; CD CE 2.20: USAC 2007-2008 Semester and Yearlong Programs Catalog).

Transcripts and transfer credit issues are handled by USAC’s Enrollment Services Department, ensuring that clearly communicated grading policies are generally equivalent to those in the U.S. Credit is assigned in accordance with guidelines of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). To ensure quality, each course offered in USAC “in house” programs is individually articulated through UNR and other consortium universities and approved by faculty-led curriculum committees (Policy 2.4 l). Financial Aid and Scholarship information (Policy 2.4 e) is made available on the USAC website (CD CE 2.21: USAC Money Matters, usac.unr.edu/usac/information.aspx?dispinfo=7).

Staff at the USAC central office at UNR consists of nine administrative faculty members, 10 classified employees, and approximately 10 student workers. Staff abroad is made up of 15 resident directors, office assistants, and other personnel hired individually by the resident directors totaling approximately 300 employees, most of whom are faculty. USAC Resident Directors generally possess doctorate degrees and have teaching and/or administrative experience. Most have been with USAC for many years and receive full-time, permanent, administrative faculty positions (Policy 2.4 i). They and their staff abroad administer the programs, supervise field trips, and assist students with all aspects of their study abroad. USAC is generally a fiscally self-sustaining entity whose programs and staff positions are funded by student fees. A few staff salaries derive a small portion of their funds from the state budget through UNR.

USAC is a member of the Association of International Educators (NAFSA), a leading association dedicated to international knowledge development, organizational development and public policy development for international educators.

USAC contributes a great deal to the educational programs. Since its inception, USAC has worked to develop courses that address the University’s goals including enhancing diversity and fostering globalization. Lately, as national mandates for study abroad have become widespread, USAC and UNR have worked even more closely to broaden the scope of study abroad across the curriculum and make this valuable opportunity available for more students (Policy 2.4 a, c).
Policy 2.5 Transfer and Award of Academic Credit (Admission to Transfer Students)

The University of Nevada, Reno grants admission with advanced undergraduate standing to students transferring from another accredited college or university, provided the applicant meets the two following conditions:

1. The applicant must be in good standing at the educational institution last attended; and,
2. Official transcripts must be presented from each college or university attended, indicating the student compiled an overall GPA of at least 2.3 on all acceptable semester transfer credits.

Applicants from accredited institutions are granted credit for all work completed at the previous institutions, provided such courses are equivalent or comparable to those in the curricula offered at the University of Nevada, Reno. Credit is evaluated by Admissions and Records and granted in accordance with University regulations, as well as the following guidelines:

1. The accreditation of the institution and the listing published in the current American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers “Transfer Credit Practices” govern the acceptance of the student's transfer credit.
2. Transcripts are initially evaluated in the Office of Admissions and Records. The results of the initial evaluation are made available to students in a Degree Audit Report System (DARS) on ePAWS. Students may appeal the initial Core Curriculum evaluation by completing a Core Curriculum Substitution/DARS Exception form.
3. Elective credit may be granted for individual courses that are not offered in the university program, provided the courses are clearly baccalaureate-level.
4. The specific credit that may be applied toward satisfying degree requirements in the assigned college is determined by the advisor and/or dean of the college.

Credits are normally transferable if they have been earned in institutions regionally accredited or approved for accreditation by regional accrediting associations recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). To transfer, credits relevant to the student’s academic program must be earned in courses comparable to those offered by the University of Nevada, Reno, or other regionally accredited colleges and universities. The University recognizes credits earned from the following regional accreditation bodies:

5. Middle States Association of College and Schools (MSA), Middle States Commission on Higher Education;
6. New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC-CIHE), Commission on Institutions of Higher Education;
7. New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC-CTCI), Commission on Technical and Career Institutions;
8. North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA-HLC), The Higher Learning Commission;
9. Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU);
10. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Commission on Colleges;
11. Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASCACCJC), Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges;
12. Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASCACSCU), Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities.

Evaluation of credits earned in specialized institutions is based on similar considerations of accreditation status, relevance to the academic program, and comparability. Joint approval by the dean of the college concerned, in consultation with the appropriate department chairman and the director of admissions and registrar, is required to grant transfer credit from these specialized institutions.
• Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE), Commission on Accreditation (formerly the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges (AABC);
• Accrediting Commission of the Distance Education and Training Council (DETC);
• Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS);
• Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic Schools (AARTS);
• Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS), Commission on Accrediting;
• Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools Accreditation Commission (TRACS).

Credits earned in U.S. institutions of higher education that are not accredited by one of the regional or national accrediting associations recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), are not accepted in transfer by the University (RE GU 2.7.a: University General Catalog, 2007-2008, NHSE Transfer Rights, pp. 37-38).

The Nevada System of Higher Education, Board of Regents has mandated that there be a NSHE website outlining the transfer process and protections given to baccalaureate degree-seeking students (NSHE Transfer Rights and Responsibilities for Students and Institutions). The website is intended to inform students of their rights and responsibilities and affirm institutional responsibilities (RE GU 2.7.b: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 15.08).

The Transfer Center aids transfer students in the evaluation process of academic credit transferred to the University. The Transfer Center has established transfer agreements with all community colleges in Nevada, and many colleges in California, Washington and other states. Articulation agreements for specific majors have been established between the University and select community colleges (RE GU 2.7.c: Transfer Center Website www.unr.edu/stsv/trcenter/).

Students attending a U.S. higher education institution with a minimum GPA of 2.3 and with 24 or more transferable credits will be considered as “transfer” students to UNR. Beginning spring semester 2008, transfer students are required to have a minimum GPA of 2.5 and 24 transferable semester credits.

Policy 2.6 Distance Delivery of Courses, Certificate, and Degree Programs

Extended Studies provides institutional leadership in developing and delivering University programs at off-campus locations or via electronic technology. In doing so, Extended Studies serves as the connection between the educational resources of the University and the needs of diverse learners statewide, nationwide, and worldwide. Unit goals focus on: (a) responding to the changing needs of lifelong learners in Nevada, nationally and internationally, by creating and delivering quality educational experiences anytime, anywhere; (b) developing and offering compelling learning experiences that employ technology and non-traditional delivery methods to increase educational access; (c) serving as an agent for institutional change by identifying and applying new technologies and models of teaching and learning; and (d) providing the institutional leadership required to ensure that UNR is equipped to meet and take advantage of the challenges characterizing the unit’s mission in an increasingly competitive higher education market.

Extended Studies supports the institutional mission of UNR and its goals of a statewide campus through its focus on extending the resources of the University to its external constituencies in the form of responsive, high-quality learning experiences offered throughout the state and beyond.
Prior to delivery, each course offered for credit is approved by University academic offices, including the academic department, college/school dean, and graduate school dean (for graduate-level courses). In addition, the academic departments offering degree programs through Extended Studies must submit to the University Provost an off-campus degree program application for approval. The department must include provisions for student advising, library services, scheduling of courses and faculty, technical support, facilities usage, and tuition/budgetary arrangements. Non-credit courses offered through Extended Studies with active involvement of University faculty are also approved by academic department. Where applicable, courses offered for Continuing Education Units (CEUs) are approved by appropriate professional licensing boards. (RD CE 2.3.f: CEU Course Section Approval Form Samples; RD CE 2.3.g: CEU Course Approval Procedures)

Independent Learning has procedures in place to monitor faculty-student interaction and timeliness of feedback. University Credit Across Nevada (UCAN) provides potential instructors with an outline syllabus outline requiring publication of their office hours and the type of office hours (i.e., by phone, face-to-face, and virtual). Students in courses using distance education technologies complete special evaluation instruments designed to assess concerns about distance learning, such as instructor feedback, effectiveness of support staff, and the dependability of technology (CD CE 2.22: Faculty Orientation and Guidelines in Teaching Online Courses).

Each course offered for credit is approved in advance of its offering by a series of University academic offices, including the appropriate academic department, college/school dean, and graduate school dean (for graduate-level courses). In addition, the academic departments offering degree programs through Extended Studies must submit to the University Provost an off-campus degree program application for approval.

Courses delivered by alternative means, online and other electronic means, are developed by the academic departments and their respective colleges. Courses with these delivery methods go through the same rigor as traditional face-to-face courses. Extended Studies provides faculty and departments with orientation materials and training on distance education delivery methods and collaborates with the faculty and departments on the selection and use of these varied methods (CD CE 2.23: Independent Learning Faculty Orientation and FAQ Packet).

The ownership of Independent Learning courses is governed by a University of Nevada, Reno Memorandum of Understanding on Intellectual Property Rights. This policy creates an intellectual environment that encourages and rewards creative efforts and innovations while still retaining for the University and its learning communities reasonable access to, and use of, the intellectual property for whose creation the University has provided assistance (CD CE 2.24: University of Nevada, Reno Memorandum of Understanding Intellectual Property Rights to Web-based Materials, www.unr.edu/policy/intellectual.htm).

Extended Studies staff meet with instructors to determine the types of electronic distance education technology to be used. Extended Studies links instructors with training in the University’s Teaching and Learning Technologies (TLT) unit for training on WebCT or on videoconferencing. (CD CE 2.25: WebCT Faculty Guide, www.it.unr.edu/webct/facultyguide.asp)

The University library has designated a distance education librarian to assist faculty with setting up online reserves for students and otherwise making library resources available to learners at a distance. This librarian also consults with administrators of continuing education programs regarding integration of library services in instruction and serves as a guest presenter at various unit faculty training sessions. (CD CE 2.26: Distance Education Speaker Schedule)
In addition to assuring students access to off-campus library resources, Extended Studies works with the Academic Skills Center to ensure all students the same access to tutoring services as well. WebCT permits faculty to monitor the frequency of use of a variety of learning resources and objects. Faculty are made aware of this monitoring capacity through training materials and one-on-one coaching.

Extended Studies has access to all facilities available on campus, whether those facilities are “low technology” or “smart” classrooms. In addition, Extended Studies directs the new Redfield Campus in South Reno. At that campus, because each classroom is a “smart” classroom, Extended Studies can provide laboratory facilities and classroom equipment for a full range of education purposes.

Student services for distance education students are equivalent to those provided to campus-based students and continue to be a priority goal of Extended Studies. Students have access to online services related to advising, orientation, and health services, as well as the Office of Admissions and Records, and Financial Aid, believed to represent the areas of greatest need for distance education students. The University offers a common point of access to all services provided for students-at-a-distance. The Extended Studies website is a major component of the unit’s program marketing and student support services. For example, students can access information about admission and registration procedures, and can complete these processes online. University library services are fully integrated, and students have remote access to research databases, delivery services, assistance, and online tutorials (CD CE 2.27: Extended Studies Webpage, extendedstudies.unr.edu/creditcourses.htm)

The University ensures that students have access to the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the full variety of distance education delivered resources. The University provides a help desk to students during business hours and during more limited times during the weekend. As the use of web-based technologies grows in the delivery of academic courses and programs, it will be essential to plan and budget resources for the expansion of both the quantity and nature of the help desk.

The University possesses the equipment and technical expertise required for distance education. The enrollments and the number of courses have increased steadily over the past four years (2004-2006). Table 2.11 and Table 2.12 indicate a growing interest and student demand for online courses, which are offered as part of the University’s ongoing commitment to alternative delivery methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.11</th>
<th>Independent Learning Online Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2004</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2005</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>1028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.12</th>
<th>Number of Online Course Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University recognizes that distance education has become an integral and necessary part of its service and survival strategies in the future. Extended Studies has worked over the past several years to build relationships and levels of trust with faculty and administration in implementing its agenda. Emerging challenges are now being driven by the growing emphasis on and expansion of distance learning and an increasing commitment to the concept of life-long learning. These include:

1. developing a distance education experience for students that will create for them a sense of community and institutional connection equivalent to that of a resident student;
2. developing and maturing the infrastructure of the University to meet the core goal of serving the University’s external constituencies while also providing an incubator for new approaches and pedagogical strategies; and
3. serving as a positive and collaborative “agent of change” for the University in using technology and new teaching and learning strategies for students and faculty, both resident and non-resident.

Many of the recommendations in the original Extended Studies strategic plan (2003) related to funding, program development and delivery, and policy development were never implemented. For the new plan to have a significant impact on the future of the University and the way it delivers instruction, there must be a formal institutional adoption and buy-in with significant input and contributions by the academic and support units of the University.

The institution evaluates the educational effectiveness of its distance education programs (including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction) to ensure comparability with campus-based programs. Integrity of student work is insured through standardized testing protocol. Students enrolled in Independent Learning courses are informed that mandatory examinations must be taken in supervised/proctored settings. Students enrolled in Independent Learning courses within the region (Washoe County) take examinations under the supervision of Independent Learning staff. Students outside the local region (international and national) take examinations under the supervision of approved proctors. Approved proctors include senior administrators of public schools, school district superintendents and their staff, community college testing and counseling staff, the education officers at U.S. military bases, and public library administration and staff (CD CE 2.28: Independent Learning Catalog 2007, p. 58).

As part of the University’s annual strategic planning process, Extended Studies undergoes a systematic internal review of its strategic plan. Each unit of Extended Studies provides a summary of the type and scope of assessment activities conducted (CD CE 2.3: EXS Strategic Plan 2007). Extended Studies offers an increasing number of courses, both credit and non-credit, in alternative delivery formats. These courses substantially increase access to a University education for working adults and traditional students, allowing them to fulfill their educational aspirations.
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Standard Three — Students

Standard 3.A — Purpose and Organization

Student programs and services support the achievement of the institution’s mission and goals by contributing to the educational development of its students. Student programs and services are consistent with the educational philosophy of the institution. The institution provides essential support services for students, regardless of where or how enrolled and by whatever means educational programs are offered.

3.A.1 The organization of student services is effective in providing adequate services consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

The mission of the division of Student Services at the University of Nevada, Reno is to provide a quality learning environment for all students. Faculty and staff are dedicated to fostering a community that values open inquiry and the lifelong pursuit of knowledge. This community thrives by providing high quality, collaborative services and programs, nurturing a diverse campus climate, and promoting a safe environment that makes a positive difference in students’ lives. Student Services’ faculty and staff are committed to student success. The core values of the division include (1) the freedom to pursue knowledge, (2) diversity within the student body and the staff, (3) the availability of a quality student experience for all students, (4) existence of a physically, emotionally and intellectually safe environment, and (5) a vision for the future (CD 3.1: Division of Student Services — Core Mission and Values).

The Vice President for Student Services and three Associate Vice Presidents administer Student Services: the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services and Registrar, the Associate Vice President for Student Success Services and the Associate Vice President for Student Life (RD 3.1: Student Services Organizational Chart). These three positions along with the Vice President comprise the Vice President’s Council.

The division is comprised of 176 faculty and staff representing more than 20 departments that serve the undergraduate and graduate student bodies. In addition, programs outside of the division such as the Math Center, Writing Center, Intensive English Language Center, the Office of International Students and Scholars, the Advising Center and the Graduate School, work cooperatively with Student Services in support of student success.

The mission and vision of Student Services is consistent with the University’s dedication to high quality academic programs and its commitment to diversity, the dissemination and creation of knowledge, a dynamic curriculum, and individual responsibility and civility.

3.A.2 Student services and programs are staffed by qualified individuals whose academic preparation and/or experience are appropriate to their assignments. Assignments are clearly defined and published. The performance of personnel is regularly evaluated.

The division is staffed by well qualified administrative faculty and support staff as indicated by the educational backgrounds and demonstrated professional successes of these individuals (CD 3.2: Student Services Bylaws; SM 3.5: Student Services Personnel). Of the 83 administrative faculty in 2006, 13 had obtained a Ph.D./Ed.D.; 47 had a MA/MS and 23 had a BA/BS. Twenty-six (26) (31 percent) of the staff were individuals of color: 12 (14 percent) African American, 10 (12 percent) Hispanic, and 4 (5 percent) Asian. Student Services staff qualifications are in part summarized in required reporting data, Table 3.1 (also RD 3.6: Student Services Staff Profile).
Each administrative faculty member has a position description (Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ)) that identifies the scope of responsibilities and duties of the position. PDQs are reviewed and updated annually at the time of the annual performance evaluation. Although the division of Human Resources establishes uniform university guidelines for the annual performance evaluation, the Student Services Personnel Committee plays an active role in defining a meaningful evaluation process for Student Services’ faculty (CD 3.2: Student Services Bylaws; SM 3.5: Student Services Personnel). Every supervisor evaluates those individuals who report directly to him or her. Upon conclusion of that conference, the faculty member, supervisor, and appropriate Associate Vice President may meet for an additional conference. If there are additional supervisors above the direct supervisor, those individuals may also be involved in the evaluation process. Individuals are rated by the NSHE standard evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, commendable and excellent. Ratings of commendable and excellent constitute meritorious performance. Every faculty member develops a plan of future goals and activities in consultation and under the direction of their immediate supervisor. Future goals and objectives are developed within the context of the individual’s job description, division goals and objectives, and the Student Services’ and University’s strategic plans. Also considered are the professional standards established by the professional associations of most areas reflected in the division.

Each classified support staff is evaluated annually by his or her direct supervisor. The evaluation is based upon work performance standards that have been established by the supervisor and are consistent with the duties and expectations of the category and class of the position as established through the state of Nevada’s classified employment regulations (CD 3.3: Rules for State Personnel Administration).

3.A.3 Appropriate policies and procedures for student development programs and services are established. The objectives of each operating component are compatible and support the goals of student services.

Student Services is actively involved in the University’s strategic planning activities. Student Services strategic plans are reviewed and evaluated within the larger context of university advancement (SM 3.2: Student Services Strategic Plans). New services and programs are closely allied to the University’s strategic plan. The funding of new programs and the strengthening of existing activities are determined through analyses of program assessment results consistent with the University and student services strategic planning priorities. Programs chosen for financial support are those that demonstrate the greatest potential to positively impact student success.
Examples of this process are the allocation of resources in response to the need for the expansion of student recruitment activities, the strengthening of academic advisement, and the development and implementation of the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). The population growth in southern Nevada and the need to reach potential students in the Las Vegas area led to the establishment of the Southern Nevada Admissions Office. Established in 1991 with one person, the office is now staffed with a Director, three recruiters and a support staff. Similarly, recognizing the importance of degree progress assessment, the DARS staff was increased from one to seven staff members. Consistent with national trends, a larger number of UNR students request psychological counseling with many exhibiting an increase in the severity of psychological disabilities than in past years. To meet the need for expanded programs and staffing, Student Services established a mandatory counseling center fee.

All programs within Student Services must adhere to Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), Board of Regents, and University policies as outlined in the Board of Regents Handbook, the University General Catalog, and the University Administrative Manual. The Vice President’s Council reviews all student development program policies for compliance with campus safety and security and the student code of conduct. Each office makes available policies and procedures governing their areas through the Internet (CD 3.4: Student Services and Related Units Webpage Contacts) and in print as appropriate.

3.3 Examples of this process are the allocation of resources in response to the need for the expansion of student recruitment activities, the strengthening of academic advisement, and the development and implementation of the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). The population growth in southern Nevada and the need to reach potential students in the Las Vegas area led to the establishment of the Southern Nevada Admissions Office. Established in 1991 with one person, the office is now staffed with a Director, three recruiters and a support staff. Similarly, recognizing the importance of degree progress assessment, the DARS staff was increased from one to seven staff members. Consistent with national trends, a larger number of UNR students request psychological counseling with many exhibiting an increase in the severity of psychological disabilities than in past years. To meet the need for expanded programs and staffing, Student Services established a mandatory counseling center fee.

All programs within Student Services must adhere to Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), Board of Regents, and University policies as outlined in the Board of Regents Handbook, the University General Catalog, and the University Administrative Manual. The Vice President’s Council reviews all student development program policies for compliance with campus safety and security and the student code of conduct. Each office makes available policies and procedures governing their areas through the Internet (CD 3.4: Student Services and Related Units Webpage Contacts) and in print as appropriate.

3.4 Human, physical, and financial resources for student services and programs are allocated on the basis of identified needs and are adequate to support the services and programs offered.

Allocating Resources
Student Services programs and activities are funded through a variety of sources including state formula funding, non-state university funds, and student fees. Mandatory student fees have funded a number of initiatives including the Counseling Center and the building of the new Joe Crowley Student Union. Resources are first allocated within the division of Student Services for federal, state and system mandates, including Board of Regents policies. Resources are then made available to program areas that support the recruitment of a diverse and academically well prepared student body and those programs dedicated to the improvement of student retention and graduation rates. The resources dedicated for student services are adequate and undergoing continuous expansions and upgrades. Significant projects — either underway or completed — that demonstrate the linkage between resource allocation and programmatic support include the following.

Student Information System
Through internal review Student Services deemed that the current student information system was inadequate. The problems, linked largely to the age of the system, were presented to the Board of Regents who determined that UNR’s student information system will be the first replacement item under NSHE’s consolidated computing upgrade which is presently out for bid.

Computing software for the University’s student information is housed and supported centrally by the NSHE System Computing Services. The software product, obtained in 1989, is a sequential file system. As such, access to the system is not 24 hours a day. The system must be taken off line each night for updates, backups and maintenance. Although additional web functionality was implemented to mitigate the limitations of the student information system (i.e., application for admission, registration, shopping for open classes, viewing of academic history, Degree Audit Reports, financial aid status, fee payment and address changes) the lack of 24-hour availability is a common complaint among students. Features such as wait listing and advisor approval for class enrollment are done manually and are thus labor intensive. The system was not designed to support the current student and faculty demand for dynamic and interactive services.
Student Services Facilities

Fitzgerald Student Services. The Fitzgerald Student Services Building was opened in fall 2000. The Office of Admissions and Records, the Office for Prospective Students, Financial Aid and Scholarships, Cashier’s Office, Police Services, Graduate School, the Office of International Students and Scholars and the Northside Café are located in this building. This brought together many services that had once been spread across campus, providing a one-stop shop for transactional services for all students.

Argenta Hall. As a result of Governor Kenny Guinn’s Millennium Scholarship program (implemented fall 2000), NSHE experienced unprecedented growth in the college continuation rate of Nevada high school graduates. With the implementation of the Millennium Scholarship, Nevada’s four-year unduplicated headcount grew by 33 percent (fall 1999-fall 2005) (CD 3.5: NSHE Fall Headcount, 1986-2006). In anticipation of these dramatic increases in the freshmen class, the Division of Student Services began construction of a new residence hall in October 1999. Ten months later, in August 2000, the first phase of Argenta Hall opened, making campus living possible for 259 additional new freshmen. Phase II opened in 2004 providing an additional 259-bed complex and a new dining facility.

Joe Crowley Student Union. The Joe Crowley Student Union is projected to open in fall 2007. This new facility replaces the Jot Travis Student Union which was built to support a student body of 7,000 and has since been forced to handle upwards of 16,000. The inadequacy of space is a challenge in supporting student demand for a wide array of co-curricular offerings.

The construction of the new student union was a student-initiated project. Consultants Brailsford and Dunlavey conducted a comprehensive needs assessment and analysis (CD 3.6: Joe Crowley Student Union Process). Two needs analyses surveys administered during the 2003-2004 school year indicated wide-spread support for a new student union. The first survey focused on student interest in the project and defined the types of services and spaces students wanted in a new union. The second survey assessed cost feasibility and student willingness to pay a specific fee. Additional input was gathered through a series of targeted forums to address issues including environmental concerns, accessibility, and the services and programs to be housed in the union. As a result, proposals for the new union were reviewed openly through a series of forums resulting in the adoption of both the building concept and the assessment of a mandatory student fee that would support the repayment of the 30-year bond. More importantly, because of student input, different fee assessment structures were applied to the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, reflecting their different enrollment characteristics.

The new student union will house the Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN), the Graduate Student Association (GSA), more than 200 clubs and organizations, Student Activities, the Center for Student Cultural Diversity, union administrative offices, ASUN Bookstore, retail establishments, lounge space, and event rooms. This new facility will support the academic and social needs of its students, faculty and staff.

Re-allocation of Space in the Jot Travis Building and Getchell Library

With the opening of the Joe Crowley Student Union in fall 2007 and the new Knowledge Center in 2008, the Jot Travis building and Getchell Library structures will be minimally renovated to consolidate many of the student services offices and programs that are currently spread throughout campus and not housed in the Fitzgerald Student Services Building or the Joe Crowley Student Union.

Standard 3.B — General Responsibilities

The institution provides student services and programs based upon an assessment of student needs, provides adequate support for the services offered to achieve established goals, and adopts, publishes, and makes available policies that are accurate and current.
3.5

3.B.1 The institution systematically identifies the characteristics of its student population and students’ learning and special needs. The institution makes provision for meeting those identified needs, emphasizing students’ achievement of their educational goals.

Headcount enrollment at the University grew 58.6 percent between fall 1998 and fall 2006. In fall 2006, 16,663 students were enrolled; 45 percent were men and 55 percent were women. Of those, 12,499 were undergraduate students and 3,312 were graduate students. In addition, 217 were first professional students pursuing the Doctor of Medicine degree. The majority of the student population was from Nevada: 13,100 including 2,095 from the state’s major population center in Southern Nevada. International students numbered 697 with 475 from Asian countries, 56 from the Middle East, 78 from Europe, 35 from Latin America and the Caribbean, and 26 from Africa (CD 3.7: UNR Data Book).

Students of color comprised 16.7 percent of the students enrolled fall 2006 (2,165) in contrast to that of 13.8 percent (1,702) in 1998. In fall 2006, 1.0 percent (170) self-identified as Native American/Alaska Native, 6.6 percent (1,100) were Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.3 percent (384) were Black/non-Hispanic and 6.8 percent (1,141) were Hispanic/Latino. The fastest growing ethnic category was Hispanic/Latino, 5.0 percent (611) of the student population in 1998. In addition, the 2006 figures may be conservative in describing the diversity of Nevada’s student population as many students identify themselves as “other” when coming from mixed racial and/or ethnic backgrounds. The newer IPEDS reporting categories planned for 2009 will assist the University in capturing a more accurate reflection of the diversity of our student body (CD 3.8: UNR Data Book).

Chart 3.1
Nevada Freshman Self Evaluations
**Freshman Characteristics**

Students chose to attend the University of Nevada, Reno because the costs were affordable, they were offered financial assistance and the University had a good academic reputation. For northern Nevadans, proximity to home played an important role in their decision to attend the University. UNR freshmen characteristics (CD 3.9: CIRP Survey 2005) were generally comparable to national averages for four-year public universities.

University of Nevada, Reno freshmen rated themselves as above average in their academic ability, drive to achieve, cooperativeness, understanding of others, intellectual self-confidence, leadership ability, creativity, physical health, self-understanding, and emotional health, although in each of these areas their self-evaluation was slightly lower than students attending all public institutions (Chart 3.1). UNR freshmen were more than twice as likely to expect to transfer to another institution before graduating (13 percent) than freshmen nationally (5 percent). UNR freshmen were less likely to expect to be satisfied with their college (40 percent) than students nationally (54 percent). Southern Nevada freshmen indicated that they would need tutoring or remedial work at a higher rate than the national average. Sixty percent (60%) of the respondents intended to obtain only a bachelor’s degree while 25 percent planned to pursue post-baccalaureate educational opportunities.

University of Nevada, Reno freshmen are more likely to be first-generation college students, a trend that increased in Nevada since 2002. Nationally, the number of first-generation college students declined during the same time period. Nevada parents were more likely to be divorced or separated, and the students expected their parents to contribute less than $1,000 annually to their education. Freshmen expected to contribute minimally to their education and expected to receive gift aid through grants and scholarship that would not need to be repaid.

**Undergraduate Student Body Characteristics**

The 2006 College Student Survey (CSS) (CD 3.10: College Student Survey 2006) was administered spring 2006 to a sample of students of all standings. Results indicated that UNR students were more likely than their national counterparts to have (1) worked full time while attending school, (2) taken a remedial course, (3) withdrawn from school temporarily, and (4) transferred from a community college. On the other hand, Nevada students were less likely than their counterparts nationally to have (1) taken an ethnic studies class, (2) had a roommate of a different race or ethnicity, (3) enrolled in honors or advanced courses, (4) participated in an internship program, or (5) participated in a study abroad program.

University students reported that they were generally satisfied with their college experience with 86 percent of respondents indicating that they would probably or definitely choose to attend the University again if given the choice. More than 80 percent were satisfied with the coursework in their major, the quality of instruction and their overall college experience.

Students also reported that professors did not frequently engage them in academic and developmental activities outside of classroom instruction. These activities included: (1) encouragement to pursue graduate study, (2) opportunity to engage in a research project, (3) emotional support, (4) ways to improve study skills, (5) assistance in achieving professional goals, and (6) opportunities to apply classroom learning to “real-life” issues.

Students were satisfied with their academic advisor in most areas. The majority (90 percent) reported that they visit with their advisor at least once a year. The areas identified for improvement consisted of information about how to define future educational goals as well as graduate school and career opportunities. Most students felt that UNR was a diverse institution, supported multiculturalism and was tolerant of multiple ways of thinking.

Notable differences in the responses of those students who had attended college for four or more years as compared to those with three or less were observed. Those who had attended for four or more years were: (1) twice as likely to
have failed a course, (2) one and half times more likely to have worked full time; (3) three times more likely to have transferred from a community college; (4) nine times more likely to have withdrawn from school temporarily; and (5) three times more likely to have studied abroad and participated in an internship program.

**NSSE Findings**

NSSE Findings

Student Services faculty and academic faculty joined together in 2004 and 2005 to analyze the results from the National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) to determine implications for program enhancements. Results from the 2005 NSSE indicated that 51 percent of respondents only sometimes or never discussed grades with their professors. Consequently, students were not aware of their academic progress. This prompted the development of mid-semester grade communications and reporting to be developed through the University’s data warehouse and Campus Advanced Information System (CAIS). Faculty were strongly encouraged to communicate student progress through this system at mid-semester or earlier so that students could obtain the academic support necessary for success. Policy discussions were initiated that would mandate this type of communication to all students enrolled in lower-division courses. ([CD 3.11: NSSE Survey 2005](#))

Only 42 percent of the seniors reported discussing career plans with their faculty while 22 percent of the faculty reported that more than half of the students enrolled in their upper-division courses engaged in this behavior. As a result, the Office of Career Development increased its outreach to both faculty and students, through a multi-pronged approach.

**Bachelor’s Degree Completion Profile**

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the first-time, full-time undergraduate students who entered the University in 2000 and were in the Student Right-to-Know cohort graduated in six years. This represented a six percent increase over the 1996 cohort. The four-year graduation rate of the 2000 cohort was 18 percent with the five-year rate at 45 percent. This represented a two percent increase in the four-year rate and a six percent increase in the five-year rate when compared to the 1996 cohort. The highest four-, five- and six-year graduation rates of the 2000 cohort were among the 28 international students at 35 percent, 51 percent and 57 percent respectively. The lowest 2000 cohort rates were among American Indian/Alaska Natives at five percent, 27 percent and 36 percent respectively ([RD 3.4: IPEDS Graduation Rate Report](#)).

In an analysis of half of the number of May 2005 graduates (477 students), the average time to degree was 5.6 years for those students who attended the University of Nevada, Reno only. In contrast, the average time to degree for transfer students was 8.5 years, with an average of 4.3 years spent at the University after transfer. Fourteen percent (14%) of the 2005 graduates had attended only the University, while 34 percent had started at the University and later transferred in some work, and 52 percent had been traditional transfer students ([CD 3.12: UNR Data Book](#)).

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of students graduating applied credits toward their degree from one or more institutions. Thirty-one percent (31%) of the transfer graduates applied credits from institutions outside of Nevada. Thirty-six percent (36%) of graduates had taken classes at Truckee Meadows Community College or Western Nevada Community College.

**Graduate Student Body Characteristics**

A Graduate Student Survey ([CD 3.14: Graduate Student Survey, 2006](#)) was administered in fall 2006. Eighty-six percent (86%) of graduate students reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their overall college experience. Sixty-nine percent (69%) indicated satisfaction with the overall sense of community among students. Most graduate students felt that they had made the right program choice and were satisfied with their academic program. Most graduate students would recommend their advisor to other students and felt that it was easy to develop personal relationships with other faculty members in their program. Most of the graduate students also indicated that they were satisfied with library and computer facilities.
Ninety-one percent (91%) of graduate students indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the availability of the faculty. More than 80 percent of graduate students indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of faculty and student relations, the collegial atmosphere between students and faculty, and the communication between faculty and students. More than 80 percent of graduate students also indicated that at least one faculty member in their program had made a strong impact on their intellectual development. More than 80 percent of graduate students also reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of instruction and the fairness in grading. They felt that courses were taught at a level of rigor commensurate with graduate-level expectations.

Less than 60 percent of graduate students were satisfied with the availability of office space, the frequency of course offerings, the fairness in providing financial support, laboratory facilities, the quality of lab training, the quality of professional advising and job placement. While 64 percent of graduate students had attended a professional or scholarly meeting, the majority of graduate students had not presented either a poster or paper, submitted an article for publication, been published, or applied for or received a grant. Less than half of the graduate students were satisfied with the level and types of student organizations and committees in their respective programs.

3.B.2 The institution provides opportunities for students to participate in institutional governance. Faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs and services.

Student Governance

Every undergraduate student enrolled in at least one credit is a member of the Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN). The ASUN Senate is comprised of 22 members elected from each of the academic schools and colleges. The Executive Board consists of the President, three Vice Presidents (Executive Vice President, Vice President for Clubs and Organizations and the Vice President for Programming), and a Speaker. The students elect the President and Vice Presidents yearly. The Speaker is elected from within the body of the Senate. The wide-ranging ASUN services include a variety of student publications, club support, Campus Escort Services, Scholarships, and many others (SM 3.3: ASUN and GSA Constitutions and Bylaws).

Every graduate student enrolled in at least one credit is a member of the Graduate Student Association (GSA). The purpose of the GSA is to promote the welfare and interests of graduate students. GSA functions through the Council of Representatives, Executive Council and established committees. The Council of Representatives consists of 24 elected students representing each of the colleges. The Council of Representatives elects a President to serve as their representative to the University, the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), and any other relevant organization or institution. The Council of Representatives also elects two Vice Presidents from their body to serve on the Executive Board. The GSA supports a variety of student clubs, travel and research programs, a wide variety of scholarships and grants, and socials for graduate students throughout the year.

ASUN and GSA are held accountable through NSHE and university policies. Both organizations have an advisor employed by the University who is responsible to guide student government and activities through university policies and procedures with regard to free speech, fiscal responsibilities and state law covered under provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law. Both organizations are regularly audited by NSHE system auditors and are also included in the University’s annual A-133 external audit. Student government is primarily funded through a student-per-credit-fee allocation as well as profit revenue from the ASUN Bookstore.

Student Participation in University Governance

ASUN and GSA have representatives on a majority of university committees. The students play an active role in committee business and participate as full committee members for most committee assignments. New committees and
boards are encouraged to seek student representatives from ASUN and GSA. These student representatives are not only charged with representing their constituencies but also to report back to their representative governments as well. Many other student organizations across the campus participate in a wide variety of policy development and decision-making committees (RD 3.7: Student Involvement in University Governance).

The ASUN and GSA presidents also participate in the administrative processes of the University by participating in presidential searches, determining policy such as the newly updated open forum policy, university master planning, and on the University strategic planning council. They are currently working in cooperation with Faculty Senate to develop a student honor code.

3.B.3 Policies on students’ rights and responsibilities, including those related to academic honesty and procedural rights, are clearly stated, well publicized, readily available, and implemented in a fair and consistent manner.

**Student Judicial, Mediation and Advocacy Services**

The Student Code of Conduct and Academic Dishonesty Policy are published in the University General Catalog and student handbook. Student Judicial, Mediation and Advocacy Services develops, disseminates, interprets, and enforces campus regulations for students by effectively addressing student behavioral problems, protecting relevant student legal rights, and providing mediation and advocacy services for students.

The Student Judicial, Mediation and Advocacy program operates under the umbrella of the University’s judicial code and Board of Regents Disciplinary Procedures for Students. The program provides judicial, mediation, and advocacy services for students. It also plays a pivotal role in cases involving academic dishonesty. In response to an increased caseload of judicial issues, a second full-time position was added in 2003.

Academic dishonesty has been a significant issue on campus. The office of Student Judicial, Mediation, and Advocacy Services played a pivotal role in the implementation of the University’s Faculty Senate recommendations (RE 3.1: Student Conduct Policies) concerning the prevention and sanction of academic dishonesty. These recommendations resulted from the faculty’s observation of increased plagiarism, cheating and academic fraud. In response to increasing concern, the Judicial Program began offering faculty workshops to educate them in the handling and sanctioning of academic dishonesty complaints.

Student Judicial Services also provides learning experiences for all students to enhance their character development, leadership development, and their participation as active citizens on campus and in society. Programming designed to educate the campus community about how values, knowledge and beliefs affect the social choices are made available to all. This includes alcohol (and other drug) abuse prevention as well as student health and wellness.

**ASUN Judicial Council**

The ASUN Judicial Council provides undergraduate students with a greater voice and responsibility in maintaining high standards of conduct. The council is composed of a chief justice, an associate chief justice and three associate justices. A nonvoting member of university faculty serves as advisor. The major functions of the Judicial Council include reviewing cases referred to its jurisdiction; investigating, adjudicating and assessing sanctions for violations of the Student Conduct Code and the Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community; interpreting the ASUN constitution and all acts of the senate. The Judicial Council also acts as an arbitration board for any cases referred to it from any organization recognized by ASUN.
3.8.4 The institution makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students and their property. Information concerning student safety is published and widely distributed.

University Police
The University Police is a fully functional law enforcement agency. Officers are certified under the State of Nevada with full police powers. The mission of the department is to provide a safe and secure environment for living, learning and research through policing methods that are unobtrusive. They perform the same functions as officers from city, county and state agencies, enforcing all local, state and federal laws and ordinances within the jurisdiction of the University of Nevada, Reno. This includes the main campus as well as other properties owned and operated by the University. Officers patrol 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The department also has standing agreements with other local law enforcement agencies giving officers authority to exercise police powers outside their immediate jurisdiction when necessary. The majority of students live off-campus in neighborhoods adjacent to the University. Police powers in these neighborhoods are an important key to the implementation of effective community policing.

Police Services maintains an interactive website (www.unr.edu/police) that details services offered to students, faculty and staff. It also allows for the reporting of suspicious activity, the ability to file a crime report, view crime statistics and e-mail questions to Police Services.

Campus safety continues to be a critical concern nationwide for students and their families. Police Services has responsive developed programs such as: RAD (Rape Aggression Defense); New Student Orientations (strategies for campus safety); Behavioral and Safety Presentation to Fraternity and Sororities and Residence Halls; and Domestic Violence/Stalking Presentations.

Among the most effective programs have been the regularly scheduled Campus Safety Walks (www.unr.edu/stsv/safety/safetywalk.html).

Each semester, a group of ASUN student government representatives, faculty, staff, and police walk through the campus at night to determine areas that may pose safety risks. In addition, physical barriers to people with disabilities are often discovered as a result of these walks. The findings have led to numerous campus improvements such as additional lighting, request for disabled access and the identification of additional grounds improvement.

Campus Escort Service
In response to transportation safety and security concerns in the early 1990s, the Campus Escort Service (www.unr.edu/escort/index.html) was established. Escort services provides safe, efficient, courteous and reliable transportation for university students, faculty, staff and visitors to their vehicles, residence or any facility on campus or within a two-mile radius from the perimeter of the main campus. A fleet of six vehicles and 25 staff provided more than 30,000 free rides per year between dusk and 1 a.m.

Campus Security Act/Student Right-to-Know Act
Police Services provides crime statistics to the campus and to the public in compliance with the Right-to-Know Act. These statistics are published in the “Campus Safety” publication, which is available in paper copy (RE 3.8: Campus Security Statistics Reporting) and online (www.unr.edu/stsv/safety/crime_stats.html) in both English and Spanish.

Communication Briefings
The Vice President of Student Services holds Monday morning communication briefings to review weekly police logs and to identify problem situations, residence hall issues and counseling referral for at-risk students. A team of individuals from Student life, Residential Life and Housing, Counseling Services, Greek Life, and Police Services work together to craft the appropriate referrals and interventions.

Drug and Alcohol Programs
When comparing the persistence rates of students most often involved in violation of the Student Judicial Code, the subgroup of students most at risk of dropping out of school within three semesters are those involved with sub-
stance abuse, alcohol and other drugs. The Core Alcohol and Drug survey was administered in 2000, 2004 and 2006. While alcohol usage has remained fairly consistent over the last six years and is slightly higher than the national average, the average number of drinks consumed each week has lessened. The use of illegal drugs is slightly higher when compared to national norms, with increased use of marijuana and cocaine since 2004. The proportion of students experiencing negative consequences as a result of alcohol and drug usage increased when compared to 2004. A full-time drug and alcohol educator was added to the staff in 2005 to augment the services of alcohol counseling at the Counseling Center. Counseling Services also provides psychological intervention for substance abuse.

SAPAC
The Sexual Assault Prevention and Counseling Program (run through Counseling Services) is an example of academic and student services collaboration. Under the direction of a psychology professor, the program provides outreach, education and counseling to individuals and victims of sexual assault. About 20 students a year use the psychotherapy services provided by SAPAC; the retention of the student victims who made use of the treatment was 100 percent. The services are free and confidential.

3.B.5 The institution publishes and makes available to both prospective and enrolled students a catalog or bulletin that describes: its mission, admission requirements and procedures, students’ rights and responsibilities, academic regulations, degree-completion requirements, credit courses and descriptions, tuition, fees and other charges, refund policy, and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it. In addition, a student handbook or its equivalent is published and distributed. A student handbook normally will include information on student conduct, a grievance policy, academic honesty, student government, student organizations and services, and athletics. The student hand-

book may be combined with the institution’s catalog.

The University publishes an annual catalog online. Limited paper editions are available for academic advisors and those in need of print versions. All of the aforementioned requirements of 3.B.5 are available in this publication. The online catalog makes use of linkages to resources related to academic advising and other guides that enhance the depth of the former paper versions. Academic, financial aid and conduct policies are articulated in the University General Catalog. In addition, all new students at Orientation receive student handbooks printed annually within the student planner.

3.B.6 The institution periodically and systematically evaluates the appropriateness, adequacy, and utilization of student services and programs and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for change.

Student Services Assessment
The Division is actively engaged in assessment for the purposes of program improvement. Departmental assessment plans and reports are available on the website of the Office of University Assessment at www.unr.edu/assess. In addition to these specific plans and reports, the division undertook a comprehensive program analysis in 2005-2006 using the guidelines of the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Each department prepared a self-analysis with recommendations for improvement (CD 3.15: CAS Reports). External review teams validated departmental findings through site visits. Final reports and plans were developed and submitted in spring 2006. CAS findings provided the basis for this accreditation self-study analysis. The major strength of the division was the demonstrated ability to allocate and re-allocate resources within the division to meet program needs. The major area for improvement was the need to systematically review and update mission statements.

The division of Student Services Assessment and Research Strategic Implementation Team (SIT) serves as a resource for the division on
assessment and research in general and specific instrument design. Made up of representatives from all student services units, this group, co-chaired by that department’s Associate Director, works closely with the Office for University Assessment.

Standard 3.C — Academic Credit and Records

3.C.1 Evaluation of student learning or achievement, and the award of credit, are based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria. Academic records are accurate, secure, and comprehensive. Credit is defined and awarded consonant with the Glossary definition.

Academic policies and procedures governing undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Nevada, Reno are outlined in the University General Catalog accompanied by definitions of academic credit and grades. Undergraduate requirements for degree completion are coded within the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). All undergraduate students access their degree audit report through ePAWS, the University’s online registration system. Degree audit reports contain additional requirements, policies, and procedures specific to the major and minor programs.

Records Maintenance
All academic transcripts of students who have been enrolled since spring 1991 are produced electronically through the student information system. Paper transcripts exist for those students who were enrolled prior to 1991. Paper transcripts are converted to electronic for those students who returned to the University in 1991 and thereafter. All paper transcripts imaged through the document imaging system are readily retrievable. In addition, the original hard copy records, stored off-site through a records management company, are readily available should there be a need for the original document.

All source documents received on behalf of a student in the Registrar’s Office are electronically imaged and stored in perpetuity. These documents range from supplemental transcripts to changes of major, program substitutions, exceptional circumstances review, appeals, etc.

Degree Audit Reporting System
NSHE supports Miami University of Ohio’s Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). Implemented in 1995 with inadequate staffing, the potential of this tool for academic advisement was largely underutilized. Less than 10 percent of the students graduating in 2001 had a DARS Report that reflected “All Requirements Met.” This situation was due to three critical factors. First, transfer credit detail did not accurately reflect course equivalencies; second, advisors did not understand the course substitution process; and third, inadequate staffing in the Registrar’s Office resulted in the inability to accurately code degree requirements and process course substitutions and exceptions.

The University Planning Council in 2000 brought this issue to the forefront. For DARS to serve as a powerful tool for academic advisors, the University needed to allocate resources. This realization led to the re-allocation of resources within Student Services and the University as a whole. A staff member in Student Services was re-assigned to lead the DARS effort. In addition, two staff positions were added from university resources and an additional two positions were re-allocated from within Admissions and Records. Today, students’ DARS Reports must reflect the completion of all graduation requirements before they may be approved for graduation.

Despite these efforts, the full functionality of DARS has yet to be realized. NSHE is operating the DARWin client and DARSWeb for faculty access. Limited NSHE resources have prohibited student access to the DARSWeb that would allow for real-time updated DARS Reports and capitalize on the “planned courses” features and “what if?” scenarios. With full functionality students would benefit from the ability to see how their planned enrollments would affect their degree attainment and departments could plan course offerings using future demand data.
Degree requirements published in the University General Catalog suggest plans of enrollment that would allow a student to graduate in four years. Graduation rates are published in the University’s data book which is available online.

Curricular Process
As new academic programs and courses are approved through the University’s Courses and Curriculum Committee, catalog information is updated through the online catalog addendum. Changes are reflected immediately and provide the foundation for the next year’s academic catalog.

3.C.2 Criteria used for evaluating student performance and achievement including those for theses, dissertations, and portfolios, are appropriate to the degree level, clearly stated and implemented.

Grading Policies and Procedures
Grades are assigned at the conclusion of each academic semester or summer session. Grades are submitted to the Registrar’s Office via final grade sheets with instructor signature. Approximately 4,500 grade sheets containing more than 60,000 grades are inputted each semester within two days of the submission deadline. Registrar staff input and verify grades per internal audit requirements. Grades are written to the web each night so that students can view their grades as they are recorded via ePAWS. Students may also access their unofficial academic transcripts via the web.

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) maintains a uniform grading system that accommodates “plus” and “minus” grades as well as “satisfactory/unsatisfactory” options. Numeric values for each grade symbol are defined in the Board of Regents Handbook and the University General Catalog. Individual instructors communicate criteria for the awarding of grades earned in courses. A student’s committee recommends credit for theses and dissertations upon completion.

Grade Appeal Procedures and the Student Appeals Board
Grade appeal procedures are outlined in the University General Catalog. The Student Appeals Board hears any student record appeal that may result in the refunding of student fees. The Student Appeals Board was convened in response to a Board of Regents’ directive for dealing with “exceptional circumstances” under which an institution may give a refund to students after the point in a semester when a refund is routinely available (Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 8.7 of the Regent’s Handbook). The Student Appeals Board is comprised of professionals from the offices of Academic Affairs, Admissions and Records, Cashier’s, Financial Aid, and Student Life. Four members of the Board vote with the Chair voting only in the case of a tie (RE 3.1: Student Conduct Policies).

Satisfactory Progress toward Degree Attainment
Criteria for good academic standing as well as academic action are outlined in the University General Catalog. Students are placed on warning, probation or academic disqualification according to well-established criteria based on credits earned and grade point averages attained. Students are notified of these actions. Students placed on academic disqualification are removed from their major and must have the permission of their academic advisor to register for a maximum of six credits or two classes each semester until they have placed themselves above the warning threshold.
3.C.3 Clear and well-publicized distinctions are made between degree and non-degree credit. Institutional publications and oral representations explicitly indicate if credit will not be recognized toward a degree, or if special conditions exist before such credit will be recognized. Any use of such terms as extension credit, X credit, continuing education credit, is accompanied by clear statements regarding the acceptability of such credit toward degrees offered by that institution. Student transcripts clearly note when any credit awarded is non-degree credit. Whenever institutions grant non-degree credit other than the Continuing Education Unit (CEU), some summary evaluation of student performance beyond mere attendance is available.

University transcripts reflect only those classes earned for credit that are applicable toward a degree. CEU credit offered through Extended Studies is reflected on a separate and distinct record from the student’s academic record.

The University does maintain a category of non-degree student, someone who has not earned a baccalaureate degree and is not seeking a degree. Non-degree students, who are limited to eight credits of enrollment, may apply up to 32 credits earned in this student category toward a baccalaureate degree. Policies regarding non-degree students are available in the University General Catalog.

The University does not award credit for experiential learning. When portfolio evaluation is requested, it is validated through a departmental credit-by-exam policy.

3.C.4 Transfer credit is accepted from accredited institutions or from other institutions under procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality and relevance to the students’ programs. Implementation of transfer credit policies is consistent with 2.C.4 as well as Policy 2.5 Transfer and Award of Academic Credit. The final judgment for determining acceptable credit for transfer is the responsibility of the receiving institution.

Persistence and graduation studies show that 37 percent of 2003 graduates were transfer students. Of all transfer students in the study, 30 percent had received an associate’s degree prior to attending the University of Nevada, Reno.

The University follows American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers practices in the acceptance of transfer credit as well as NSHE policies governing the transfer of academic credit between NSHE institutions. Transfer agreements applying to 95 percent of the majors offered at the University are maintained among the University of Nevada, Reno, the Nevada community colleges and several neighboring California community colleges. (www.unr.edu/stsv/trcenter/how/transfer_agreements.asp)

The Transfer Center serves as an advocate for transfer students in support of a seamless transfer to the baccalaureate degree program. The Transfer Center provides services such as: major to major agreements for all programs with all Nevada community colleges; transfer curriculum and schedule planning; an evaluation of credit for all baccalaureate-level courses for a minimum of general elective credit; information concerning admissions requirements, transfer procedures and policies. Transfer student rights and responsibilities outlined in the University General Catalog were adopted by the Board of Regents.

Common Course Numbering System
NSHE and the University continue to work toward “seamless transfer” through implementation of common course numbering. NSHE policy requires that all courses with the same title and content must be numbered the same at every NSHE institution. Each new course that is developed at any NSHE institution must be reviewed by all other system institutions for common course numbering eligibility.
The registrar decides the transferability of academic coursework applying toward core curriculum and general elective credit. Academic departments determine the specific course equivalencies applicable to major requirements.

3.C.5 The institution makes provision for the security of student records of admission and progress. Student records, including transcripts, are private, accurate, complete, and permanent. They are protected by fireproof and otherwise safe storage and are backed by duplicate files. Data and records maintained in computing systems have adequate security and provision for recovery in the event of disaster. The information-release policy respects the right of individual privacy and ensures the confidentiality of records and files.

Table 3.2
Admissions Applications Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Security of Student Record Information

Individuals with a legitimate educational interest and a need to access student information to fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities receive access to the student information system. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services serves as the campus student information security coordinator. Individuals requesting access to student information must sign a security application, explain what information they need access to, and how they plan to use the information. They must also agree to comply with all university policies regarding the confidentiality of student information. FERPA information is available on the first page of the University General Catalog along with additional training materials online.

NSHE System Computing Services stores back tapes to the Student Information System daily in a secure off-campus location. Document imag-
ing within the office of Admissions and Records is backed-up daily with additional back-up tapes stored weekly in a secure off-campus location.

The University also maintains a campus-based data warehouse. Individuals receive permission to access data in through this application based upon the kinds of data that they need. For example, all instructors may access their class rosters through their NetID logon. Department officials may access class rosters within their departments. Department officials needing to extract student data for research purposes are guided by IT in the development of standard queries that best suit their needs. Data warehouse security and integrity is managed by university IT.

**Standard 3.D — Student Services**

The institution recruits and admits students qualified to complete its programs. It fosters a supportive learning environment and provides services to support students’ achievement of their educational goals.

**3.D.1 The institution adopts student admission policies consistent with its mission. It specifies qualifications for admission to the institution and its programs, and it adheres to those policies in its admission practices.**

*Freshman Admission*

To succeed, students must be academically prepared when they enter the University. The University is dedicated to providing access to higher education to a broad diversity of students while at the same time assuring that these students have completed a rigorous high school curriculum that will enable success. The widely published requirements for admission are established by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents. Some of these locations include the Board of Regents *Handbook*, the University General Catalog and the University’s website. The Board of Regents, in cooperation with university representatives, periodically reviews admissions standards to insure that incoming students are prepared for the demands of a rigorous college curriculum.

In 2002, the Board of Regents raised the requirements for admission to Nevada’s two universities. These changes were in response to the addition of a state college providing a new tier of access to higher education and the desire to recruit the best and the brightest to the two universities. Student assessment at both research universities revealed that success is closely tied to the student’s academic performance in the required high school core courses.

Effective fall 2006, students seeking freshman admission were required to complete 13 core units of English, mathematics, natural science and social science with a 2.75 grade point average in these core courses. First-year students admitted in 2010 must have attained a 3.0 grade point average in these same core courses. University faculty, administrators and legislators raised concerns that more than one-third of all new freshmen enrolled in remedial English or mathematics courses upon entering the University. These concerns prompted the Board of Regents to vote in 2006 for early implementation (fall 2008) of the 2010 requirement. The early implementation decision was supported through evidence of higher persistence and graduation rates for those students entering the University with a high school core grade point average of 3.0 or better (*CD 3.16: Impact of Proposed Admissions Requirements Presentation*).

The early implementation of the 2010 requirements was intended to assist students in choosing the most educationally appropriate entry point within NSHE. Students who are not academically prepared for university demands are encouraged to begin their studies at the community colleges or Nevada State College. Northern Nevada has three community colleges: Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) located three miles north of campus, Western Nevada Community College (WNCC) in Carson City, and Great Basin College (GBC) in Elko. Great Basin College also offers select four-year degree programs. Transfer to the University is supported through transfer agreements between these institutions and the University’s Transfer Center. (www.unr.edu/stsv/trcenter/how/)
Transfer Admission

In an effort to insure student preparation prior to transfer, the requirements for admission to advanced standing were also strengthened in 2006, now requiring a 2.3 grade point average and the completion of 24 college transferable credits. In fall 2008, students must earn a 2.5 grade point average based upon the completion of 24 college transferable credits. However, any student who has earned the Associate’s Degree of Arts, Sciences or Business is automatically admissible to the University and satisfies completion of the University’s lower-division core curriculum.

NSHE continues to explore transfer admission policies that would require a student to have earned the associate's degree prior to university admission. This proposal is problematic, as not all requirements for all majors can be met through exclusive enrollment during the first two years at the community college. This is especially true for science and engineering majors. Although students are able to complete most of the first two years of their major at the community college, faculty prefer that students develop a connection with university faculty and receive academic advisement directly from their major department at the University as early in their academic career as possible. While some students may benefit from a requirement to obtain the associate’s degree prior to transfer, this same policy could become a hindrance to others.

Special Admission Program

Per Board of Regents policy, the University may admit up to 10 percent of the previous year's enrolled freshmen class on a special admissions basis. Special admits are students who do not meet the traditional admission criteria but who demonstrate special talents and/or circumstances as well as a strong potential for success. A committee chaired by the director of admissions (a non-voting member) and comprised of academic and administrative faculty, meets on a regular basis to review those students who have submitted an appeal of their denial of admission or who have been referred for special review by counselors or other student advocates. The criteria for special admission are published in the Board of Regents Handbook and the University General Catalog.

Students admitted under the Special Admission Program participate in a support program such as the Department of Athletics Academic Support Program for Athletes, the Learning Communities established within Residential Life, the TRiO Scholars or the ACCESS Program through Student Success Services. Each of these programs monitors student success.

Graduate Admission

Admission to a Master’s degree program requires a minimum of a 2.75 undergraduate grade point average or at least a 3.0 on course work taken during the last half of the student’s undergraduate record. Completion of the Bachelor’s degree is also required. Doctoral admission criteria include a 3.0 grade point average for undergraduate and graduate coursework as well as the completion of specific program prerequisites. Application for admission is initiated through the Graduate School and subsequently reviewed by the program faculty for an admission recommendation.

The required summary data report for admissions is shown in Table 3.2 (also RD 3.5: Admissions Report).

3.D.2 The institution, in keeping with its mission and admission policy, gives attention to the needs and characteristics of its student body with conscious attention to such factors as ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious diversity while demonstrating regard for students’ rights and responsibilities.

Student Services is dedicated to the recruitment, persistence and graduation of a diverse student body. As the face of Nevada has become increasingly more ethnically and racially diverse over the last decade, so has the composition of the student body. Diversity goals are set and reviewed each year during the University's strategic planning process. Students of color accounted for 55 percent of the increase in new student enrollment in 2006. In 2005, students of color numbered 2,165 as compared to 2,795 in 2006. This represented a 29 percent increase in one year with students of color accounting for
16.7 percent of the total enrollment of 16,663. While the enrollment of students of color is critical to a diverse student body, the concept of diversity is broadly defined and embraced by the Division of Student Services. All of Student Services Programs support a diverse student body by increasing student persistence and degree completion.

The Division of Student Services strives to achieve a graduation rate that exceeds that of all open admission public land-grant institutions. As noted in 3.B.1, 53 percent (53%) of the first-time, full-time undergraduate students who entered the University in 2000 and were in the Student Right-to-Know cohort graduated in six years. This represented a six percent increase over the 1996 cohort. The four-year graduation rate of the 2000 cohort was 18 percent with the five-year rate at 45 percent. This represented a two percent increase in the four-year rate and a six percent increase in the five-year rate when compared to the 1996 cohort.

The freshman persistence rate from 2004 to 2005 was 75 percent. This increased to 76 percent from 2005 to 2006. The University strives to achieve a 90 percent freshman persistence rate. Although freshman persistence rates have steadily improved over the last decade, much improvement is needed in the four-, five- and six-year graduation rates for all students.

While the overall graduation rate shows modest improvement, graduation rates for students of color are mixed in comparison to the overall rate. The six-year graduation rates for students of color for the 2000 cohort were: American Indian/Alaskan Native 30 percent; Asian Pacific Islander 58.2 percent; Black/Non Hispanic 31.4 percent; Hispanic 50.6 percent; White 52 percent; Non-Resident Alien 89.3 percent; and Un-known 42.9 percent. The University recognizes the need to improve both the four-year and six-year graduation rates for all students.

The freshman persistence rate from 2004 to 2005 was 75 percent. This increased to 76 percent from 2005 to 2006. The University strives to achieve a 90 percent freshman persistence rate. Although freshman persistence rates have steadily improved over the last decade, much improvement is needed in the four-, five- and six-year graduation rates for all students.

The Center for Student Cultural Diversity

The staff and budget of the Center were expanded in both 2005 and 2006 in response to the increase in student diversity. Two additional staff and more than $25,000 in operating dollars were infused into the Center. The mission of the Center is to research, design and implement unique programs and services that promote student recruitment and retention in pursuit of academic success and graduation. The Center helps expand cultural, historical and community awareness while maintaining an open, safe and inclusive environment for all students. While many universities have independent culture centers, the University of Nevada, Reno’s Center operates on the model of intercultural initiatives by providing outreach to targeted demographics. Examples of these initiatives are the Black Culture Cooperative, the Asian-Pacific Islander Heritage Project, Las Culturas, Intertribal Higher Education Program, the Pride Collaborative in support of Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgender individuals and MOSAIC, an intercultural initiative. Retention data indicates students who participate in the Center’s programming persist at significantly higher rates than those who do not.
The Asian and Pacific Islander Heritage Project: The aim of the API Heritage Project is to provide academic and social support to the Asian American and Pacific Islander student body, and increase the University and larger community's awareness of the different cultures within these populations.

Black Culture Cooperative: The Black Culture Cooperative (BCC) provides a wide range of support services, programs and activities aimed at the development of prospective, undergraduate and graduate students. The BCC is committed to creating an environment that encourages the intellectual, professional, and cultural growth of African-American students entering and completing degree programs.

The Intertribal Higher Education Program: The mission of the Intertribal Higher Education Program is to assist Native American students to obtain a university education by providing recruitment and retention services.

Las Culturas: Las Culturas researches, designs and implements unique programs that promote the pursuit of academic success, retention and graduation of Hispanic and Latino students from the University of Nevada, Reno.

The Pride Collaborative: The Pride Collaborative provides a comprehensive range of education, information and outreach services to create and maintain an open, safe and inclusive environment for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students at the University of Nevada, Reno.

The Center for Student Cultural Diversity promotes a safe space philosophy and therefore does not collect data that would identify a student as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender. The LGBT student population served by the Center is included within this report according to ethnicity.

ACCESS
The ACCESS Program (Access to College with Counseling and Educational Support Services) was established in 2003 in preparation for the expected increase in the number of special admission students in 2006. In 2006, the Board of Regents Policy allowed approximately 300 students to be admitted in this category, representing a 100 percent increase over previous allowable limits. This program was designed to provide counseling and academic support to first-time full-time freshmen admitted through the special admission program in order to increase retention and graduation rates. Their academic progress is tracked for the duration of their enrollment.

The 2004 cohort of ACCESS participants (16) demonstrated a 69 percent first-year persistence rate to 2005 and a 50 percent persistence rate to the second year. The 2005 cohort of 14 students demonstrated a 73 percent first-year persistence rate. The 2006 cohort increased to 143 students as a result of the strengthened admission requirements and an increased provision for special admission. Many ACCESS participants have experienced social and cultural barriers that may have precluded participation in a college preparatory program while in high school.

Summer Bridge
The Summer Bridge Program is a unique and intense three-day program specifically designed to assist select students from historically underrepresented groups in making a smooth academic and social transition from high school to college. ACCESS, TRIO Scholars and the Center for Student Cultural Diversity collaborate to provide services for this program. The goal of the program is to match students with campus resources and retention programs that will support persistence and graduation. The 2004 and 2005 cohort participants numbered 59 and the 2006 cohort numbered 70 students. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the 2004-2005 participants were enrolled in the fall of 2006 with 78 percent in good standing. The students reported that as a result of the program they felt prepared for the University’s new student orientation and felt connected to the campus as well as to one another.
TRIO Scholars

The TRIO Scholars Program provides academic and counseling support designed to assist first generation, low income participants with an identified academic need to graduate. TRIO participants reflect a diversity of ethnicity, culture and economic backgrounds. More than one-third of Nevada students are first generation and are at higher risk for attrition than the general student population. Participants are provided with individual tutoring, academic counseling, peer mentoring and assistance with budget management including financial aid applications and limited financial assistance. The federally funded program serves 175 students per year. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the program participants persisted from fall 2004 to fall 2005. Ninety-six percent (96%) were in good academic standing at the end of the 2004-2005 academic year. The six-year graduation rate for the 1999 first-time, full-time freshman TRIO scholars cohort was 56.3 percent. The six-year graduation rate for a similar cohort of eligible students who did not participate in the program was 37.1 percent.

Upward Bound

The Upward Bound Program provides programming to encourage high school completion and continuation to higher education for low income, first generation high school students in northern Nevada. In recognition of the very high proportion of low income and first generation college bound students in Nevada, two additional Upward Bound Programs were added to serve the communities surrounding the Reno area. Although these programs do not serve as a recruitment funnel to the University of Nevada, Reno, more than 90 percent of the Upward Bound participants matriculate here. Upward Bound students are diverse ethnically, culturally, and economically.

McNair

Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program, a federally funded program, serves 22 juniors and seniors who are first generation/low income students and students of color. Scholars are selected because of a demonstrated potential to enter and complete doctoral programs. Students receive the preparatory support needed to enter doctoral programs that will lead to careers in teaching, research, or administration on college and university campuses. Under faculty mentor guidance, the scholars conduct their own research project from initial conceptualization through data collection to the writing of the final report and presentation. In 2004-2005, 85 percent of the participants maintained a minimum 3.0 GPA. Eighty-three percent (83%) graduated and 100 percent of graduating seniors completed graduate school applications. Of the 2003 cohort, the first group of scholars, 67 percent are in graduate school. Of the 2004 cohort, 100 percent are in graduate school.

Disability Resource Center

The Disability Resource Center insures that students with disabilities have equal access to participate in, contribute to, and benefit from university programs. The DRC seeks to eliminate attitudinal and architectural barriers that present themselves to disabled students.

Students with disabilities are the fastest growing population of students in the University; the number of students requiring accommodations grows at an average rate of 17 percent per academic year. The DRC served 957 students in the 2005-2006 academic year. The largest numbers of those presenting to the DRC were those with psychological disabilities, 352 and learning disabilities, 319.

Consistent with national trends, students with psychological disabilities presenting to the DRC have doubled, making them the fastest growing population served by the DRC. The DRC also noted a substantial growth in their deaf and hard of hearing student population, thus increasing the need for auxiliary aids and services.

In response to the rising cost of providing accommodations, the University was able to secure a stable funding base from the 1999 Nevada Legislature. The formula provides a guideline that allocates resources for students with disabilities. The implementation of the funding formula has enabled the expansion of DRC staff from one in 1996 to seven in 2006.
While the focus of the DRC is not rooted in retention but rather in compliance, the accommodations and services provided demonstrate a positive impact on the retention and persistence of students with disabilities. In 2006, the six-year graduation rate of students presenting to DRC was 52 percent. The persistence rate for first-time full-time freshmen was 64.29 percent and the rate across all class standings was 76.27 percent.

The DRC has made tremendous progress in removing barriers for students with disabilities. Yet students continue to face a number of challenges. The Reduced Course Load Policy for students with disabilities recognizes students enrolled in less than 12 credit hours as full-time; however, the campus Supplemental Health Insurance Policy fails to honor this accommodation. Access to technology also remains a challenge for students with disabilities. Statewide adoption of Section 508 federal guidelines is needed to facilitate electronic and information technology accessibility. Lastly, during the course of the semester students who drop below full-time status as a result of a disability lose the state’s Millennium Scholarship. There is currently no appeal procedure through the state Treasurer’s Office that recognizes these exceptional circumstances.

The Graduate Student Association

Recognizing that the average age of graduate students is 35, the Graduate Student Association created many programs in response to the unique needs of this population. These include a Household Items Program that collects and distributes furniture and household items of all sorts to those trying to establish new households, a Child Care Grant for those in need of financial support for child care, an Outstanding International Graduate Student Scholarship, and an International Student Transitional Student Loan Program. In addition, GSA was honored nationally for its International Student Programs by the National Association for Graduate-Professional Students, and it has been the only organization of this group to win the Graduate Student Organization of the Year award two times, in 1997 and 2005.

3.D.3 Appropriate policies and procedures guide the placement of students in courses and programs based upon their academic and technical skills. Such placement ensures a reasonable probability of success at a level commensurate with the institution’s expectations. Special provisions are made for “ability to benefit” students.

Requirements for initial placement into freshmen English and mathematics courses are clearly stated in the schedule of classes and the University General Catalog. In addition, course prerequisites are published in the catalog and checked within the registration system. Academic departments make further decisions regarding the dis-enrollment of students from courses in which they don’t meet prerequisites.

Many academic programs have specific requirements for entry. Some of these programs include, but are not limited to, nursing, business and education. Admission to these programs is clearly communicated in the University General Catalog and registration is controlled in these programs through proper student coding.

3.D.4 The institution specifies and published requirements for continuation in, or termination from, its educational programs, and the institution maintains an appeals process. The policy for readmission of students who have been suspended or terminated is clearly defined.

Satisfactory Academic Progress is clearly defined in the University General Catalog. Academic actions consisting of warning, probation and disqualification occur when students fall below the specified grade point average and credit thresholds for each class standing. Disqualified students are dropped from their academic programs but are allowed to enroll in six credits each semester contingent upon permission of their academic advisor. When students successfully restore themselves to the academic warning threshold, they may petition the University to be returned to an academic program.
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3.D.5 Institutional and program graduation requirements are stated clearly in appropriate publications and are consistently applied in both the certificate and degree verification process. Appropriate reference to the Student Right-to-Know Act is included in the required publications.

Graduation rate reports are available online through the University data book. Copies of the IPEDS completion reports are available through the Office of Institutional Analysis and the Registrar. Program and graduation requirements are clearly stated in the University General Catalog. The degree verification process is conducted through the Degree Audit Reporting System as described in section 3.C.4. Graduation application instructions and the graduation application itself are available on the web.

3.D.6 The institution provides an effective program of financial aid consistent with its mission and goals, the needs of its students, and institutional resources. There is provision for institutional accountability for all financial aid awards. AND

3.D.7 Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) is published and made available to both prospective and enrolled students. AND

3.D.8 The institution regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institutional loan default rate. Informational sessions, which give attention to loan repayment obligations, are conducted for financial aid recipients.

Financial Aid
The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships provides financial assistance to all qualified students and supports the institution's commitment to achieve the enrollment of a broadly diverse student body. All programs are administered within federal, state and institutional guidelines. More than 30 financial aid programs are administered to undergraduate and graduate students. These include Pell Grants, Academic Competitiveness Grants, Smart Grants, Stafford Loans, campus-based programs, institutional loans, state grants, state work programs and scholarships, including the Nevada Millennium Scholarship Program.

The INFORMS Student Information System (SIS) is used to manage and award financial aid. Interfaced with ePAWS, the University's web registration system allows students to access their financial aid application, view their most recent offer letters and check for the disbursement of funds. A recent survey indicated that 95 percent of the respondents were comfortable viewing their financial aid information over the web. Security is maintained through NetID authentication, SIS logon ID and private PIN (Personal Identification Number).

Institutional accountability for all financial aid programs is maintained by the awarding of funds through the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships and disbursed by the University's Cashier and Student Accounts Manager. This insures adequate procedural controls designed to protect against improper awards and fund disbursement. The office also participates in an annual A-133 audit as well, conducted by Moss Adams in 2006 and Price Waterhouse in prior years. The financial aid office closely monitors student loan default rates and implements default prevention programs.

In recognition of a lack of freshmen financial literacy, a $120,000 grant from EdFund made possible a luncheon workshop series, beginning in fall 2002. By spring 2006, more than 1,500 students had participated in informational sessions outlining responsible credit card use, student success, budgeting, identity theft, personal money management and loans.

In partnership with EdFund Default Prevention Initiatives, a Default Prevention and Cohort Analysis was performed by EdFund in 2005. The analysis revealed that the University’s Cohort Default Rates (CDR) were significantly lower than the four averages posted by public four-year institutions, institutions within Nevada as well as the nation at large. The official CDR for the University for 2003 was 3.0 percent and
3.1 percent in 2004. This minor increase was expected due to the large number of students consolidating loans. The University has instituted 12 steps/changes to address the needs of students identified as most likely to default (CD 3.17: Default Prevention and Cohort Default Rate Reduction Strategic Plan).

The financial aid office continues to improve service through the increased use of technology such as online forms, The Guide on CD, an online scholarship application, Stafford Loan Activation forms, reporting resources and change form, satisfactory progress forms and a user friendly website. Participation in the Quality Assurance Program insures that the students who need financial aid are indeed those students receiving need-based funds. The financial aid technology team meets monthly to review and enhance the web presence. All forms are available in Spanish and a bi-lingual staff member is available at all times for translation assistance.

The office has a complete and tested set of network documentation including backup and restoration procedures of computer systems within the department. The staff monitors network security daily. Web surveys are conducted yearly for customer service improvement.

Scholarships

The Millennium Scholarship Program

In 2000, the state of Nevada enacted the Millennium Scholarship program, which provides students graduating from a Nevada high school with a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 a scholarship award to attend a Nevada institution of higher education (nevadatreasurer.gov/millennium/). This is a renewable award with full-time enrollment each semester and satisfactory academic progress. The University has disbursed funds to more than 8,000 students since the inception of this program. The eligibility requirements have risen to a 3.1 cumulative grade point average as well as the attainment of higher grade point averages for continued eligibility. The University of Nevada, Reno has retained Millennium Scholars at a higher rate than any other NSHE institution.

The University General Scholarship Program

Scholarships are primarily funded by private endowments with minimal contributions from state funding and student fee sources. Scholarships are awarded to qualified entering students at the freshman level based upon academic indices calculated through a combination of grade point averages and test scores. Transfer scholarship awards are based upon academic history. Students meeting continuation criteria are reawarded as sophomores. At the junior and senior level, schools and colleges assume the responsibility for continuation awarding. In the absence of funding sources at the college level, the general scholarship program will award continuation awards to juniors and seniors who meet established criteria.

In 2003, the University sought the consulting services of Noel Levitz to improve the effectiveness of the scholarship program. Following consultant recommendations, all funding sources for general awards were consolidated to provide a fair and equitable distribution of awards to entering students. An academic index was established and used as the guide for funding scholarship amounts.

A collaborative team was established between Financial Aid, Scholarships, Admissions, Prospective Students, and Residential Life and Housing to insure that obstacles to enrollment were removed for new freshmen. The team established admission and enrollment goals for specific, targeted populations of students identified as contributing to the diversity of the student body such as students from Clark County, Washoe County students of color, and students residing outside of Nevada.

In summation, the clear delineation of responsibilities regarding college-based scholarships versus general scholarship, as well as the establishment of objective criteria for the initial and continuing scholarship awards and the establishment of an enrollment management team resulted in a 67 percent increase in scholarship awards across all class standings. The number of freshmen receiving awards under the new system has nearly tripled. In fall 2003, 510 freshmen were awarded $1,126,324 in scholarships.
The average award was $2,207. In fall 2006, 1,508 freshmen awards were made totaling $1,283,258. The average award was $851.

Research conducted by the University’s Office of Institutional Analysis indicated that students who received merit-based awards were more likely to persist and graduate than those who did not (CD 3.18: Institutional Analysis Report). In addition, an analysis of retention rates by academic index provided further support for the strengthening of freshmen admissions requirements. The restructuring of the University’s scholarship program is an example of how assessment data was used with the assistance of an objective consultant for program improvement.

3.D.9 The institution provides for the orientation of new students, including special populations, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Undergraduate Students
New Student Orientation is a program that is facilitated by students for students. A Student Orientation Staff of more than 100 volunteers provide the majority of programming for orientation. New Student Orientation is a requirement for all new freshmen and transfer students.

Upon admission, students complete an online activity called Nevada Overview. This is the first in a series of five activities that comprise the New Student Orientation Program. Nevada Overview provides students with information about getting started and allows them to notify the University that they are planning to enroll.

Second in this series are early advisement and college preparation sessions (Wolf Pack Advisement) held in Reno, Las Vegas, Elko, and Sacramento. Attendance at this session satisfies the new freshmen advisement requirement. Students are guided into the appropriate English and mathematics courses based upon university and NSHE placement policies. Students may register after attending one of these sessions. Approximately 75 percent of new students who enroll as freshmen complete their advisement requirement through these sessions. Students who are not able to attend these sessions may contact their advisors or departments directly. The third activity, the Las Vegas Send Off, is for students from Southern Nevada. Students and parents living in the Las Vegas area are invited to attend a special program that helps both students and parents prepare for the change in their families’ lives as these students travel more than 500 miles to Reno.

The fourth activity is the traditional New Student Orientation program, held on the Wednesday, Thursday and Friday prior to the beginning of classes. Orientation begins with the Opening Ceremony that welcomes all new students to campus. This Ceremony was established in 1999 in response to a need for the establishment of a ritual that would celebrate the students’ transition to college. The President, deans, faculty and student body leaders assemble in their full academic regalia to set the tone of rigor and promise for the new year. It is a time of celebration and commitment to the beginning of a new academic career. Following the ceremony is a series of informational sessions and activities that prepare new students for their college experiences. In addition, students and parents are welcomed by the colleges and have the opportunity to personally connect with Deans, department chairs and faculty to seek answers to any lingering academic questions.

Finally, the Student Orientation Staff conduct a mid-semester follow-up phone campaign with students who attended orientation in the fall. This campaign has two purposes: (1) program assessment and (2) the identification of any needed academic or personal interventions during this mid-semester time frame. Students are referred to the appropriate services as needed.

Orientation Activities for Special Groups
International students participate in all the University’s new student orientation activities, as well as programming geared toward the needs of new international students provided by the Office of International Students and Scholars.
Transfer and Non-Traditional Student Orientation occurs during an evening session. This special web-based orientation was created in response to requests from non-traditional students who were unable to physically attend an orientation session.

Graduate Students
Guided by a 2005 survey of graduate students (CD 3.19: Graduate Student Association Survey) conducted by the Graduate Student Association, the Graduate School established an orientation for new graduate students. The orientation provides guidance to new graduate students on campus, including information on differences between undergraduate and graduate education, the demands of a graduate curriculum, and the role of the Graduate Program Advisor. There are also opportunities to talk with current graduate students about navigating through the graduate experience. A special focus for international students incorporates the expectations of an American graduate experience. Assessment of the 2006 orientation program (CD 3.20: Graduate Orientation Assessment, Fall 2006) revealed that students did not find the information concerning intellectual property important at this time. Students also expressed a desire for more interactive student sessions and groupings within their own major. These recommendations will be incorporated into the fall 2007 graduate student orientation program.

Orientation Weekend Activities
Requests by new students for additional programming during the weekend days that follow orientation led to the establishment of additional formalized Saturday and Sunday programming activities in 2001. These activities give students the opportunity to get to know the Reno community as well as to connect with the many student organizations and activities on campus. As a result, extensive programming is provided by the Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN), Residential Life and Student Services’ units for the duration of the entire weekend.

Parent Orientation and Involvement
In response to the growing national trend of increased parental involvement, a Parent Orientation was added in 2002 to better serve the needs of parents of new undergraduate students. Parents attend their own set of orientation activities, organized and presented by the Parents’ Network. Two days of informational sessions, a dessert reception and parent networking opportunities assure that parents are well informed and knowledgeable about university expectations. Parents are given guidance in how they may support the success of their students.

The Parents’ Network provides support through a wide variety of programs, events and communication tools. These include Parent and Family Orientation, Parent and Family Weekend, a website dedicated to parents and a parent monthly newsletter. Parents may seek guidance from each other as they recognize the integral role that they play in supporting their students’ success. The Parents’ Network serves as a support group for all parents and families of University of Nevada, Reno students.

3.D.10 A systematic program of academic and other educational program advisement is provided. Advisors help students make appropriate decisions concerning academic choices and career paths. Specific advisor responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students.

Academic Advisement
Results from the National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) revealed student academic success depended on the communication of clear pathways toward degree completion. To insure readiness for academic rigor, placement into math and English courses require the attainment of minimum SAT/ACT scores or the successful completion of a departmental placement exam. In addition, prerequisites are enforced for freshmen English and mathematics courses. Until they have met these prerequisites, students are blocked from registering for these courses. In addition, all students are now required to complete any remedial coursework within their first 30 credits attempted at the University.
To improve student persistence, reduce the time to degree and maximize correct course placement, the University implemented a comprehensive undergraduate advising program that includes mandatory advising for all incoming and continuing freshmen. Undergraduate advisors were identified in each college and program. Undecided students receive guidance through the Advising Center. The fall 2006 persistence rates of new freshmen indicated that freshmen persistence was 76 percent as compared to that of 75 percent for the 2004-2005 freshmen class.

NSSE results also indicated that 72 percent of all freshmen reported that the quality of the academic advisement they received was good or excellent; only 53 percent of the seniors reported the same level of satisfaction. As a result, the University now requires academic advising beginning with the freshmen class.

The Degree Audit Report System (DARS) allows both students and advisors to monitor academic progress. Students’ final DARS reports must indicate the completion of all degree requirements before a student can be considered for graduation.

Millennium Academic Persistence Program (MAPP)

The Millennium Academic Persistence Program, a program implemented to support the first group of Nevada Millennium Scholarship recipients in the fall of 2000, has resulted in the highest retention rates of Millennium scholars statewide. In fall 2006, 5,619 Millennium Scholars were enrolled at the University across all class standings. The percentage of students maintaining eligibility from semester-to-semester has ranged from a low of 80 percent to a high of 91 percent. The University of Nevada, Reno has consistently demonstrated the highest percentages of students retaining eligibility each semester compared to all other institutions in the state.

Millennium Scholars are required to attend a Millennium Scholarship instructional session intended to provide guidance and strategies to maintain the scholarship. Students also participate in a list-serve that provides a weekly e-mail and newsletter with information about important deadlines, academic policies, procedures and services needed for student success. Students are encouraged to seek out the assistance of Academic Intervention Services, Academic Skills Center, Financial Aid and Scholarships as well as others.

Las Vegas Retention Pilot Program

An analysis of persistence by geographic origin revealed that students from southern Nevada were at high risk for not returning to the University after their first year. In response to this need, a new program entitled “702,” the area code for southern Nevada, was developed in 2005. This Las Vegas area pilot program focuses on “institutional mattering,” offering a multi-faceted approach to connect students in this program. Students are provided with a point person to serve as an initial contact for problem resolution. They participate in a virtual community through weekly e-mails and close collaboration with Residential Life, Counseling Services, DRC, TRiO Programs, Student Judicial Affairs and the Parents Network. This program increased freshmen retention rate for students from southern Nevada to 73 percent in fall 2006 as compared to 65 percent in 2005.

Academic Intervention Services

Students experiencing significant extenuating circumstances (medical, family, psychological) impeding their success at the University may seek assistance from the Academic Intervention program. This program explores student options, partial or complete withdrawal from the University, exit interviews, and refund appeals when appropriate. The program, established in 2001 for the purpose of insuring student success, provides immediate assistance in crisis situations and then links the student with ongoing support through collaboration with various campus resources including Counseling Services, Disability Resource Center, Career Development, and Financial Aid. Students receiving services in 2005-2006 achieved a 77 percent persistence rate, a 10 percent increase from those who were assisted through this program in 2003-2004 (RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence).
**Freshman Start**

Freshman Start provides support to incoming freshmen who place into remedial English and mathematics as a result of their standardized or placement test scores. The program offers students the opportunity to complete these remedial classes in the summer prior to the freshmen year. Taking remedial classes during the summer enables students to start their academic program at the same point as most new freshmen. The program began in 2006 with enrollments of 63 in English and 99 in mathematics.

**Living and Learning Communities**

The continuing mission to integrate the academic and social lives of students resulted in the establishment of living and learning communities in 2005. These communities are housed within the residence halls for the purpose of enhancing student adjustment through the development of a strong supportive network of other students, peer mentors, residence hall and student services staff, and academic faculty. In fall 2005, 70 students participated in the Living and Learning Communities established for both Honors Program students and undecided majors. These students were assigned to the same floor in the residence hall, were enrolled in one to three core classes together, and were expected to participate in weekly activities. Faculty offices were located on these residence hall floors providing additional academic support. The persistence rate for these freshmen was 84 percent. The average first semester grade point average was 2.83 for the undecided students in remedial courses and 3.22 for the undecided students in college level courses. These figures compare to a 2.64 for all new freshmen and a 2.84 for freshmen living in the residence halls.

**Residence Hall Academic Intervention Programs**

Residential students who fail to achieve a 2.0 semester grade point average are required to participate in an academic intervention program that includes an academic success conference and individualized meetings with a Resident Director or an academic advisor housed in Residential Life. The conference provides an overview of university policies and procedures regarding good academic standing. It also offers instruction in time management, stress, dealing with abusive behaviors, and the availability of a variety of academic support programs. Individual plans are developed for each student. Data from 2003, 2004 and 2005 indicated grade point average improvement rates between 67 percent and 84 percent (RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence).

**First Year Experience**

First Year Experience courses are designed to enhance the academic and social integration of the first year student into the University. To ease the transition from high school to the University, these courses typically assist students in developing the academic skills necessary to succeed at the University and provide students with information on campus resources. Some colleges/departments have developed major-specific courses that also serve to introduce students to their declared majors. The Academic and Career Exploration (ACE) 110 courses for undecided students place an emphasis on major/career exploration. Retention and support programs such as ACCESS, TRIO Scholars and Wolf Pack (athletics) Academic and Compliance Program also offer ACE classes as part of their programs. Although data regarding the success of these classes have been mixed over the last 10 years, students who enrolled in these classes and who participated in one of the above mentioned programs were retained at higher rates than the general freshmen population (RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence).

**Writing Center**

The Writing Center works with students on writing projects from any class at any level of instruction. In 2004, 7,000 students were tutored from 500 different classes, representing every discipline at the University. Students who seek assistance are more likely than their placement scores indicate to succeed in higher-level courses. Fifteen students who had only placed into remedial English were randomly selected to enroll in English 101. These students received weekly tutoring at the Writing Center. Twelve of the students completed English 101 with grades of A or B. Engineering students who are tutored
for one hour on a given paper receive a letter grade higher than those who are not tutored.

**Math Center**
The Math Center helps students at the University of Nevada, Reno improve their mathematical skills and increase their appreciation of the use of mathematics, primarily through its support of a program called Mathematics Across the Curriculum. The program assists non-mathematics faculty in enhancing the mathematical content of their courses, with special emphasis on mathematics within the context of a particular discipline. The Math Center has worked with professors from numerous courses to promote a greater appreciation of the uses of mathematics in diverse disciplines. The Math Center provides tutoring to students as well as placement testing for mathematics courses.

**Academic Skills Center**
The Student Academic Skills Center offers group tutoring, at no cost, for lower-division core classes. Tutoring is based upon a model of supplemental instruction that incorporates behavioral, cognitive, and social learning theories that support learning in a communal setting. Additionally, in collaboration with academic departments such as Engineering, Mathematics, Core Curriculum, and the Extended Studies Summer Program, the Center provides supplemental instruction for students in classes determined to be at high risk for failure.

In 2005, 38 tutors provided services for 911 tutoring sessions, and 570 individual students made use of these services each semester, totaling 17,222 student visits. The persistence rates for 2005 freshmen who received tutoring was 85 percent, 10 percent higher than the general 2005 freshman population persistence rate. The persistence rate for Washoe County students was 87 percent for those who received tutoring and 75 percent for those who did not. Similarly, the persistence rate for Clark County students was 77 percent for those who received tutoring and 71 percent for those who did not (**RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence**).

### 3.D.11 Career counseling and placement services are consistent with student needs and institutional mission.

Today's students want to know how their area of academic interest will translate into a career and how employers view students' college experiences in terms of preparation for success in the world of work. The Career Development Counselors provide this guidance through individual and group counseling, classes focusing on career development, Internship Programs, graduate and professional school preparation workshops, the online job board called Career Navigator and the Graduating Senior Survey.

After analysis, Career Development determined that Veteran's Services and the Human Resources functions of Student Employment were inconsistent with the unit's vision, mission, philosophy. As a result, Veteran's Services, primarily an enrollment certification function, was moved to Admissions and Records. The human resources functions of Student Employment such as hiring documents and data entry into the Human Resources Database were moved to Human Resources. The job development portion and the on- and off-campus student employment functions remained within Career Development. Thus, career services counselors can help students securing employment within a framework of long-term career goals. More than 3,000 students are employed on campus.

Throughout the year Career Development assesses program impact, service reception and client satisfaction. The fall 2006 snapshot survey revealed that although 37 percent of the students responding indicated they had considered leaving the University because of financial reasons, 63 percent indicated that career development services helped them to remain enrolled.

Career Navigator allows students 24/7 access to employment opportunities. Students can search for local, regional, national and international employment opportunities. More than 49 percent of undergraduates are registered with Career Navigator. The post-graduate plans of the May 2006 graduates included enrollment in advanced
degree programs at more than 40 universities and employment with more than 50 employers (CD 3.21: Graduation Survey, Spring 2006).

3.D.12 Professional health care, including psychological health and relevant health education, is readily available to residential students and to other students, as appropriate.

Student Health Services
The University of Nevada School of Medicine provides oversight to Student Health Services, which is directed by the Associate Dean of the Medical School. In August 2005, the Accreditation Association of Ambulatory Health Care (AAAHC) accredited the Student Health Center (SHC) for a three-year period (CD 3.22: Health Center Accreditation Report). An assessment of patient satisfaction revealed that 93 percent of the individuals who sought care were very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of care received.

SHC is engaged in a quality improvement (QI) program that includes weekly staff meetings, regular meetings of specific QI task forces, monthly peer review of patient charts, patient suggestion boxes, triage log books with suggestions for improvement, bi-annual patient surveys, monthly Student Health Advisory Committee meetings, and continuous quality improvement studies and projects.

A peer review of charts, for example, looked at the practice of administering antibiotics in the treatment of bronchitis. Because of the increase in bronchitis cases and the medical evidence suggesting the overuse of antibiotics as treatment, the group reviewed all such incidences at Student Health. Findings indicated that 48 percent of the patients so diagnosed were unnecessarily treated with antibiotics. As a result, health care providers received these results in conjunction with the literature suggesting the inappropriate use of antibiotics in these cases. These ongoing and continuous reviews improve the decision-making of care providers at SHC.

Student Health works cooperatively with the Office of Admissions and Records in assuring compliance with the state's immunization requirements for enrollment at the Nevada universities. SHC makes immunization available to all admitted students and frequently holds “shot” clinics in the Fitzgerald Student Services Building in close proximity with the Office of Admissions and Records. SHC regularly participates in both student and parent orientation programs to inform both groups about SHC services, health concerns, and prevention programs, some co-sponsored with Student Services.

An example of a most valuable cooperative program is that of the Counseling Center and SHC. A Counseling Center Staff Psychologist specializing in suicidality is housed in the Student Health Center. When physicians see students who are in need of counseling for depression or suicidal tendencies, the physician simply walks the student to the psychologist's office on the premises and the student is seen immediately. This preventive intervention comes in the wake of a growing tide of severe emotional and psychological problems among college and university students.

Counseling Services
The Counseling Center staff is made up of a group of highly trained professionals with advanced degrees in psychology, clinical social work, marriage and family therapy or substance abuse counseling. The staff specializes in working with issues specific to the college student population including depression, anxiety, substance abuse, eating disorders, women’s issues, sexual identity, international and multi-cultural issues, interpersonal concerns, academic success and stress. Student fees, with the exception of the state-funded director position, support Counseling Services. The Center was able to expand its professional staff thanks to the implementation of a graduated (amount determined by credit hours enrolled) and mandated student fee.

Students most often express concerns about fear, anxiety, worries, nervousness, academics, school, work, grades, stress management, depression and concentration. This pattern has remained stable for the last several years. Based
upon repeated measures of 61 students, statistically significant improvement occurred in the reduction of overall psychological distress.

Counseling Services has been successful in reaching a broad spectrum of the student body. With the advent of the Millennium Scholarship in 2000, increased numbers of freshmen began to present themselves. Students often presented with an academically related difficulty that, at the conclusion of treatment, resolved itself as an apparent result of the counseling services provided (RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence).

3.D.13 **Student housing, if provided, is designed and operated to enhance the learning environment. It meets recognized standards of health and safety; it is competently staffed.**

Residential Life and Housing offers students a variety of living options, including six residence halls, one apartment-style residence hall, and 40 family housing apartments. The program promotes academic and personal growth by creating positive living and learning environments, including substance-free lifestyle living and the Living and Learning Communities. Living and Learning Communities enable students to take advantage of a rich social and educational environment that encourages growth and development. In addition, tutoring services became available in the residence halls in 2006.

Resident Directors are highly engaged in supporting academic success. The Academic Intervention Program identifies those students living in the residence halls each semester who have fallen below a 2.0. Resident Directors then work individually with these students to identify action plans for the next semester. These may include attendance at academic and life skills workshops, tutoring, meeting with academic advisors, financial aid advisors and psychological counselors. Attendance in class is verified for those students demonstrating at-risk behaviors. In spring 2006, 42 students were identified with grade point averages of less than 2.0. After participation in the academic intervention program, 86 percent showed some improvement the following semester with 22 students raising their grade point averages above 2.0 for that semester.

Resident Assistants sponsor and create a variety of educational and social programs throughout the year. They communicate clear expectations of appropriate conduct. Residents are held accountable through the student conduct process.

Residence Hall security consists of six full-time attendants and additional student employee support. Five full-time resident directors live at each of the halls (or a cluster of very small halls). A graduate assistant complements the efforts of the resident directors and 48 student resident hall assistants provide models of leadership and peer modeling for residence hall students. Administrative faculty oversee all support positions, residence hall staff and facility safety and security. In addition, student administrative support staff completes a full complement of staffing to insure a quality residential life experience.

Although on-campus housing is available to graduate students, only limited living arrangements support the needs of married, non-traditional or older students. Despite this being a clearly identified need, the cost of providing accommodations appropriate for this population exceeds the perceived value of those accommodations. Balancing cost containment with the provision of housing suitable for graduate students and families is a major obstacle. The University is committed to expand housing options for all students in the next decade. As an incentive for freshmen to live on campus, $2,000 housing grants were made available to those students with financial need.
3.D.14 Appropriate food services are provided for both resident and nonresident students. These services are supervised by professionally trained food service staff and meet recognized nutritional and mandated health and safety standards.

Dining services are available for all individuals on campus. The Downunder Café is primarily a residential dining facility but also serves as a venue for educational programming, nutritional counseling, and a convenience store. In addition to the Downunder Café, other campus options provide varied meal plans. These include the Overlook, which provides a food court within the student union; the Downunder Convenience (DC) store, located next to the Downunder Café; the Wolf Perk Coffee House in the student union; Las Trojes Express, Mexican food housed in the Ansari Business Building; the Barista Brothers Coffee Cart located at Getchell Library and the Northside Café, located in the Fitzgerald Student Services Building. The DC store provides late night access to a wide range of food options including pizza service.

Dining Services, which are supervised by professional staff, are outsourced to Chartwells Food Service. In 2005, the food services operation achieved the status of Center of Excellence for campus dining services.

In response to an assessment of dining services on campus, the opening of the Downunder Café in 2004 incorporated a wider variety of choice for special dietary needs including vegan and international. As half of the University’s international population is Japanese, the availability of sushi and sticky rice was very important. In addition, the demand for fast and healthy food in the Student Union and the Overlook, led to the availability of a wide choice of concessions including Coyote Jacks, Mandalay Express Asian food, subs, salads, sushi, pizza, Freshens smoothies and Starbucks.

3.D.15 Co-curricular activities and programs are offered that foster the intellectual and personal development of students consistent with the institution’s mission. The institution adheres to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity for participation. It ensures that appropriate services and facilities are accessible to students in its programs. Co-curricular activities and programs include adaptation for traditionally underrepresented students, such as physically disabled, older, evening, part-time, commuter, and, where applicable, those at off-campus sites. AND

3.D.16 The co-curricular program includes policies and procedures that determine the relationship of the institution with its student activities; identifying the needs, evaluating the effectiveness, and providing appropriate governance of the program are joint responsibilities of students and the institution.

ASUN, through Flipside Programming, and the Graduate Student Association develop and implement social and academic programs of interest to their constituencies. In addition to the activities offered by each student government, clubs and organizations also develop programming related to their unique interests (SM 3.1: List of Recognized Student Organizations). The University was an active political arena during the 2006 gubernatorial and senatorial campaigns. Outdoor free speech zones were expanded to include any location on the entire campus, providing voice and access for all.

In 2005-2006, ASUN clubs and organizations submitted 197 requests for sound and lighting services for on-campus events. More than 50 clubs and organizations planned 678 events, supported with more than $245,000 of funding allocated by ASUN. The Student Events Advisory Board advises and approves events on campus such as Night of All Nations, The Hispanic Youth Soccer Initiative, fall and spring Movie Series, and many other events that draw more than 1,000 community and university members.

Flipside Programming
The Programming Board, or Flipside, is the social and event-planning arm of ASUN. Flipside is comprised of eight unique chairs who are re-
The Student Events Advisory Board (SEAB) chairs the Student Events Advisory Board (SEAB). In 2005-2006, 678 events were planned and presented by the nearly 200 ASUN recognized clubs, organizations and ASUN Flipside Programming Board. Student Activities fosters the development of student civic responsibility, citizenship, leadership and personal growth. All programs are accessible and advertised with a statement encouraging persons with disabilities in need of accommodation to contact the student activity office for suitable arrangements.

Greek Life and Leadership
The University provides services and leadership to support, challenge and improve the contribution of its Greek members. Seven hundred thirty-eight (738) students were Greek affiliated in spring 2006, ranging in age from 17-27. The average grade point average for all undergraduates was 2.89 and for Greeks, 2.82. Students participating in Greek organizations persist at a higher rate than the student population in general, 88 percent for Greek students enrolled fall 2004 and 85 percent for Greeks enrolled fall 2005 (RE 3.7: Retention and Persistence).

The University provides a full-time faculty advisor whose objectives are to: restructure the Inter-fraternity Council demonstrating effective student leadership on campus; promote successful colonization for new Greek organizations; create a Greek profile to assess member needs; develop a Greek Council for multicultural organization; and promote the efficiency of the annual recognition process for the 19 Greek chapters on campus.

JTSU
The current Jot Travis Student Union (JTSU), and the 2007 opening of the new Joe Crowley Student Union, are critical to the success of co-curricular programming. The JTSU maintains guidelines for the use of union facilities for student programming. These guidelines ensure equal access to student organizations.

Through programming and the co-sponsorship of events supporting cultural, ethnic, spiritual, political and ideologically underrepresented groups, the union provides a welcoming and inclusive environment. With the new Joe Crowley Student Union, programming can more than triple with students well served by welcoming and sufficient space.

3.D.17 If appropriate to its mission and goals, the institution provides adequate opportunities and facilities for student recreational and athletic needs apart from intercollegiate athletics.

The Campus Wellness and Recreation Center, a division within the College of Health and Human Sciences, offers quality recreation and fitness opportunities to promote the pursuit of lifelong health. It benefits the health and wellness interests of all students, faculty and staff. Programs reflect the interests and needs of the population it serves. In a 2003 survey, 97 percent of students surveyed had participated in a Campus Recreation and Wellness program, with
90 percent of those students perceiving that participation had a positive impact on their college experiences (CD 3.23: Campus Recreation).

In partnership with ASUN, Campus Recreation led the effort to renovate the Lombardi Recreational Facility to construct a fitness center, rock climbing wall, multipurpose rooms and a rental equipment shop. In addition, this partnership resulted the re-invention of the John Sala Intramural Field complex, which now enjoys synthetic turf, lights and fencing.

3.D.18 If the institution operates a bookstore, it supports the educational program and contributes to the intellectual climate of the campus community. Students, faculty, and staff have the opportunity to participate in the development and monitoring of bookstore policies and procedures.

The bookstore, a self-supporting operation, owned and operated by the Associated Students of the University of Nevada offers services such as textbook reservations, buyback programs, computer loans and purchases, online purchasing, special orders, online textbook requisition and graduation regalia. The quality of customer service and satisfaction is excellent. ASUN oversees the use and distribution of the bookstore profits, funding many activities and programs in support of student success.

Space restrictions have hampered bookstore expansion over the past decade. With the opening of the new Joe Crowley Student Union, the bookstore will enjoy 24,200 square feet of space, a 62 percent increase over its current operating area.

3.D.19 When student media exist, the institution provides for a clearly defined and published policy of the institution's relationship to student publications and other media.

In 2002, ASUN allocated funding to hire a full-time publications coordinator for their publications. The student newspaper, The Sagebrush (nvsagebrush.com), has won numerous journalism awards. Among these was the top award in the four-year college weekly publications at the Associated Collegiate Press National College Publications Workshop. In addition, the newspaper captured a dozen awards in the University of Missouri's 18th annual College News Design Contest in July 2006. The Sagebrush pickup rate is 80 percent. The paper, which launched its online version in 2005, is currently fielding more than 1,000 hits per day. The Brushfire (asun.unr.edu/brushfire/) is the student literary magazine. (Samples of student publications are presented in SM 3.4.)

In response to dwindling enthusiasm for the student yearbook concept, the Artemesia (www.theartemisia.com/), the University’s yearbook, re-invented itself into four tri-monthly publications with articles and photography appealing to the student audience.

The University radio station known as Wolf Pack Radio (www.wolfpackradio.org/), has a listening audience of more than 20,000 students, faculty and staff.

Standard 3.E — Intercollegiate Athletics

3.E.1 Institutional control is exercised through the governing board’s periodic review of its comprehensive statement of philosophy, goals, and objectives for intercollegiate athletics. The program is evaluated regularly and systematically to ensure that it is an integral part of the education of athletes and is in keeping with the educational mission of the institution.

The University of Nevada, Reno, a member of the Western Athletics Conference (WAC), participates in intercollegiate athletics at the NCAA Division I-A level. The University sponsors 19 intercollegiate athletics teams: 12 women’s teams and seven men’s teams (CD 3.24: List of Sport Teams, 2006-07).
The governance of intercollegiate athletics at the University of Nevada, Reno is the primary responsibility of the director of athletics who reports directly to the President of the University and is a member of the President’s Cabinet. The President, in turn, reports to the Board of Regents, which is the governing body of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

The Athletics Advisory Committee (AAC) (CD 3.25: Athletics Advisory Committee), appointed by the University President, serves in an advisory capacity to the athletics director. The AAC is comprised of faculty, staff, students and administrators for student services, academic affairs and athletics. The AAC focuses on student-athlete well being. Areas of involvement include NCAA, WAC Conference, university compliance, academic policies such as graduation rates and admission standards, and outreach and educational programs. The Special Assistant to the President for Athletics Academics and Compliance chairs the AAC.

The Athletics Association of the University of Nevada (AAUN) (CD 3.26: AAUN) is composed of key decision-makers and business leaders from the private sector in northern Nevada, the athletics director, the associate athletics director for external operations, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations. The AAUN provides scholarship support for all 19 intercollegiate sports and for general program operations and capital projects. A member of the community chairs the AAUN.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) (CD 3.27: SAAC), which is composed of 2-3 student-athletes from each sports team, communicates directly with the athletics director and the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), particularly on issues relative to student well-being. One male and one female student-athlete co-chair the SAAC.

The Wolf Pack Appeals Committee (CD 3.28: Wolf Pack Appeals Committee) exists to determine the validity of student-athlete appeals regarding decisions about scholarships and/or transfer when a student-athlete leaves a team. The Special Assistant to the President for Athletics Academics and Compliance chairs the appeals committee. The Director of Financial Aid and the Director of Student Judicial Affairs also serve on the committee.

The governance of the intercollegiate athletics program is carefully monitored, not only by the committees mentioned above, but also by periodic NCAA required self-studies and audits conducted by the University and by the system.

An extensive audit of the athletics department was conducted in 2003. The audit made numerous recommendations — most intended to improve the financial accountability of the intercollegiate athletics program — that have been accepted by the athletics department and the University. All recommendations have either been fully implemented or are in the process of being implemented.

3.E.2 The goals and objectives of the intercollegiate athletic program, as well as institutional expectations of staff members, are provided in writing to candidates for athletic staff positions. Policies and rules concerning intercollegiate athletics are reviewed, at least annually, by athletics administrators and all head and assistant coaches. The duties and authority of the director of athletics, faculty committee on athletics, and others involved in athletics policy-making and program management are stated explicitly in writing.

The mission and goals of the athletics department are outlined in the University General Catalog. The mission, core values, purpose statement (vision), and goals and objectives of the athletics department are part of its strategic plan which is posted on the athletics department website (CD 3.29: Athletics Strategic Plan). The Athletics Department Policy Manual, which is reviewed annually by the Director of Athletics, is posted on the department website (CD 3.30: Athletics Department Manual). The Student-Athlete Handbook (CD 3.31: Athletics Student Handbook), reviewed annually by the
Special Assistant to the President for Athletics Academics and Compliance, is distributed to all student-athletes, coaches, and athletics department staff. The athletics director meets monthly with all staff including coaches, assistant coaches, trainers, compliance personnel, athletic academic advisors, athletic administrators and staff, and the faculty athletics representative. The athletics director meets with all head coaches once each semester. The athletics director meets weekly with the athletics management team.

The athletic administration, athletics academics and compliance personnel, and all coaches frequently review the NCAA and WAC Conference rules and policies. The Director of Compliance is on the agenda for each monthly all-staff meeting to review NCAA legislation and rules. She communicates regularly with athletics administrators, coaches, FAR, and the athletics advising personnel to keep them apprised of proposed/new rule changes.

Coaches must pass the NCAA coaches certification exam annually to recruit for the University. The test, administered by the FAR, is preceded by several rules education sessions provided by the Compliance Director and the Coordinator of Compliance at each all-staff meeting.

3.E.3 Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards and degree requirements, and financial aid awards for student athletics are vested in the same institutional agencies that handle these matters for all students.

Student-athletes are held to the same admission, academic standards, and degree requirements as are all other students at the University of Nevada, Reno. No admission slots are held expressly for student-athletes. The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and all of its personnel are accountable for following all university policies and standards relative to academic progress and student well being. The Office of Admissions and Records makes all admissions decisions and the Financial Aid Office oversees all awarding and distribution of financial aid.

The Wolf Pack Compliance Program and Wolf Pack Academics (CD 3.32: Wolf Pack Compliance and Academic Program) monitor progress toward a degree for all student-athletes consistent with NCAA legislation. Their monitored graduation rates are reported in the Graduation Success Rate Report. Academic Progress Reports are completed for each sport, as required by the NCAA. Wolf Pack academic advisors solicit progress reports at various times throughout the semester from each faculty member of each course in which a student-athlete is enrolled. That unit is also responsible for informing a faculty member when a student-athlete in his or her course will miss a class because of the travel requirements of the team.

The Athletics Department finalized construction of a 6,000 square-foot strength and conditioning, sports medicine, and equipment facility in 2006. By spring 2008 the Athletics Academic Center (CD 3.33: Athletics Academic Center) should be complete. This new facility will replace the current one, which no longer meets the needs of our student-athletes. The Athletics Academic Center will provide a state-of-the-art computer center, study hall, and advisement center. The completion of this facility, privately funded, will reinforce the philosophy of the athletics department that academic success is as important to student-athletes as athletic success.

3.E.4 Athletic budget development is systematic; funds raised for and expended on athletics by alumni, foundations, and other groups shall be subject to the approval of the administration and be accounted for through the institution’s generally accepted practices of documentation and audit.

All financial and budget policies and procedures for the athletics department are consistent with and abide by university standards and regulations (CD 3.34: Funding and Budget Policies). An associate director of athletics with primary responsibility for the athletics budget works closely with not only the athletics director and other athletics administrators but also with university budget director, Vice President for Administration and Finance, and the Treasurer of
the University of Nevada Foundation. The director of athletics prepares the annual budget of the athletics department with oversight by the President and, ultimately, the Board of Regents.

The athletics department receives a line item budget allocation from the state legislature. Funding is also received from ticket sales, modest student fees, private donations, NCAA distributions, broadcast rights, and corporate partnerships. Grants-in-aid are provided by the state in support of student-athletes.

As the operating expenses for a successful athletic program continue to increase, the athletic department is challenged to raise financial support far beyond that provided by the state. The need for private donations and corporate partnerships will continue to grow. This increase requires continued and expanded involvement of athletics personnel with the activities and financial oversight of the University of Nevada Foundation and university finance and budget personnel to assure financial responsibility at all levels throughout the department and the University.

3.E.5 The institution demonstrates its commitment to fair and equitable treatment of both male and female athletes in providing opportunities for participation, financial aid, student-support services, equipment, and access to facilities.

The University of Nevada, Reno offers a broad-based athletic program for men and women. The athletic department and the University are fully committed to gender equity and compliance with Title IX. During the past decade the state legislature has provided significant new resources to address gender equity in athletics. Accordingly, coaches’ salaries, recruitment budgets, travel schedules, facilities, and equipment are comparable throughout the athletics department for male and female athletes. Three sports (soccer, golf, and softball) have been added in the last decade, making the number of female sports opportunities comparable to those of male athletes on campus. All sports for men and women are fully funded according to NCAA regulations.

Equal opportunities for summer school financial support are provided to male and female athletes. Fifth year aid is available for male and female athletes to assist them in meeting degree requirements and promoting graduation in a timely manner.

The University of Nevada, Reno is one of few institutions in the country meeting all three prongs of the test used to measure compliance with Title IX. In 2006 the University of Nevada Intercollegiate Athletics Department was listed as the best in the nation in providing opportunities for women in sports, according to the Kennedy Index (CD 3.35: Title IX Compliance). The index ranks schools based on their compliance with the spirit and intent of Title IX. The University of Nevada, Reno ranked first in the nation among 103 universities from the ten conferences included in the study. The University of Nevada, Reno was acknowledged for exceeding the study’s goals in participation, operating and recruiting budgets, and coaching salaries. The University of Nevada, Reno was one of just two schools in the country to be given a positive score for its commitment to gender equity.

In 2006, UNR was one of only 10 universities in the nation to be named Diversity in Athletics Award winner, in recognition of NCAA Division I-A athletic departments that excel in the area of diversity. The University of Nevada, Reno athletics department was honored for its overall excellence in diversity as well as the gender diversity of its employees.

3.E.6 The institution publishes its policy concerning the scheduling of intercollegiate practices and competition for both men and women that avoids conflicts with the instructional calendar, particularly during end-of-term examinations.

The Athletic Department Policy Manual outlines the procedures coaches are required to follow before finalizing their competition schedules. Coaches must outline their scheduling philosophy in their annual report, which is reviewed by the athletics director and discussed with each coach.
The athletics academic advisors work closely with the coaches and student-athletes to keep faculty informed of travel commitments and to accommodate both study sessions and examinations that need to be given while a team is traveling. When possible, student-athletes provide each of their instructors with the team travel schedule, identifying when it will impact a particular class. Student-athletes are encouraged to make arrangements in advance directly with the faculty member to determine how content from missed classes or missed tests can be made up. The Wolf Pack Academics unit has secured laptops that student-athletes can check out for use when they are traveling with a team. When necessary, the athletics department provides funding for an athletic academic advisor or other appropriate non-coaching personnel to travel with a team in order to set-up study tables at a lengthy event such as a conference tournament or to proctor an examination when other accommodations on-campus cannot be made.

**Policy 3.1 Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status**

All candidate and accredited institutions, or individuals acting on their behalf, must exhibit integrity and responsibility in advertising, student recruitment, and representation of accredited status. Responsible self-regulation requires rigorous attention to principles of good practice.

**Student Recruitment for Admissions**

**Undergraduate Student Recruitment**

The University follows the ethical principles of student recruitment as defined by the National Association of College Admissions Counselors (NACAC) and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). All student recruitment publications accurately reflect university programs and accreditation status. The recruitment of new students to the University is a responsibility shared by all nine of the schools and colleges on campus. The Office for Prospective Students within the Enrollment Services unit of Student Services provides leadership by coordinating all major student recruitment events. Examples of these events include school presentations and visits, receptions for prospective students and campus visitation programs.

The Academic and Student Services Council (ASSC) represents a unique partnership between Student Services and Academic Affairs. Representatives from each school and college participate in the planning, implementation and evaluation of recruitment events. The enrollment planning group of the ASSC regularly meets to review the effectiveness of student recruitment events through the analysis of focus group and student and faculty survey results. Enrollment goals are established with wide consultation
from the President's Council, the Academic Leadership Council, the ASSC and the Enrollment Management Group.

The Student Ambassadors are the foundation and the face of the University’s recruitment efforts. Student Ambassadors are a group of 70 undergraduate volunteers who manage the Campus Tour Program, providing five regularly scheduled tours daily with weekend and holiday tours by appointment. Tours include the highlights of living and learning on campus including class attendance and visiting student rooms in the residence halls. Assessment data indicates a strong correlation between campus tours and a student’s decision to apply for admission.

To determine the most effective means of recruiting students, Stamats Consultants in 2001 recommended that the University improve its recruitment funnel through the implementation of a prospective student database. Prospective students are now tracked through Recruitment Plus, a comprehensive prospect tracking database, developed by the College Board and implemented in 2005.

All student contacts, as early as the fifth grade, are entered into the database. Contact information charted includes ACT/SAT search results, campus visits, requests for information and attendance at recruitment events. Communication flow profiles are established for each category and class of student in terms of future follow-up and contact. The systematic collection of data will enable the University’s Office for Prospective Students to better understand the relationship of recruitment activities as a predictor for future enrollment.

A program targeting top eighth graders, Silver Scholars, for example, recognizes these students at a special school event, presenting them with certificates of achievement and reminding them of university entrance requirements to keep them on track to higher education.

*The Center for Student Cultural Diversity*

Passionately committed to building a diverse student body, the Division of Student Services’ Center for Student Cultural Diversity plays a critical role in the recruitment of students of color to the University. Through programs such as STAC (Start Thinking About College) and the Northern Nevada Indian Education Collaborative (NNAIHEC), the Center complements the general recruitment efforts of the Office for Prospective Students.

Start Thinking About College (STAC) is a cooperative program between the Washoe County School District and the University. The program was created in response to district, community and university concerns surrounding the admissions requirements of 2006 and 2008 and their effects upon access to higher education for students of color. The objectives of the program are: (1) to expose students of color to the University entrance requirements early in their secondary school career; (2) to expose these students to successful university students from similar backgrounds and with similar experiences; and (3) to continue to build upon a partnership with the Washoe County School District, the faith-based community, and local organizations in support of furthering the education of these targeted groups.

The project brings more than 700 seventh grade students of color to campus annually for a day of education, information, and exposure to the University campus and students. Follow-up sessions for parents include guidance in how best to support their students in preparation for university admission. Additional workshops guide parents through policies and procedures for application for admission, financial aid, residential life and academic support opportunities.

The NNAIHEC is a cooperative effort on the part of the Nevada Indian Commission and the University of Nevada, Reno; Truckee Meadows Community College; Western Nevada Community College and Great Basin College. Similar to STAC, the collaborative was formed in response to university and community concerns about the low higher education participation rates of Native Americans in Nevada as well as the lowest retention and graduation rates of any group. The collaborative provides outreach to northern Nevada Indian youth, resulting in increased enrollment, retention and degree completion.
Welcoming Hispanic students and their parents to campus is another example of the collaborative efforts of the Center and the Office for Prospective Students. With bi-lingual staff members in recruitment, admissions, financial aid and the Center, materials and programs for students and parents are available in Spanish. Most successful has been a three-part series of parent orientation workshops conducted in Spanish each spring.

Southern Nevada Recruitment
In the early 1990s it became apparent that the center of the state’s population had shifted, and would remain, in the south. With this shift, the Las Vegas area represented the greatest proportion of diversity within the state. In 2005, students of color represented 58 percent of the school-aged population in Clark County, one of the largest school districts in the nation. It became evident that efforts to recruit a diverse student body required a strong and consistent university presence located in Las Vegas. In 1990, the Southern Nevada Office for Student Recruitment opened with one recruiter and a half-time support staff. In 2006, there were five staff members: a Director, three full-time recruiters and a full-time support staff. In addition, the office shares a new building with Nevada’s Cooperative Extension Units, achieving the goal of a strong and consistent presence in the Las Vegas area. This effort resulted in tremendous enrollment growth in the freshmen class from southern Nevada, seven percent of the incoming freshmen class in 1996 to 22 percent in 2006.

International Student Recruitment
The Office of International Students and Scholars coordinates the recruitment of international students through recruitment activities around the world. It also develops relationships with international sponsoring agencies, educational agencies overseas and foreign embassies. The enrollment of international students has decreased since 9/11. The University complies with all Student Exchange and Visitor Information System (SEVIS) requirements.

Representation of Accredited Status
The University’s accreditation status is published in the University General Catalog.

Standard Three Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

**Strengths: Students**

- Strategic and “Futures” focused thinking on the part of student services faculty and staff that anticipates student needs resulting in the proactive development and implementation of programs and services.

- Assessment-based decision-making, such as the student needs assessments that resulted in the building of the Joe Crowley Student Union, the doubling of the number of mental health counselors, and the allocation of one-half million dollars to merit-based scholarships. Ability to incorporate assessment findings in a timely fashion to meet the needs of students as evidenced in the establishment of ACCESS, Living and Learning Communities, and the Millennium Academic Persistence Program.

- Students involved in all levels of campus and system decision-making; strong commitment to shared governance with several committees and/or advisory boards having representatives from all constituencies.

- Increasingly diverse student body.

- Policies and procedures based on student learning and developmental models.

- A faculty consultation team that meets regularly to support at-risk students through the coordination of services to meet student needs. Intrusive support programs such as ACCESS designed to positively impact a documented at-risk population.

- An enrollment management team that monitors enrollment goals and progress toward goal attainment as well as identifying intervention strategies to preclude enrollment barriers. Implementation of Recruitment Plus, enabling the merger of recruitment and admissions
processing and communications as well as the tracking of students from prospect to applicant to student.

- The establishment of scholarship policies guaranteeing a four-year renewal pending satisfactory progress each year. Objective and clearly communicated award criteria in the awarding of funds from the general scholarship fund.

- Federal Family Educational Loan Program (FFELP) cohort default rate of 3.1 percent, lower than the average public four-year rate nationwide and the lowest among the Nevada institutions of higher education.

- A comprehensive undergraduate advising program that includes mandatory advising for all incoming and continuing first-semester freshmen, identified undergraduate advisors in each college/program, Degree Audit Reports with comprehensive and varied advising notes for various stages of program completion, and an advising center that assists undecided students and students who are transitioning from one college/major to another.

- The Kennedy Index has recognized University of Nevada Athletics as the best in the nation two years in a row in providing opportunities for women.

**Challenges: Students**

- Meeting the demands of student and faculty for enhanced web transactional services, given to the limited technical capacity of the current student information system.

- Reviewing systematically program and departmental mission statements.

- Facilitating the transition to an extended-hour campus starting with the opening of the Joe Crowley Student Union and the Knowledge Center.

- Finding ways to provide a secure environment for student learning by balancing student safety and community access.

- Demand for programs is outpacing the growth of resources. The University is challenged to find innovative ways to meet a growing student population’s demand for campus programs and services.

- Keeping abreast of changing technology and finding effective and diverse methods of disseminating important policy information to faculty and students in an era of print and e-mail overload.

- Increasing the awareness of all faculty and staff of their critical importance in serving student recruitment.

- Developing a synergy between student services and academic faculty focused on improving the student experience, student retention and graduation rates.

- Reducing the time to degree for all students, with an emphasis on transfer students.

- Improving the college going rate in a state with a high drop-out rate.

- Increasing the availability of non-restricted funding to increase merit and non-need based awards to qualified students.

- Insuring that increased campus diversity is representative of all groups.

- Locating all campus-wide academic student support services, such as the Math Center, Writing Center, and Academic Skills Center, into a central campus location for ease of use by students.

- Increasing collaboration within and between Student Services units, academic units, P-12 and the community.
Recommendations: Students

- Continue to use assessment as the basis for informed and data-driven decision-making across all services and programs.

- Improve the use of new technologies, such as a new student information system, WebCT, and podcasting, to develop innovative methods of communicating campus policy, services, and news to students, faculty and staff.

- Strengthen student recruitment in an effort to improve the state’s college going rate through the enhancement of services and scholarship resources.

- Develop and provide resources for unique, diversity sensitive recruitment and retention programs for underrepresented groups.

- Focus on integrative/collaborative programs that will result in improved retention and graduation rates.

- Identify campus services that would be necessary to support an ‘after hours’ campus community and provide necessary support for their extended functionality.

- Review assessment practices to insure the incorporation of unified student benefit outcomes and/or student learning outcomes.

- Review periodically student services programs to insure that programs are located within the correct administrative structure to maximize student success.

- Develop collaborative/integrative programming within the division, the academic community, P-12 and constituent groups in the greater Northern Nevada community.

- Investigate alternative funding beyond state resources to expand programs through fund-raising and grant writing activities.

- Continue the assessment of the division’s physical resources to insure adequacy of space allocation through renovation or new construction.

- Continue to evaluate the use of scholarships and financial aid as tools for retention.

- Continue to evaluate safety and security on campus, including special attention to distressed and distressing students.

- Continue to build a welcoming and exciting campus community that encourages student participation, voice and learning both within and outside the classroom.
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Standard Four — Faculty

Standard 4.A — Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development

Overview

The University defines academic faculty as “members of the professional staff who specifically create and disseminate scholarly information through teaching, research, or providing library sources closely and directly supportive of teaching and research” (CD 4.1: University Administrative Manual, 2,506). On April 1, 2007, the University’s full-time and part-time academic faculty and staff numbered 998: 238 in the School of Medicine (SOM) (+49% from the 1997 self-study), and 760 in the other colleges and schools (+17%). Women are 36.7 percent of the faculty, and 15.7 percent belong to ethnic minorities. Nearly 40 percent of the 628 tenure-track faculty (ranks II, III, and IV) have been hired since 1998, as well as the vast majority of the 370 non-tenure-track faculty (rank 0). Two-thirds of rank 0 faculty are continuing faculty; the rest have either contingent contracts (renewable contingent upon funding) or non-renewable, one-year contracts.

These data, presented in greater detail in Table 4.1a and Table 4.1b (RD 4.1: Gender and ethnicity, by rank and full-time/part-time status; RD 4.2a/b: Institutional Faculty Profile), include “regular” faculty classified by rank: 0 (I-IV) (lecturers and instructors, as well as School of Medicine clinical staff); I (instructors); II (assistant professors); III (associate professors); and IV (full professors). They do not include several other categories of faculty and instructional staff:

- Administrative faculty: “members of the professional staff who are employed in executive, supervisory or professional and administrative support positions” (CD 4.1: University Administrative Manual, 2,506). Most administrative faculty work in such divisions as Student Services and Administration and Finance, but others are housed in academic departments as professional and technical staff. They have a system of ranges different from the ranks of the academic faculty. They are not eligible for tenure, with the exception of several long-serving members whose employment predates rule changes several decades ago.

- Library faculty, who hold academic faculty rank and are eligible for tenure.

- Letters of Appointment (LOAs): part-time, temporary appointments, including instructional staff hired to teach specific courses, either because of professional expertise (e.g., community professionals teaching for the colleges of Business Administration and Education) or because of student demand (e.g., for core English and Mathematics courses).

- Teaching Assistants (TAs, totaling 318 on April 1, 2007): graduate students whose assistantships carry teaching responsibilities.

Administrative and library faculty are discussed in the standards related to their arenas of responsibility. Teaching Assistants are discussed within the standard on graduate education. Sections 4.A.8-10, below, address issues related to contingent faculty and LOAs. Because faculty policies and procedures in the School of Medicine differ considerably from those in the rest of the University, the specifics reported here refer primarily to the regular faculty outside SOM.
### Table 4.1a: Institutional Faculty Profile — Excluding School of Medicine (April 1, 2007)

#### Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number of Terminal Degrees</th>
<th>Salary, 9 Mo. ($1000s)</th>
<th>Years at UNR&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Credit Hour Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (IV)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professor (III)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professor (II)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (BD)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (B)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 0 (IV)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 0 (III)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 0 (II)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 0 (I)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Total</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Student TA</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Student RA</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.1b: Institutional Faculty Profile — School of Medicine (April 1, 2007)

#### Full-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number of Terminal Degrees</th>
<th>Salary, 12 Mos. ($1000s)</th>
<th>Years at UNR&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (IV)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (III)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (II)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (D)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (B)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Asst. Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data provided by Office of Human Resources and Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis.

<sup>3</sup>UNR does not maintain data on prior faculty years of service at other institutions.

4.2
4.3

4.A.1 The institution employs professionally qualified faculty with primary commitment to the institution and representative of each field or program in which it offers major work.

For tenure-track positions, hiring criteria generally include a terminal degree in one’s field: most often a doctoral degree, in some fields a terminal master’s degree (e.g., Master of Fine Arts) (RD 4.2c: Number and Source of Terminal Degrees of Faculty). The search process (see 4.A.6, below) emphasizes discipline-based faculty judgment of candidates’ qualifications. The purposes of tenure are “to provide a faculty committed to excellence and to provide a substantial degree of security to those persons who have exhibited excellent abilities, sufficient to convince the University of Nevada, Reno community that their expected services and performances in the future justify the privileges afforded by tenure” (NSHE CODE, sec. 3.1.2). Criteria for promotion and tenure, codified in the University’s governing documents, include research, scholarship, and creative activity, evaluated by external reviewers in one’s field as well as by one’s departmental colleagues; teaching; and service to one’s profession and to the University.

The regular faculty’s primary commitment to the University is evident in the proportion of credit hours taught by regular faculty (see Table 4.2). This proportion is virtually identical to that of ten years ago (71.5 percent in fall 1995, 72.3 percent in spring 1996). Regular faculty at each rank teach a percentage of credit hours corresponding roughly to their representation within the regular faculty as a whole (see Table 4.3).

However, a significant shift has occurred since 1995. That fall, 28.6 percent of total credit hours were taught by rank 0 faculty, LOAs, graduate TAs, and “temporary faculty” (a category no longer employed). In fall 2005, 34.1 percent of all credit hours were taught by rank 0 faculty, LOAs (N=296), graduate TAs, and postdoctoral scholars (a category not used in 1995). The increase owes partly to the rising use of LOAs, who taught 10.5 percent of credit hours in fall 1995 and 14.1 percent 10 years later. It is also partly attributable to the increased role of contingent lecturers and instructors within rank 0. (Note: when counting credit hours, the University’s data do not distinguish between rank 0 continuing lecturers and rank 0 contingent faculty.)

Over the past five years, the University has taken steps to document the faculty’s commitment to institutional responsibilities. Each year every faculty member signs a conflict of interest policy (RE 4.11a: Conflict of Interest Policy and Form), devised by the Board of Regents. An effort-reporting policy (RE 4.11b: Effort Reporting Policy), created in 2006 in compliance with federal regulation of grants and contracts, specifies the proportion of a faculty member’s time allocated to each grant. In addition, the University has long maintained limits on external consulting (CD 4.1: University Administrative Manual, 2,690).

4.A.2 Faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance.

Faculty participate in academic and curricular planning at every level: departments, colleges, and university. In the recent strategic-planning process (2001-2006), departments were instructed to explain their academic visions and strategies, and deans incorporated some elements from departmental plans into college-level documents. (See Standard One for discussion of this process.) Department-level academic planning also includes NSHE-mandated program review every 7-10 years, a process that includes internal self-evaluation and peer review by external colleagues in the discipline. Most colleges have faculty councils or committees to oversee and recommend academic policies and to review new courses and curricular changes proposed by departments. Faculty were instrumental in designing the academic requirements and internal procedures of the new College of Liberal Arts and College of Science (2003-2005).
At the university level, several faculty boards and committees play a role in academic issues (RE 4.3: Faculty Committees and Membership). The Faculty Senate’s Academic Standards Committee, which receives its charges annually from the Senate’s Executive Board, monitors and investigates areas of concern and makes recommendations to the President. The Graduate Council, an elected body of faculty representatives from each college, provides oversight for the Graduate School’s operations, reviews graduate-level course proposals from departments, and considers policy issues (for example, standards for graduate-level requirements in 400/600 courses). Several faculty boards participate in governing research policy and maintaining adherence to national and institutional research standards (see 4.B.3 below).

The University Courses and Curriculum Committee (UCCC), formerly a faculty committee, has been transformed since the last accreditation review into a board constituted by associate deans of the colleges, with a faculty chair and a liaison from the Faculty Senate. To the extent that this committee provides final review for course and curricular proposals already vetted at departmental and college levels, this membership may be appropriate. However, this committee also deliberates and makes decisions about academic policy, potentially (given its composition) without faculty involvement. One recourse would envision the Senate’s Academic Standards Committee as a parallel body, authorized to deliberate and consult with UCCC on all policy matters and to make joint and/or parallel recommendations to the Provost and President.

**Table 4.2**
Distribution of Teaching Loads among Faculty, Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 Semesters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Fall 2005 Semester</th>
<th>Spring 2006 Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Credits</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>7329.2</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Appointment</td>
<td>1427.3</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate TA</td>
<td>506.1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholar</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Faculty</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Faculty/Other</td>
<td>629.7</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3**
Distribution of Teaching Loads among Regular Faculty by Rank, Fall 2005 Semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage of Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage of Regular Faculty Course Credits¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (I-IV)</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>19.8%²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data provided by Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis.

¹Does not include course credits taught by LOAs, TAs, Postdoctoral Scholars, DRI faculty, administrative faculty, or others.

²Rank 0 includes research faculty and clinical staff, accounting for the low percentage of course credit hours taught relative to percentage of the faculty.

Academic advisement occurs primarily in two settings: within departments, for majors, minors, and graduate students; and in the Advising Center, run by Student Services, for students who have not declared a major. Departments handle advising in various ways. In some departments, a designated faculty member serves as undergraduate advisor. In larger departments, more than one designated faculty member may concentrate primarily on advising. In others, most or all faculty advise a fraction of the undergraduate majors. In others, a staff member provides initial advisement. Graduate students generally are advised by the chair of their examining-advisory committee (responsible for intellectual supervision) and the department’s director of graduate studies (responsible for adherence to Graduate School procedures). Improving undergraduate advisement was among the central recommendations of the 1997 accreditation self-study and was the subject of a five-year external review. To address the issues identified then, the Uni-
versity created the Advising Center and an Academic Advising Advisory Board, instituted mandatory training sessions for departmental advisors, and created an advisors’ network to keep departmental advisors up-to-date about processes and guidelines. (See also Standards 2.C.5 and 3.D.10.)

The Faculty Senate (see Standard 6.D) is the faculty’s primary voice in university governance as specified in the NSHE CODE, Title 1, Section 4:6-8. Its standing committees (Academic Standards, Bylaws & CODE, Campus Affairs, Salary & Benefits, Technology, Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures) receive charges from the Senate Executive Board and make policy recommendations to the entire Senate, which if adopted are recommended for presidential action. In the past several years, committees have recommended new policies and procedures for addressing student academic dishonesty; evaluated the distribution of technology-replacement funds; and devised a new process for revision of departmental and college bylaws. The Faculty Senate also elects or recommends faculty to serve on other university committees, notably the University Promotion and Tenure (UPT) Committee, the Professional Development Leave Committee, and search committees for senior administrators. In the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), academic faculty expressed concerns about their role in university governance. More than half (56.1 percent) disagreed with the statement, “Academic faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision-making,” possibly reflecting widespread unease with the strategic-planning process of the previous five years (see Standards One and Nine). Faculty were more sanguine about their role in departmental governance: for example, 83 percent agreed with the statement, “I have adequate input in departmental curriculum decisions.”

**4.A.3 Faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty, allowing sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal.**

Most faculty contracts run nine months (“B” contract), from mid-August to mid-May. These allow time for research and creative activity in the summers, as well as in the interstices of the academic year. The University’s sabbatical policy (see 4.B.5, below) permits faculty to go on leave every seven years, through a competitive application process.

In August 2004, the Board of Regents adopted “Faculty Workload Guidelines” (CD 4.3: NSHE Faculty Workload Policy) that stipulated “expected teaching workloads” at NSHE institutions, including 18 credits per year for university faculty (except those “heavily involved in doctoral-level education,” for whom the load is 12 credits per year). However, this document also affirmed the institutions’ “substantial autonomy to select and determine the relative importance of faculty activities” in teaching, research or creative activity, and service, and stated that “Faculty workload cannot and should not be measured solely by the time spent by the faculty member in the classroom.” The guidelines stipulated that each campus president devise “justifiable, equitable workload standards through a process of shared governance with the faculty” — adjusting the Board’s guidelines to take account of different sorts of instruction associated with the variety of disciplines, e.g. stu-
A faculty-driven process led to the creation of UNR’s 2005 “Instructional Faculty Workload Policy” (CD 4.4: UNR Instructional Faculty Workload Policy, 2005). Designed “to be flexible enough to enable faculty to do the varied tasks that are required throughout the university and to credit them appropriately for that work,” the policy describes a variety of “illustrative, not exhaustive” circumstances that might warrant teaching reassignments: for example, service on master’s and doctoral committees; administrative assignments within departments; advising and independent studies; courses with extra contact hours, new preparations, or very large numbers of students with limited TA support. Faculty write annual “role statements” in consultation with their chairs, who are responsible for maintaining equity within departments; deans are responsible for equity across departments within their colleges; the provost has the same responsibility across the University.

In general practice, faculty in departments with doctoral programs maintain a 2-2 course load, plus theses, dissertations, and other independent study supervision. Faculty in departments with master’s programs generally maintain a 3-2 course load; those in departments without graduate programs ordinarily have a 3-3 course load. Across the University, the median credit-hour load in fall 2005, including independent-study and theses/dissertations, was 10.7 hours for assistant professors, 11.6 hours for associate professors, 12 hours for full professors, and 11.6 hours for instructors/lecturers (rank 0).

Faculty who assume departmental administrative roles (e.g., chair, director of graduate studies, director of undergraduate studies) generally teach reduced course loads; the reduction varies by department and college. In addition, department chairs and program directors receive stipends, the amount determined by a standing policy committee that assesses the extent of management responsibility and authority and the complexity of the assignment (CD 4.1: University Administrative Manual, 2,550).

Faculty have concerns about several aspects of workload, as well as its reporting and monitoring.

Workload: In most departments and colleges, faculty workload has expanded over the past five years to encompass strategic planning and learning assessment; “unfunded mandates” created by university administration and accreditation, respectively. Departments were instructed to devise and annually update strategic plans and to create and implement student assessment plans, without being given resources (time, money) to facilitate these processes. These ongoing endeavors have added to faculty’s service responsibilities, already considered by many to be little noticed or rewarded. More broadly in the arena of service, 55.1 percent of faculty who responded to the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2) disagreed with the statement, “Academic faculty are adequately rewarded for service to the University.”

The workload of department chairs and program administrators, in particular, has mushroomed. Reporting and data-gathering requirements — some new, some formerly accomplished at higher levels of administration — fall especially on chairs and directors (e.g., directors of undergraduate studies and of graduate studies), and on departmental support staff, which has not increased commensurate with these added responsibilities. As processes of faculty evaluation have become more professionalized (some would say bureaucratized), chairs must attend workshops and other training sessions. Most department chairs are research and teaching faculty who do not seek careers in administration. Their role as chairs must not become so burdensome, nor their term so long, that these faculty members’ academic careers are stunted.

In 2005-06, a task force of chairs examined institutional policies for designating the administrative positions that require faculty reassignment and for determining the stipends for such positions, and made several recommendations.
about these issues. An administratively driven task force is now studying a broader range of concerns related to the department chair’s role: orientation and training, contracts, compensation, and the balance between administrative responsibility and ongoing scholarly productivity. That task force’s conclusions and recommendations, expected in 2007-08, should help guide future policy and practice.

Of greater concern is the University’s collection and reporting of data about individual faculty teaching loads. Each semester, Planning, Budget and Analysis reports to deans the student FTE generated by every faculty member. Department chairs are expected to justify individual FTE below NSHE-mandated norms, which are based upon generalized notions of whether specific departments provide “high,” “medium,” or “low” cost instruction. At the same time, the University claims that departments should devise collective curricular and scholarly priorities. Departmental planning, the linchpin of strategic planning as envisioned by both Presidents Lilley and Glick, gives different faculty members diverse roles in teaching (from large service courses to graduate supervision) and governance (assessment, program direction, etc.). Requiring chairs to justify that variety every semester runs counter to this principle and implies — contrary to the University’s own policy — that one workload model should fit all faculty.

Table 4.4
Comparison of Nevada Faculty Mean Salaries with Average Salaries at Public and Land-Grant Institutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Public, Category 1</th>
<th>Land-Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor (Rank IV)</td>
<td>$116,401</td>
<td>$106,495</td>
<td>$105,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof. (Rank III)</td>
<td>$96,986</td>
<td>$74,075</td>
<td>$74,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof. (Rank II)</td>
<td>$65,835</td>
<td>$63,131</td>
<td>$63,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (Rank I)</td>
<td>$51,233</td>
<td>$43,974</td>
<td>$44,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (Rank 0)</td>
<td>$51,333</td>
<td>$48,529</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UNR and land-grant data exclude medical-related disciplines; UNR data exclude research-only faculty.
1Doctoral-level institutions, including UNR. Source: Academe, March/April 2007.
246 institutions, including UNR. Source: Oklahoma State University 2006-07 Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline. “Instructor” may include faculty designated both Rank I and Rank 0 at UNR.

4.4 Faculty salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain a competent faculty and are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available, and equitably administered.

The University annually creates an academic salary schedule, which identifies the minimum, median, and maximum salary level for each academic rank. This schedule (CD 4.5: UNR Academic Salary Schedules, 2006-07) is built upon “the rank and discipline mix at the University of Nevada, Reno with salary data from the AAUP & Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey.” Supplementary salary schedules are developed for faculty in Business Administration, Engineering, and Medicine. In practice, salaries of entering faculty members are strongly influenced by discipline-specific market forces, and the University seeks to offer competitive salaries to recruit the strongest candidates.
Salaries at all ranks are competitive with other land-grant institutions (in the OSU survey) and are above the mean for Category I (doctoral) institutions (AAUP, 2006-2007) (see Table 4.4, which corresponds to RD 4.3: Salary Data for Faculty). When benefits are included, the results are more mixed: AAUP data suggest that the University’s compensation packages rank mostly in the 30th-40th percentile among Category I institutions, and below the national averages for public doctoral institutions, with packages for assistant professors much lower. (It is unclear whether the AAUP’s data reflect the University’s strong retirement package, in which a 10.5 percent employee contribution is fully matched by the state.)

For many years, the University’s faculty have benefited from an exceptional system of merit awards. In the annual evaluation process (see 4.A.5), faculty are considered for merit raises. The University as a whole receives a state-funded merit pool equal to 2.5 percent of its salary base, which is distributed in dollar-step increments to faculty rated “excellent” or “commendable.” In addition, most years the state provides cost-of-living adjustments (2 percent per year, on average, over the past decade) as a percentage of salary to all employees, including University faculty. The result is a system in which strong faculty can receive frequent, significant raises — a boon to retaining the best faculty, because other institutions will be hard pressed to match the University’s salaries.

The merit system was strengthened significantly in 2003, following a university-wide conversation about allocation of the merit pool. Prior to that date, most of the merit pool was allocated to colleges on the basis of each college’s salary base — while merit awards were defined as university-wide, set dollar amounts. Consequently, colleges with highly paid faculty received large sums to distribute, driving individual awards much higher on average than in colleges with lower average salaries, regardless of the level of meritorious work across the colleges. After significant faculty input, this system was overhauled in favor of a university-wide step system. Regardless of college, chairs and deans now recommend faculty for a number of merit “steps” corresponding to their performance (if commendable, excellent, or extraordinary). The Provost’s office examines the recommendations for equity, totals all the recommended steps, and divides the merit pool by the number of steps to create the dollar value of a step. This system has produced a degree of equity — and consistency between evaluation and reward — that the previous practice had lacked.

Human Resources also conducts biennial salary-equity studies, which employ discipline-based comparative data to identify faculty whose work has not been equitably compensated. Although the recommendations of these studies are not regularly funded, they provide the necessary information to bring salaries into equity in biennia when money is available.

Policies on salaries and benefits are available in several sections of the University’s website, including the Human Relations site (benefits, compensation) and the University Administrative Manual (benefits, merit, compensation).

Several issues deserve further discussion, because they may affect recruitment and retention. The University has no policy on spousal hiring, and an increasing number of faculty commute between a home in Reno and a spouse or partner’s professional home elsewhere. In addition, the cost of housing in Reno has risen enormously in the past ten years. New faculty without other financial resources face a significant challenge in buying a house.

4.A.5 The institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation.

All regular faculty are evaluated annually (RD 4.4: Policy and Procedures on Evaluation of Faculty). For statements of policy and procedure, see RD 4.4. The process begins at the de-
partmental level, where each faculty member prepares a report of his or her activities for the year in three categories: teaching and advisement; scholarship, research, and creative activity; and university, professional, and public service. Department chairs, often in consultation with personnel committees, evaluate the faculty members’ performance in each area. Evaluation of research generally includes publications (peer reviewed or not; caliber of journal or publisher; etc.); artistic creation and/or performance; grants and contracts for scholarly work (agency; amount); conference presentations and other contributions to scholarship; and other measures. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness generally includes multiple measures of accomplishment, such as students’ teaching evaluations; review of syllabi and/or assignments; information about each course (number of students, amount of new preparation); and colleagues’ peer observations. Chairs submit their narrative evaluations and a rating of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, commendable, or excellent as recommendations to the dean, who assigns each faculty member a rating for the calendar year. (The Board of Regents has specified these four ratings as the only official evaluative terms. A rating of “extraordinary,” conferred only by the Provost, is employed internally for the sole purpose of granting the highest merit award.)

For probationary tenure-track faculty, a formal third-year review is now university-wide policy. (Ten years ago, third-year review existed only within some colleges.) This review evaluates progress toward tenure, and makes recommendations designed to promote a candidate’s chances of achieving tenure in the sixth year. On rare occasions, a junior faculty member may be given a terminal contract (i.e., removed from the tenure track) on the basis of the third-year review. In the College of Liberal Arts, department chairs and the dean also prepare annual progress-toward-tenure letters, based on a template, to each probationary faculty member. It would be desirable to adopt this practice, employed at numerous other universities, in all colleges, so that junior faculty receive such formal feedback in the years before and after third-year review. (Alternatively, this assessment could occur as a formal, explicit portion of annual evaluation for junior faculty. However, because annual evaluation is based on a calendar year’s work, it may not always align with multi-year progress toward tenure.)

The tenure and promotion process is defined in the NSHE CODE, the UNR Bylaws, and college and departmental bylaws. The CODE and UNR Bylaws define tenure as a means to specific ends: (1) “academic freedom for teaching, research, and extramural activities”; (2) “a sufficient degree of economic security” for persons of excellent ability and accomplishment (see 4.A.1, above). Tenure decisions generally coincide with promotion from assistant to associate professor and are typically made in a faculty member’s sixth year, although early tenure applications may be considered in extraordinary cases. To achieve tenure, a candidate must be judged “excellent” in either teaching or research/creative activity, and at least “satisfactory” in the other as well as in service. (The UNR Bylaws specify that individual colleges and departments “may provide for additional standards” for tenure, as long as they are not “less stringent” than the University’s and NSHE’s.)

Applications for tenure, which begin in the faculty member’s home department, entail rigorous examination of the candidate’s accomplishment. The chair solicits four to six external peer reviews of the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative activity, a process codified since the last accreditation. External reviewers must hold at least the rank for which the candidate is applying, and they must be at institutions considered at least UNR’s equivalent (with exceptions as necessary to obtain unusual expertise in some specialized fields). Evaluation of teaching requires multiple indices: for example, students’ teaching evaluations, colleagues’ classroom observation, and a teaching portfolio of syllabi, assignments, and philosophy. Service, which receives the least emphasis as in annual evaluation, is reported on the candidate’s vita, sometimes corroborated with supporting letters from within or outside the University, and evaluated by the department.
The department deliberates on the application and makes a recommendation to the college level, where a personnel committee reviews the material, makes an evaluation in each of the three areas (scholarship, teaching, service), and makes recommendations to the dean regarding tenure and regarding promotion. The candidate’s application form and c.v., the dean’s recommendation, the chair’s letter, and the external peer reviews are forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for recommendation to the Provost. At each level, a negative decision stops the process. Candidates denied tenure at any stage can appeal for reconsideration, a process described in the UNR Bylaws.

Tenured associate professors may apply for promotion to professor at any time; generally, this occurs at least five years after attaining the rank of associate professor. (The UNR Bylaws, Section 42, stipulate that “an associate professor shall be evaluated in writing by the department and/or the dean regarding progress toward promotion no later than the end of the sixth full academic year in rank.” There is no evidence that this provision is followed.) The criteria for promotion to professor are specified in college rather than university bylaws, but generally include establishment of a national or international relationship in one’s scholarly field. The process is identical to that for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

In the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), two thirds (66.4 percent) of academic faculty reported that “the criteria for promotion and tenure decisions are clearly stated,” and a similar percentage (66.1 percent) reported that these criteria “are fairly implemented.” Criteria for annual evaluation and merit received slightly lower ratings for being clearly stated (62.5 percent) and fairly implemented (56.6 percent), perhaps because the system of annual evaluation has undergone some transformation over the past four years.

Rather than formal, periodic post-tenure review, the annual evaluation process applies to all continuing faculty and individuals holding contingent faculty contracts. Through annual evaluation and merit review, chairs and deans inform tenured faculty members of areas in need of improvement. The UNR Bylaws (Section 51b) describe the process by which tenured faculty’s employment may be terminated. If a tenured faculty member receives two consecutive annual evaluations of “unsatisfactory,” a hearing is convened to determine whether that person’s employment should be continued or terminated.

**4.A.6 The institution defines an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. Institutional personnel policies and procedures are published and made available to faculty.**

Recruitment and appointment: The Faculty Searches Office of Faculty Human Resources (within the Human Resources area of Administration and Finance) has oversight responsibility for all regular faculty searches. Departments, through their chairs, submit position requests — either to fill vacancies (retirement, resignation, termination) or to create new faculty lines — to their deans. Deans prioritize requests within their colleges and schools, and submit those requests to the Provost. Once the Provost has approved the request to search, the department names a search committee chair and coordinator, who must attend workshops sponsored by Faculty Human Resources. From this point, the process works from the department level upward. Departments advertise the position through disciplinary publications (increasingly online) and national venues that specifically target ethnically diverse candidate pools, receive and document applications, and select and interview candidates. For continuing faculty positions, at least two candidates are brought to campus for interviews with the department, dean, and representative of the Provost’s office. Departments submit documentation to Faculty Human Resources for approval at each point the applicant pool is winnowed, in order to maintain compliance with university search and affirmative-action policies. Once the department has identified its preferred candidate, it makes a recommendation to the dean, whose formal offer letter describes the terms and conditions of the position.
Since the 1997 self-study, the University has made huge steps in this recruitment process. Transferring its oversight from the Affirmative Action office to an entity specifically concerned with faculty searches helped immensely, as did the creation of an informative website describing every stage of the process (CD 4.6: Academic Faculty Search Flowchart). Ten years ago, departments commonly waited days (or longer) to receive approval to contact candidates; now that process routinely occurs within twenty-four hours, thanks in part to good professional staff and in part to E-search, an online system that has eliminated the necessity of walking paperwork around campus for each needed signature.

Today, departments’ primary concern is financial. Searches cost money, especially placing advertisements (an ad in Science typically costs $1,000), sending faculty to academic conferences to conduct preliminary interviews, and bringing finalists for campus interviews. In recent years, central administration has borne a diminishing amount of these costs (from $4,000 per search in 2003 to $900 per search in 2006). As a result, colleges and departments must assume an unpredictable share of search expenses, from budgets that are committed to other needs.

Personnel policies and procedures: The University makes an ongoing effort to update, streamline, and provide access to documents related to personnel policies and procedures. Previously, the University maintained the Faculty Handbook, a binder of materials formerly distributed to new faculty upon hire, which has become increasingly obsolete and largely been abandoned. Materials concerning the faculty are contained in the University Administrative Manual (RE 4.1a: University Administrative Manual, 2,500). The Faculty Senate maintains a “faculty survival guide” that compiles information (RE 4.1b: Faculty Survival Guide). Policies and procedures are available on the University’s website. Some portions of the site are extremely clear, notably the newly revised Human Resources section. Finding other governing documents can be circuitous. (For example, information about sabbatical leave appears in the section of the website titled “Forms.”) Some documents appear in multiple places on the web, occasionally in different versions. (For example, information about the promotion and tenure process appears both in “Forms” and on the Provost’s office page.) The President’s office, Provost’s office, and Faculty Senate are collaborating on a streamlined, one-stop web portal with access to all relevant documents, including college and unit bylaws.

4.A.7 The institution fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty.

Title 2 of the NSHE CODE (RE 4.2: Policy on Academic Freedom), “Academic Freedom and Responsibility,” defines the System’s commitment to academic freedom for faculty in teaching, research, and the broader community. Presidents Joseph Crowley, John Lilley, and Milton Glick have each safeguarded the centrality of academic freedom. In the past five years, the Faculty Senate has not received a complaint about the University’s commitment to this core principle. In the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), 82.5 percent of academic faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Academic faculty are granted adequate autonomy and independence to conduct their research and teaching.” (See Standard 9.A.5.)
4.A.8 Part-time and adjunct faculty are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignment and/or other prescribed duties and responsibilities in accord with the mission and goals of the institution.

“Part-time faculty” fall into several categories, based on the terms of employment. Letter of Appointment (LOA) instructors are hired on a course-by-course basis. LOAs who teach at least the equivalent of a half-time load (eight credits or more) are eligible for benefits and are termed “letter of appointment with benefits” (LOB) instructors. Most “contingent” faculty, whose contracts are either nonrenewable (one year) or renewable contingent upon funding (RCUF), are employed full-time, although some hold a percentage of a full-time position. The term “adjunct” is not used to describe instructional faculty, but instead denotes unpaid scholars who possess an authorized affiliation with the University or one of its units.

Hiring contingent faculty requires a search, through a process monitored by Faculty Human Resources (often a streamlined version of the process for hiring continuing faculty). Hiring LOAs occurs at the department’s discretion, with the approval of the dean: a letter of application and vita are required; departments may require additional credentials, such as letters of recommendation. Departments generally hire contingent faculty and LOAs for two purposes. Many teach lower-division, general education courses (e.g., English composition, introductory Mathematics) for which demand exceeds the capacity of continuing faculty and teaching assistants. Others, often practitioners employed full-time in the community, teach specialized courses as LOAs in areas of their professional expertise, notably in Business Administration and Education. Some individuals hired on letters of appointment teach enough university courses, or a combination of enough university and community college courses, that they are full-time instructors. Graduate students not on teaching assistantships sometimes try to live on LOA salaries.

Courses taught by contingent faculty and LOAs are evaluated with the standard college or department student evaluation forms. In some departments, the chair or his/her designee conducts classroom observation as well. These mechanisms aim to ensure high-quality instruction and, ideally, guide departmental decisions about reappointment.

Salary is the greatest challenge to finding and retaining excellent LOAs. The University’s standard rate is $800 per credit (i.e., usually $2,400 per course), a 33.3 percent increase from ten years ago but considerably less than national norms in most disciplines. Departments or colleges with discretionary funds (for example, from research grants or faculty course buy-outs) may pay more, but departments such as English and Mathematics & Statistics, which employ the greatest numbers of LOAs each year, have no such opportunity. Increasing LOA salaries has long been a goal of the Board of Regents and the University, but funds have not been forthcoming. LOA salaries are not adjusted for cost-of-living or merit. In 2001-02, a Board of Regents task force conducted a survey of nearly 1,200 part-time faculty members at all NSHE institutions (CD 4.7: Board of Regents Part-Time Faculty Task Force, Final Report, 2002). The large majority (70 percent) reported that they were treated well and respected in their departments and colleges, but a similar majority (68 percent) testified to feeling unfairly compensated. Qualified individuals regularly decline to teach on LOA because the University pays so little. (RE 4.6 describes the employment and compensation of faculty in a variety of special programs.)

The task force recommended a salary model for part-time faculty: a per-credit target, based on the entry-level salary paid to full-time instructors. Implementing this model would enhance LOA salaries and ensure regular cost-of-living adjustments commensurate with the state COLA.
Departments vary in other resources provided to LOAs and contingent faculty, such as office space (important for holding student office hours) and access to computer and telephone. Most are provided access to a mailbox and copy machine (CD 4.7: Board of Regents Part-Time Faculty Task Force, Final Report, 2002, Appendix 3, page ii).

4.A.9 Employment practices for part-time and adjunct faculty include dissemination of information regarding the institution, the work assignment, rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment.

Disseminating such information is primarily a departmental responsibility. Several colleges and departments (for example, Educational Specialties) have developed manuals for new instructors and teaching assistants, which include relevant university policies, departmental mission and procedures, academic expectations and assessment, and benefits. For the most part, however, the effectiveness of communication rests with department chairs and may be quite variable across the University.

On the recommendation of the 2001-02 Board of Regents task force, the University now runs an orientation program for LOAs each semester. The Excellence in Teaching Program’s workshops, conducted throughout the academic year, are open to contingent faculty and LOAs as well as continuing faculty.

4.A.10 The institution demonstrates that it periodically assesses institutional policies concerning the use of part-time and adjunct faculty in light of the mission and goals of the institution.

The Board of Regents’ 2001-02 task force report was the most recent, systematic assessment of policies concerning these instructors. It recommended that each NSHE institution “form a committee, or use an existing committee, to enact the principles and recommendations” contained in its report. These committees were supposed to prepare annual reports to the Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents, but there is no evidence that this has occurred. The Faculty Senate created a task force in 2006 to study the roles and rights of non-traditional faculty of all types: research faculty, clinical faculty, rank 0 faculty, and LOAs. This task force spent its first year seeking to define the dimensions of this complex task (CD 4.8: Faculty Senate Task Force on Non-Traditional Faculty, Interim Report, 2007) and will conduct more specific investigations and make recommendations in future years.

Standard 4.B — Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation

Overview

Scholarship, research, and creative activity are central to the University’s mission and goals. According to the mission statement, “By fostering creative and scholarly activity, [the University] encourages and supports faculty research and application of that research to state and national problems.” The first characteristic of a strong university, according to our statement of institutional values, is “an unmistakable emphasis on learning and thinking.” Our values statement also celebrates “research, scholarship and creative activities that bring recognition to the university by contributing substantively and articulately to the body of knowledge and to the needs of society.” Without a faculty dedicated to the pursuit, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge to scholarly disciplines and to the broader public, the University would not foster a culture of learning and thinking in its classrooms, teaching labs, and studios.
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4.8.1 Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty are engaged in scholarship, research, and artistic creation.

Research and/or artistic creation (hereafter “scholarship”) is one of the three arenas of endeavor required of all tenure-track faculty. Departments establish the criteria for their faculty on the basis of disciplinary expectations and individual role statements. Departments and deans evaluate faculty scholarship annually, and the University requires scholarly or creative activity for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Our faculty’s research productivity and visibility have grown enormously over the last ten years. Funding for sponsored projects has nearly doubled since the 1997 accreditation self-study, and funding for sponsored research projects has more than tripled. Growth over the last five years in extramural funding for all sponsored projects, and in research awards specifically, is shown in Table 4.5.

In addition to research dollars, faculty scholarship is strong by many other measures. In the calendar year 2006, UNR faculty published 84 single- or joint-author books, 132 edited books, and 855 journal articles or book chapters, many with the leading university presses and the foremost journal articles in their fields; gave a total of 1,572 formal presentations at state, national, and international professional meetings; and registered 30 provisional or issued licensing agreements or patents. Faculty presented 47 juried shows, commissioned performances, or competitive exhibitions in physical or electronic venues; in addition, our faculty in the creative and performing arts make the University the hub of a growing, thriving arts scene in northern Nevada. (Data in this and the following paragraph are derived from faculty annual evaluations, compiled through Digital Measures.)

Invited service to their disciplines is another marker of faculty reputation and visibility. In 2006, faculty held 663 leadership positions (elected officers, committee chairs, conference chairs, etc.) in professional organizations, and performed an additional 570 activities “related to recognized or visible service to [their] profession,” such as service on regional and national committees or accreditation efforts. Faculty wrote 2,223 invited reviews of books and/or manuscripts, and held 236 editorial positions.

RD 4.5: Representative Examples of Institutional and Public Impact of Faculty Scholarship, a 2006 publication of the Office of Marketing and Communications, describes representative examples of the impact of faculty scholarship in Nevada, across the United States, and worldwide. RD 4.6: Summary of Significant Artistic Creation, Scholarly Activity, and Research by Faculty summarizes recent significant scholarly, research, and creative activity by college and department.

Many faculty members participate in interdisciplinary centers, institutes, and consortia at the University, in addition to discipline-based scholarship. Among the strategic planning efforts of 2001-2005 was an attempt to catalog and streamline the welter of “centers,” many of indeterminate existence, that the 1997 self-study identified. The results included a clearer institutional definition of such

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5 Sources of Sponsored Projects Funds</th>
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Source: Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Annual Reports, 2002-2006.

1 Other sources include local, private, and states other than Nevada.

2 Includes sponsored projects funds devoted to instruction, public service, research, scholarships, and student services.
terms as “center,” “institute,” and “consortium,” and the creation of several new entities to showcase and promote areas of strategic initiative and scholarly strength across the disciplines: notably the Academy for the Environment (which received a university funding line), but also numerous smaller entities. These clusters typically emerge out of faculty interest and expertise and reflect interdisciplinary directions within academic scholarship.

Faculty scholarship is also connected to the University’s instructional mission and goals. Graduate education, particularly in the sciences and engineering, involves students in faculty scholarship, and faculty in other disciplines, particularly the humanities and social sciences, draw upon their own research expertise as mentors for graduate students pursuing original research. Moreover, for over a decade the University has committed itself to promoting undergraduate research and creative activity. Several departments and the Honors Program require a senior thesis or senior project of all majors.

The Office of Undergraduate Research (created c. 2000) reports to the Vice President for Research (VPR) and distributes research grants to undergraduates engaged in scholarship with a faculty mentor. This program works best in the sciences and engineering, where students pursue projects in the faculty member’s direct specialty (often in the faculty member’s lab), and where the required final poster session is a typical disciplinary assignment. The Office of Undergraduate Research has expressed a desire for students’ participation from a wider variety of disciplines, notably the humanities and the arts. It should consult with those departments about how its grant requirements and application calendar might be modified to encourage more applications from those fields. The Graduate Student Association (GSA) provides some funding to support graduate student research, chiefly to defray the cost of presenting scholarly work at academic conferences.

4.B.2 Institutional policies and procedures, including ethical considerations, concerning scholarship, research, and artistic creation, are clearly communicated.

Policies and procedures about scholarship are available online to all members of the University community. A handbook on the website of the VPR (CD 4.9: Research Best Practices) defines the responsibilities of lead investigators and mentors and the nature of research misconduct; introduces issues related to conflict of interest and disclosure, financial compliance, and intellectual property; sketches the processes for working with human subjects, vertebrate animals, and hazardous materials, among other topics; and guides researchers to relevant other websites and documents. The websites of the Office of Human Research Protection (OHRP) and the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (OSPA) also contain important information, especially about Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and financial management of grants and contracts, respectively.

In addition to written guidelines, the University conducts a variety of relevant workshops for faculty and staff. OSPA runs a workshop series on grant administration, as well as periodic workshops on effort reporting (CD 4.10: Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, Workshop Schedule, 2006-07). OHRP maintains a subscription to the web-based “CITI Course in the Protection of Human Research Subjects,” sponsored by the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative (CITI) and the University of Miami. In 2006 the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs granted “qualified accreditation” to OHRP, one of 39 U.S. organizations so recognized for meeting rigorous standards that exceed federal regulations.

4.B.3 Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty have a substantive role in the development and administration of research policies and practices.

The University ordinarily involves faculty in formulating major research policies. Three re-
cent examples — new or emerging policies on conflict of interest, effort reporting, and research misconduct — show how the process typically works. All three are required for compliance with federal grant oversight. In developing the policies, the VPR and OSPA have worked with University legal council to begin drafting the policies. The Faculty Senate Executive Board reviews the drafts, and in the case of the effort-reporting policy the Senate and the Provost appointed a committee of faculty, deans, and departmental administrative personnel to suggest revisions and refinements. Ultimately, the Faculty Senate is consulted before the President takes final action on the policy.

Once these policies and procedures are in effect, faculty play a central role in administering them. For example, the new research misconduct policy (currently in Faculty Senate review) mandates an ethics committee, composed of faculty, to oversee the process: appoint inquiry and investigative panels, receive those panels’ recommendations, and make its own recommendations to the VPR and the President.

The VPR consults monthly with members of the Committee on Advanced Studies, recipients of the University’s Outstanding Researcher Award. In addition to policy, this group discusses UNR’s research environment and ways to stimulate further research activity and visibility. Routine, federally mandated review processes also entail faculty oversight of the research enterprise. These include the Institutional Review Boards, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the committees within of Environmental Health and Safety (Biosafety, Radiation, and Laboratory Use).

4.B.4 Consistent with its mission and goals, the institution provides appropriate financial, physical, administrative, and information resources for scholarship, research, and artistic creation.

Financial: Monetary support for scholarship takes several forms, many of which have improved tremendously in the past 10 years. The Provost’s Office provides $5,000 in start-up funds (which may be used over three years) for all new tenure-track faculty, whereas ten years ago only a computer and printer were standard. Funds from facilities and administration (F&A), with some match from colleges and departments, cover the ever more costly start-up packages for labs and other major expenses in the sciences and engineering. A bottleneck in F&A funding delayed some tenure-track hiring in these fields in the past three years, but that problem is expected to be short-lived. The provost’s office now requires chairs and deans to submit estimates of start-up costs when they request to conduct searches, to make certain that individuals hired will have the necessary research support. Further, improved planning will ensure an annual university-wide start-up budget of nearly $3 million by fall 2008. (See Standard 7.A.)

The University has made enormous strides over the past decade in providing start-up packages for faculty in disciplines in which research requires substantial equipment or other needs. However, there is still work to do in matching the start-up offers of top-tier research institutions. The VPR’s office should systematically collect data on the start-up packages offered by our peer institutions, so that we can address this question more rigorously.

The University provides additional financial resources for scholarship. Junior Faculty Research Grants (JFRG) of up to $15,000, which may be spent over two years, are available to untenured faculty through a competitive application process. Despite the University’s steadfast commitment, the JFRG program is perennially beleaguered. The available funds — usually between $100,000 and $200,000 per year — never suffice to reward the number of worthy proposals. (In 2006-07, there were 38 proposals. Approximately 26 were viable, but only 12-14 could be funded.) The dollars available often depend upon the amount of F&A available at the end of an academic year; consequently, although applications are due in February or early March, awards have typically not been made until May, a hardship for faculty planning summer research. There is also a continuing question of whose needs should have highest priority. For faculty whose scholarship is largely self-funded (i.e.,
disciplines in which few external grant opportunities exist), a JFRG is a vital resource for research travel and presentation. For faculty in grant-driven disciplines (such as the sciences and engineering), $15,000 is typically a supplement to a sizeable start-up package, and potentially seed money for national grant applications. The VPR considers the JFRG program a top priority and hopes to increase the number of recipients and the size of awards, as well to consider similar programs for senior scholars seeking to pilot new projects or scholarly directions. Those objectives will require far more funding than is currently available.

Travel funding is available from several sources. The VPR/Graduate School provide up to $300 per year for conference travel for each continuing faculty member. Funded from F&A, this amount has not increased in more than a decade, and it is routinely exhausted by the middle of each semester, suggesting that the budgeted amount ($50,000 in 2006-07) is perennially insufficient in relation to the need. Numerous colleges and some departments also maintain regular faculty travel budgets.

F&A funds are also the basis for the Scholarly Activities Pool (SAP), an innovative approach to assisting research and creative work in disciplines where scholarship is primarily self-funded. When it was proposed to divide the College of Arts and Science into the Colleges of Liberal Arts and of Science, the college share of F&A (then called indirect cost recovery [ICR]) became a significant issue. Most of the F&A-generating departments would come within the College of Science, leaving the Liberal Arts departments — which had theretofore benefited from the portion of F&A assigned to college-wide discretion — poorer than they had been. At the recommendation of the University Planning Council, a task force (2003) studied the university-wide distribution of F&A. This task force proposed distributing F&A consistently between deans, departments, and principal investigators (college practices had varied widely), and reallocate F&A dollars from the President’s office to information technology. The task force report is included in CD 4.11: ICR Distribution Policy Committee, Final Report, 2003.

Most important, the task force recommended the creation of the SAP, equal to 3.5 percent of all F&A funds. Initially, SAP funds were to be distributed annually to colleges whose own average F&A generation totaled less than $1,000 per faculty member. The distribution was to occur on the basis of state-funded faculty headcount, with allocation of funds within the college left to the discretion of the dean. The SAP has had a tremendous impact on scholarship, not just in Liberal Arts but also in other colleges where external grants are unusual. It has underwritten research travel more effectively than under the previous system. (For example, faculty in Arts and Sciences received up to $300 annually in college travel funds — barely enough to cover an airline ticket, much less lodging or conference registration fees. Because of the SAP, faculty in Liberal Arts may request up to $600 annually.) The Colleges of Liberal Arts and Education have devised internal, competitive grant programs for research and creative activity. Faculty can now apply for money to cover research expenses and publication and presentation costs that would otherwise fall upon themselves.

The SAP was created with several conditions, to insure that the University would provide continuing, increased support for scholarship across the disciplines. Most of those conditions have been met: for example, the creation of the SAP was not to replace existing funding opportunities (e.g., the JFRG program or the VPR’s travel support). One has not: the SAP was created as a percentage of the University’s total F&A, so that distributions would grow with the larger research enterprise. In subsequent years, the distribution was to be recalculated proportionally to recognize changes faculty headcount (this has been done) and in F&A revenue (this has not). However, distribution has been held constant (calculated at $1,000 per faculty member). Rising research costs in all disciplines suggest restoration of the original intent.

Physical: Space, more than anything else, constrains the University’s research enterprise. Some departments have no space for additional faculty offices and increasingly crowded office spaces shared by contingent faculty, TAs, and LOAs. Animal facilities are woefully inadequate
to meet the growing demands of biomedical and other research. Lab space is at a premium and in many fields simply non-existent for a growing faculty, at times creating a constraint on faculty hiring in the sciences. The new Mathematics and Science Education Building (to be constructed over the next four years, contingent on fund-raising) will eventually alleviate some of these pressures, but primarily will only address the challenges faced by the Chemistry, Math, and Physics departments. Other departments will remain sorely in need of space. In addition the quality of existing laboratory space is quite variable, ranging from state-of-the-art to antiquated.

The cost of remodeling labs can be very high, and funds for this are quite limited. Piece-meal remodeling is not a cost effective strategy, and we may need to develop a more vigorous building program to address research space needs across the University. Visual arts and music also face tremendous constraints. Church Fine Arts Building has been overcrowded for many years; despite a recent addition, studios and practice rooms remain far too few for increasing numbers of faculty and students. (See Standard 8.A.3.) In the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), academic faculty were evenly divided on the statement, “UNR provides adequate facilities for my research” (51.3 percent agreed, 48.6 percent disagreed), although more than 60 percent agreed with the statement, “I am satisfied with the quality of my office/lab space.”

Administrative: The University’s administrative infrastructure for scholarship seems sufficient at the central level (i.e., the offices that report to the VPR), but this is always fragile for a fast-growing institution, where new hires are increasingly productive researchers and creative artists. To put it another way, not only is the overall size of the faculty growing, but so is the average faculty member’s scholarly production. In the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), 58.5 percent of academic faculty agreed that “University management of grant and research activities is effective,” while 41.5 percent disagreed. There was an identical split on the statement, “UNR policies facilitate academic faculty pursuit of external funding opportunities.”

Review of research protocols involving human subjects attempts to be responsive to researchers’ schedules. There are now three IRBs: one for biomedical proposals, two for social behavioral proposals. Expedited review is available for proposals that meet certain conditions involving minimal risk; and IRBs meet regularly enough that all protocols requiring full board review can be evaluated within a month of submission. (Although proposals of minimal risk can be exempted from review by OSPA staff, some faculty in the social sciences believe that IRBs overstep their mission, returning protocols for revision for administrative or methodological reasons unrelated to the protection of human subjects.) Service on IRBs is demanding; in particular, it can be difficult to secure faculty members to conduct expedited reviews. Some universities now pay IRB panelists, as well as chairs; however, any such move ought to be part of a broader campus-wide dialogue about the value of and compensation for diverse forms of service. As of fall 2007, OSPA will have several staffers based in Las Vegas, to assist the growing number of researchers there with writing and submitting proposals.

The greatest administrative challenges lie within colleges and departments, where classified staff must prepare and handle the increased paperwork and complex financial arrangements commensurate with enhanced research productivity. Although many departments receive larger state-funded operating budgets and more grant dollars than they did a decade ago, few have been able to hire additional staff (e.g., grant administration staff with pertinent expertise) needed to meet growing operations. Several colleges have staff positions devoted to research support; others do not. Administration of extramurally funded research has now become a major time demand for chairs in departments with substantial research missions. Some of these chairs are paid for the academic year only, and oversight of the research enterprise during off-contract times is an issue that should be addressed.

Information: The University generally furnishes the information resources that faculty need for scholarship (see Standard Five). The libraries have moved strongly in the direction of provid-
ing access, often electronic (document delivery, interlibrary loan), although collection development also remains strong. The desktop computer replacement program, made possible by the reallocation of F&A dollars from the President’s office to Information Technology, aims to provide faculty with new, centrally funded office computers every three or four years. This is a considerable improvement over past practice, although it has been cut in years when budgets were tight.

**4.B.5 The nature of the institution’s research mission and goals and its commitment to faculty scholarship, research, and artistic creation are reflected in the assignment of faculty responsibilities, the expectation and reward of faculty performance, and opportunities for faculty renewal through sabbatical leaves or other similar programs.**

Department chairs and deans are responsible for assigning equitable workloads and ensuring that faculty have adequate time to pursue their scholarship while fulfilling the University’s instructional mission and performing the service necessary to the institution’s functioning. Annual role statements, negotiated between faculty members and chairs (and requiring deans’ approval), are the mechanism for enumerating each faculty member’s balance of responsibilities: these documents indicate roughly what percentage of effort is to be devoted to scholarship, teaching, and service in the coming calendar year. For tenure-track academic faculty, a 40 percent (research), 40 percent (teaching), 20 percent (service) role statement is probably the most typical, although chairs and deans may vary the percentages to meet the varying needs and responsibilities of individual faculty members. For example, the University has no formal policy for compensating a teaching overload one semester with a research-oriented subsequent semester, but deans have the prerogative to allow such arrangements.

Through annual evaluation, scholarship (along with teaching and service) is considered for merit award. The University and most of the colleges also award annual prizes for research and teaching excellence. Each year, too, the University Foundation recognizes three distinguished scholars on the faculty, who receive stipends and teaching reductions for three years, as well as the permanent title of Foundation Professor. Faculty overwhelmingly believe that their scholarship earns rewards: in the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 4.2), 75 percent agreed that “academic faculty are rewarded for being productive researchers,” and 81.4 percent agreed that “academic faculty are rewarded because of the amount of external funding they obtain.” If anything, the survey data suggest that faculty consider research to be over-rewarded: only 50.2 percent agreed that “Academic faculty are rewarded for being effective teachers,” and only 35.5 percent agreed that “research and teaching are equally valued during annual reviews.” Although the University’s criteria for promotion and tenure require at least a rating of “excellent” in either research or teaching and at least “satisfactory” in the other, it is commonly understood that merely “satisfactory” research is unlikely to earn tenure. Criteria for promotion to full professor, where they exist, emphasize research more than teaching, as well.

The University’s faculty development leave program affords faculty the opportunity for scholarly and creative renewal. Sabbatical leave, a state-funded program that provides a limited number of leaves per year, is available to academic faculty. Faculty development leave, an internally funded program that roughly matches the number of sabbatical leaves, is open to academic or administrative faculty. In practice, a single faculty committee oversees both programs jointly, reviewing all leave applications in a common process. Regular faculty are eligible to apply after every six years of service, for either a full year (at 2/3 salary) or one semester (at full salary). The faculty development leave program was initiated many years ago, partly to allow administrative faculty the possibility of leave and partly to address the inadequate number of state-funded sabbaticals.
The availability of sabbatical and faculty development leave varies from year to year. In some years, the total number of leaves suffices to admit all the proposals deemed worthy by the Faculty Development Leave Committee. In other years, as many as a third of applicants were denied leave (many of them were awarded leaves in the next year’s cycle). Ideally, the University should work with its sister NSHE institutions toward more state-funded sabbaticals, a system-wide concern. In the meantime, the University should assess whether the number of internally funded faculty development leaves remains sufficient to meet the needs of an increasingly research-active faculty. The sabbatical program is highly beneficial. It would be even better if faculty could accrue credits for sabbatical by waiting more than seven years so that they might take full-year sabbatical at full pay (as is possible in some peer institutions). The University should also consider the possibility of pre-tenure leaves and teaching reductions, which many peer institutions offer to attract the strongest job candidates and which can significantly aid junior faculty’s path to tenure and promotion.

4.B.6 Sponsored research and programs funded by grants, contracts, and gifts are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.

The various offices (OSPA, OHRP) and committees (IRBs, IACUC, Environmental Health and Safety) that monitor compliance with federal regulations also ensure that grant-funded research meets the University’s ethical guidelines. Many of our sponsored projects are also directly related to the public and social dimensions of the University mission, which mandates that we “contribute to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge that will help to improve society at the state, regional and national levels.” Programs sponsored by grants, contracts, and gifts also contribute directly to other aspects of the mission. In FY 2006, for example, 62.4 percent of sponsored projects funds went to research; the rest were devoted to public service (26.0 percent), instruction (5.3 percent), scholarships (5.7 percent), and student services (0.6 percent), each connected to dimensions of the mission and goals. (For specific examples of such funded projects, see RD 4.5 and 4.6.)

4.B.7 Faculty are accorded academic freedom to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.

As stated above, more than four-fifths of academic faculty believe that they have “adequate autonomy and independence to conduct their research and teaching.” The University administration stalwartly supports faculty’s scholarly independence. To date, neither the governing board nor the state legislature has threatened to interfere with that academic freedom. Nevertheless, in a nationwide climate where such interference is increasingly common and where some social commentators decry the freedom to pursue scholarship with which they disagree, faculty and administrators must regularly explain and defend the purpose of academic freedom for the University’s mission.

**Standard Four Summary:**
Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

**Strengths: Faculty**

- The University has built and continues to build a superb academic faculty, dedicated to teaching and distinguished for research, scholarship, and creative activity. Departments and colleges hire faculty of the highest caliber, and the process of promotion and tenure is rigorous.

- Shared governance and academic freedom have long been among the University’s core principles. Faculty participate in planning and decision-making at every level, from departmental to university-wide.

- Instructional workload policies have been formulated with faculty input and with sensitivity to the characteristic teaching in diverse disciplines, the variety of faculty re-
sponsibilities in undergraduate and graduate education, and the centrality of research and creative activity as well as excellence in teaching.

• The articulation between annual evaluation and merit pay has been much improved, due to positive changes in the evaluation process and the distribution of merit awards.

• The search process for academic faculty has improved markedly, thanks to excellent professional staff and use of technology to speed and streamline paperwork.

• Institutional support for faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity across the disciplines has increased substantially. This has strengthened our recruitment of new faculty, afforded them tools for early professional success, and enhanced the scholarly activity of veteran faculty members.

• Faculty participate in developing research policies and maintaining research oversight processes. Many important review processes have been expedited over the past several years.

Challenges: Faculty

• The growing number of “unfunded mandates” to departments and faculty, particularly department chairs, encroaches upon the core missions of teaching and scholarship.

• Data collection that emphasizes FTE generated by individual faculty members cuts against a culture of department-centered planning and goals.

• To recruit and retain the best faculty, the University needs to devise strategies to compete with peer institutions. These might include the sorts of incentives and opportunities typically offered by such institutions: course reductions and leave semesters for junior faculty, spousal hiring policies, large start-up packages, housing allowances, etc.

• The growing proportion of credit hours taught by non-continuing instructors (contingent faculty and LOAs) suggests the need for ongoing scrutiny, in two senses: (1) How well do the University and colleges and departments support these instructors and evaluate the quality of their work? (2) How does increased reliance on such instructors affect specific majors and programs, notably the Core Curriculum?

• Even as the University experiences a growing student body and periodically difficult budget biennia, it is essential we not sacrifice momentum in scholarship, research, and creative activity. Momentum depends on the support afforded to those activities through workload policies, start-up packages and internal grants for scholarship, and facilities and technology. It also depends on maintaining adequate infrastructure — administrative support, classified staff, operating budgets — to meet increasing responsibilities, including “unfunded mandates” noted above.

Recommendations: Faculty

• Faculty should maintain a central role in university-wide curricular policy, in a role parallel to the University Courses and Curriculum Committee (composed mostly of administrators), while approval decisions about individual courses should be decentralized to the college or departmental level.

• Information about policies and procedures should be streamlined into a single web portal, rather than scattered across various sites.

• Faculty members, especially department chairs, should receive the sorts of support (administrative, training, and compensation) needed to perform their essential administrative and service responsibilities. While this support should be based upon principles of universally shared information and equity, the University should be sensitive to disciplinary differences in determining policies about named administrative assignments (e.g., length of term, nature of contract, size of department).
• Junior, tenure-track faculty in all colleges and departments should have equitable access to information about their opportunities and performance. Among other things, this might take the form of (a) regular workshops and forums about policies, practices, and professional development, beyond the initial orientation for new faculty; and/or (b) formal, annual progress-toward-tenure letters prepared by the department chair and dean. The Faculty Senate might survey recently hired and recently tenured faculty to assess their sense of how well the University (and particularly their department and college) informed them about University policies and procedures that affected them and helped them prepare for promotion and University tenure.

• The University should regularly assess its compensation, training, and evaluation of non-continuing faculty and part-time instructors, in accordance with the recommendations of the 2001-02 Board of Regents Task Force on Part-Time Faculty.
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Standard Five — Library and Information Resources

Introduction and Overview

The University of Nevada, Reno Libraries (UNR Libraries) are currently a complex of research facilities consisting of one main library (Getchell) and five branches: the DeLaMare Library (mines, engineering and maps), the Life and Health Sciences Library, the Physical Sciences Library, the Savitt Medical Library, and the Basque Studies Library. The Dean of Libraries also serves the University as Vice President for Information Technology. He directs library operations with the assistance of a senior management team that includes specialists in information systems operation, cataloging, development, acquisitions, collection management, and research and access services. Because the Libraries and Information Technologies areas are so closely related, and because Information Technologies services and initiatives are interwoven throughout all campus activities and are therefore described in other sections of the accreditation report, this Standard will tend to focus more specifically on the services and resources of the University Libraries; for further details about the integrated nature of the Libraries and IT, please refer to the IT/Libraries strategic plan (CD 5.1: IT/Library Strategic Plan).

The UNR Libraries are among the most innovative and forward-looking small research library systems in the country. Over the past 10 years, the world of scholarly publishing and information management has changed almost beyond recognition, moving quickly and irrevocably from a print-based to a predominantly online environment. The UNR Libraries have monitored those changes and adapted to them quickly, taking opportunities to create new services and to update old ones not only in response to patrons’ changing needs, but in anticipation of them. While the University Libraries have not only responded nimbly to change, quickly adopting emerging technologies and techniques, they have also blazed the trail for other academic libraries with pioneering practices and policies.

In 1999, the Libraries took advantage of what was then a relatively new and unusual offer from Elsevier Science, the world’s largest publisher of scientific journals; in return for a promise to retain current subscriptions, the Libraries were provided online access to those journals and all other journal titles in the Elsevier catalog at an extremely advantageous price. The deal has revolutionized access to scientific research literature at UNR. Between July 2005 and June 2006, UNR students and faculty downloaded an average of 337 Elsevier articles per day in full text, seven days a week — an average of one article every five minutes, around the clock, every day of the year. Similar deals have been struck with other major science publishers, including Wiley, Springer Verlag, Taylor & Francis, the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Physics, and Kluwer, making UNR’s collection of online research journals particularly strong.

At the same time, the Libraries have added more than 46,000 electronic books to their collections and more than 250 online databases; the Libraries’ collection of electronic journals now stands at just over 19,000. At the same time, traditional print collections have remained strong; taken together, Getchell Library and the various branch collections include more than one million printed volumes.

The Libraries’ digital initiatives are also worth noting. Established in 2001, the DataWorks Department (renamed Nevada Digital Initiatives in 2007) provides extensive and sophisticated data support to the University community, including such services as:

- Eight terabytes of redundant networked storage space
- Local storage and site-wide dissemination of University-created datasets
- Software applications development supporting dissemination of University research
- Local storage and dissemination of Web-based datasets procured from third party vendors
• ArcIMS interactive map server
• Data Analysis and Visualization Lab
• SPSS Cubes server for online publishing of SPSS output
• Dataset indexing
• Dynamic software applications including Mathematica, SAS, Maple and MATLAB, both on-site in the Lab and remotely via a Citrix server farm
• 42”-wide HP DesignJet printer (popular for student and faculty poster projects) and 52”-wide scanner

Nevada Digital Initiatives is the University’s official representative body to the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

Budget Challenges

The Libraries have made these significant advances in an increasingly difficult budget environment. Over the past 10 years, the libraries’ collections budget has increased at an average rate of just under three percent annually (Table 5.1), while the cost of research journals and monographs has increased at roughly 8 percent annually during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1</th>
<th>Library Collections Budget, 1998-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$3,565,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$3,615,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$3,715,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$3,715,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$3,915,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$3,915,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$4,140,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$4,190,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$4,190,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$4,583,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even as publication and research patterns have shifted from print to online, it has remained necessary to continue building and maintaining the Libraries’ core collections of printed research materials. Library staff have identified and withdrawn outdated materials and those materials beyond the scope of the collection; they have replaced good printed resources with better online ones, where available and feasible. Despite this aggressive online acquisitions program, the Libraries’ physical facilities are bursting at the seams and patrons have sometimes been left waiting in line to use resources. Study spaces — which are heavily used by students throughout the school year — are filled as quickly as they can be established (always at the cost of collection shelving). The installation of wireless network technology across campus has not resulted, as one might expect, in fewer people entering the library buildings, but has rather brought more and more students into the libraries with their laptop computers, thanks to the inviting atmosphere and desirable study and collaboration areas available within the facilities. The need for more space has become acute as was predicted in the last accreditation study.

The Knowledge Center

The University will meet this challenge with the construction of the Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center, a 295,000 square-foot building that will be one of the most technologically advanced libraries in the country. In the Knowledge Center, computing and information technologies and support will be combined with the latest in multimedia tools and the resources of the UNR Libraries in a physical environment designed for comfort, efficiency, and collaboration. Along with the Libraries’ print collection, online databases, and electronic journals, the Knowledge Center will offer:

• Wireless network access and desktop computers throughout the building
• 200-seat auditorium and stage
• Smart classrooms equipped with the latest technology
• A spacious faculty and graduate student reading room
• Dynamic media lab for postproduction work on video and multimedia projects
• Collaboration and conference rooms with built-in connectivity, screens, and projectors for shared multimedia projects
• A popular collection reading room with current newspapers, periodicals, and best-selling books
• State-of-the-art viewing and listening areas with a bountiful collection of videos, DVDs, and sound recordings
• Research, computing help and consultation
• Online course support (including electronic course reserves) and Web services center
• Computing and DataWorks labs and services with high-end hardware and software for data visualization, GIS, and more
• Art gallery, sculpture garden, exhibit areas, used bookstore, and the Nevada Writers Hall of Fame
• A robotic storage and retrieval system housing older books and journals

Construction of the Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center began in early 2006, and the facility is scheduled for completion and occupancy over the summer of 2008.

Standard 5.A — Purpose and Scope

5.A.1 The institution’s information resources and services include sufficient holdings, equipment, and personnel in all of its libraries, instructional media and production centers, computer centers, networks, telecommunication facilities, and other repositories of information to accomplish the institution’s mission and goals.

The UNR Libraries’ core collections include the following (as of December 2006):

• 1,163,705 printed books
• 87,230 reels of microfilm
• 3,211,534 pages of microfiche
• 49,433 audio recordings
• 15,139 films (12,522 videotape; 2,617 DVD)
• 19,058 electronic journals
• 3,900 print journal subscriptions and standing orders
• 46,296 electronic books (non-government)
• 41,706 electronic books (federal government documents)
• 17,000+ online Geographic Information System files
• 252 online databases
• 3,914 audio compact discs

Aggregate collection growth since 1997 is reflected in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Volumes (all formats)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>950,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>999,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,054,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,105,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,163,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel in the University Libraries are allocated as indicated in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel in the UNR Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is illustrated in 5.D.1, this is an unusually lean staff in comparison to peer institutions. Nevertheless, the UNR Libraries are open approximately 100 hours per week during the regular semester, staff a central Reference Desk in Getchell Library 60 hours per week during the same period, provide Subject Liaisons for all academic disciplines on campus, and provide other standard library services (RE 5.1: Library Information).

5.A.2 The institution’s core collection and related information resources are sufficient to support the curriculum.

As indicated in Table 5.4, the University Libraries’ core collection of books is distributed both broadly and deeply across the curriculum, and covers well the subjects taught at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Resources in other formats are similarly distributed by topic to reflect the mission and curricular focus of the University.
5.A.3 Information resources and services are determined by the nature of the institution’s educational programs and the locations where programs are offered.

The UNR Libraries’ program of subject specialists and faculty liaisons (CD 5.2: Faculty Liaisons) ensures there is timely response to changes in curriculum and research focus in the academic departments; a committee consisting primarily of library subject specialists makes larger collection development decisions. Those decisions are frequently the result of direct consultation with faculty members. Budget constraints do not permit the purchase of all desired or requested resources. Academic faculty are consulted when compromises must be made, and are invited to try out new products and resources being considered for purchase (RE 5.6: Assessment Measures of Holdings).

As explained in response to 5.C.1, the UNR Libraries monitor the creation of new course offerings and programs to ensure that collections and other information resources and services serve the needs of faculty and students. These measures, combined with the general collection resources outlined in 5.A.2, demonstrate the UNR Libraries’ ongoing commitment to building and maintaining collections and services tailored to the University’s educational programs. To support the limited number of programs offered off-site — as well as to support the work of UNR students and faculty wherever their research or studies may take them — the UNR Libraries offer authenticated remote access to almost all of its online resources. As a greater and greater portion of the Libraries’ information resources are being offered online, this means that the Libraries’ collections are less and less closely tied to physical location and are increasingly easily available to all affiliated users, regardless of their geographical location or the time they may wish to use them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Classification</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>21,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Philosophy, Psychology, Religion</td>
<td>59,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Auxiliary Sciences of History</td>
<td>7,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>History: General &amp; Old World (Eastern Hemisphere)</td>
<td>68,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-F</td>
<td>History: America (Western Hemisphere)</td>
<td>57,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Geography, Anthropology, Recreation</td>
<td>35,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>140,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>34,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>15,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>42,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>20,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>31,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td>183,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>129,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>29,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>16,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>84,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>7,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Naval Science</td>
<td>1,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Bibliography, Library Science</td>
<td>32,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 5.B — Information Resources and Services

5.B.1 Equipment and materials are selected, acquired, organized, and maintained to support the educational program.

Please see response to 5.A.3.

5.B.2 Library and information resources and services contribute to developing the ability of students, faculty, and staff to use the resources independently and effectively.

Information access boundaries are nearly non-existent for the UNR community. Students, faculty, and staff of the University are able to gain access to UNR’s array of online journals and databases around the clock, from anywhere in the world, using the same login and password that they use to login to their campus email. Patrons’ access to the collections of other institutions is also mediated electronically, by means of LINK+ (an expedited interlibrary loan service explained below), WorldCat, and fully online interlibrary loan and document delivery requests.

The UNR Libraries consider it a top priority to ensure that patrons be able to use information resources independently and effectively. The Libraries pursue that goal in three different, but complementary ways:

First, by taking ease of use and clarity of presentation seriously at point of purchase. It is an article of faith in the UNR Libraries that search interfaces and content presentation must be as clear as possible. The Libraries constantly refine and improve their own online interfaces, and critically evaluate those of any online database, journal, or service being considered for purchase. While UNR librarians and staff stand ready to help patrons at all times, their goal is to make information searches as self-help as possible by providing research tools that can be used with ease.

Second, by offering online tools that lead faculty and students to frequently used resources and to answer questions about policies and procedures. The University of Nevada, Reno Libraries’ Web site (www.library.unr.edu) offers direct links to pages customized to the needs of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students, each offering links to UNR forms, specially selected online resources, information about classroom and other support services, and current-awareness services (such as table of contents alerts, RSS feeds, and other information resources).

Third, by offering customized training and research help to individuals, classes, and departments. Even with the best and most intuitive research tools, library patrons may need guidance in what sources will best meet their needs and tips on formulating effective research strategies. UNR’s librarians regularly visit classrooms, faculty offices and department meetings, and consult individually with students to bring members of the UNR community up-to-date on recently purchased resources, to offer searching tips, and to make themselves known as potential helpers and research consultants.

5.B.3 Policies, regulations, and procedures for systematic development and management of information resources, in all formats, are documented, updated, and made available to the institution’s constituents.

These policies and procedures are set out in the Collection Development Policy documents included with this report as RE 5.2. The policy is available to anyone who requests to see it; however, it is not yet available as an online document. It will be made available electronically following its revision as per the KMAD Report (CD 5.3).
5.B.4 Opportunities are provided for faculty, staff, and students to participate in the planning and development of the library and information resources and services.

As the University Libraries have prepared for their move into the Knowledge Center, there has been extensive consultation with the campus community in regard to both the details of the move and the needs of various constituencies. Early in the planning for the Knowledge Center, the Libraries enlisted the assistance of a prominent member of the Reynolds School of Journalism to hold a detailed focus group of instructional faculty. The focus group was taped and the results were valuable in gaining an understanding of current and future expectations of academic information services. The Libraries conducted a study using the Association of Research Libraries’ LibQUAL product (an extensive user-survey tool) and created a report (RE 5.14: Studies of Library and Information Resources), and individual subject librarians have met with their faculties to discuss issues and receive input on management of the collection. For example, the subject librarian for History met with the faculty of that department as a group and as well as with individual faculty members, in order to determine which books should go into the browsing stacks of the Knowledge Center and which should be placed in the Automated Retrieval System.

These same faculty were recently consulted on the progress of implementing their recommendations. Input is solicited on an ongoing basis via the University’s Knowledge Center website (www.knowledgecenter.unr.edu/contact.html), through which visitors can submit questions about the new facility and suggestions for features and programs.

Library users are also invited to submit comments and suggestions on an ongoing basis through the University Libraries’ website. One recent addition to the Libraries’ services (the establishment of a “quick print” station near the Reference Desk) came about as the result of one such suggestion. The Libraries also provide live online help to the campus at large — both library-related help and answers to more general questions about the University and its services — via “Live Help” links on UNR’s main webpage and the University Libraries main webpage as well.

5.B.5 Computing and communications services are used to extend the boundaries in obtaining information and data from other sources, including regional, national and international networks.

In addition to offering easy off-campus access to nearly all of the University Libraries’ online journals, databases, and other resources, the Libraries regularly gather and distribute information about online resources that are available to the public at no charge; some are provided by the State of Nevada or the federal government, while others are provided by nonprofit entities of various kinds. These resources are identified by green dots on the University Libraries’ alphabetical lists of databases and online journals:

www.library.unr.edu/subjects/databases.aspx

www.library.unr.edu/ejournals/Default.aspx

Several major digital initiatives now make regional and unique historical resources available online to the UNR community (and, in many cases, to the world at large). A growing number of UNR’s large collections of unique primary research and local-interest materials have been digitized and made available to the general public. The collections include:

- 3,000 photographs
- 650 historic Nevada maps
- 421 Agricultural Experiment Station publications (in full text)
- Numerous posters and publications related to Basque culture
These materials, along with many others, are organized into 12 online exhibits, including:

**Images of Lake Tahoe**, a selective collection of historic photographs of the Lake Tahoe region representing a wide range of topics, activities, geographical regions, and time periods.

**Sagebrush Vernacular**, a collection of 120 photographs of rural Nevada architecture.

**Just Passin’ Through**, a collection of early-20th century photographs documenting life along the Lincoln and Victory Highways.

**The Olga Reifschneider Collection**, consisting of 1,580 color slides of plants and trees taken in the northern Nevada and Lake Tahoe region between the 1940s and the 1970s.

Additionally, through the Web-based W.M. Keck Earth Sciences & Mining Research Information Center the Libraries host access to 17,000+ Geographic Information System files focusing on Nevada and the Great Basin, and remote use (via Citrix) of ArcView and ENVI software for geodata analysis of those files.

**Standard 5.C — Facilities and Access**

5.C.1 Library and information resources are readily accessible to all students and faculty. These resources and services are sufficient in quality, level, breadth, quantity, and currency to meet the requirements of the educational program.

Recognizing the central importance of providing both targeted and general support to instruction and research, the UNR Libraries are keenly focused on providing user-centered services and a rich collection of online and printed materials designed to meet the changing curricular and research needs of the UNR community, wherever its members may be. The Libraries accomplish these tasks in a number of ways; such as by:

- Assigning a team of 15 librarians with specific areas of research expertise to liaise with corresponding academic departments
- Participating on campus committees that oversee curriculum development
- Reviewing all proposals for new courses and programs, assessing their feasibility and adding new resources where possible and needed
- Purchasing research materials in the formats best suited to their expected use (which, in a growing majority of cases, means online)
- Making those materials easily available to members of the UNR community both on- and off-campus, from remote locations around the world
- Replacing archival material currently housed in outdated and hard-to-use formats (especially microfilm and microfiche) with online versions, wherever possible
- Refining old finding tools and adapting new ones as students’ and faculty research patterns change
- Making consortial arrangements with other libraries in the region, particularly in the area of online collections, greatly leveraging our purchase power and increasing the effective size of the library collection without impact on local space (RE 5.11: Formal Agreements with Other Libraries)
- Offering real-time online reference services and research assistance via email and “chat” interfaces and by phone as well as traditional desk-based research and reference help; these questions are referred from a “Get Live Help” link on the University’s home page (and therefore deal with non-library issues) as well as from the library page
- Offering in-class orientations and tutorials and customized Web-based online resources and assist students and faculty in their use of library resources
In recent years, the UNR Libraries have taken bold strides in making library services and resources available more quickly, easily, and flexibly to the University community. The Libraries’ early and aggressive adoption of online information technology has made possible new services that build on traditional library offerings and expand them in exciting ways. As an example:

*Online resources are not only individually available from remote locations and at all hours of the day or night, but are also linked together.* The Libraries have taken extensive steps to enhance accessibility of electronic resources by making them interoperable, taking advantage of emerging link-resolution technology that allows seamless navigation from online indexes to online full-text sources. Users who find a citation to a needed article in one database can, in many cases, click through that citation and link directly to the full text of the article in another database. Where online full text is not available, the user is redirected to a request form (already filled out with data drawn from the citation index) and the Libraries purchase a copy of that article, delivering it electronically to the patron usually within 2-3 business days.

*Via Campus Express, graduate students, staff, and faculty can request delivery of books and articles.* The Libraries’ Document Delivery Services department delivers books and photocopies of articles held in Getchell Library, the Life and Health Sciences Library, or the DeLa-Mare Library to the campus offices of staff, faculty, and graduate students. All items are sent to the requestor electronically via email, Campus Mail or delivered directly to the department office, and books are delivered already checked out to the requestor. This service is more than a convenience — it means that library materials are now available to members of the University community for whom a trip to the library may be difficult or even impossible. Since its inception in 2002, usage of Campus Express has grown by nearly 400 percent (from 613 requests in 2002 to 2,397 requests in 2006).

Patron assistance is now available via both email and live “chat” service. For 35 hours each week, a member of the library faculty or staff is available to respond in real time to questions posed via a “Live Help” service using a real-time “chat” interface. Questions come from both inside and outside the campus community, and deal with everything from research problems to questions about the University itself, about the registration and financial aid process, and about the University’s curriculum. When “Live Help” is not available, questions are answered by email via “Ask a Librarian,” “Click and Ask” and webmaster@unr.edu links scattered strategically throughout the University’s and the Libraries’ webspace. These services are among the most conspicuous ways in which the University Libraries are expanding their traditional role as brokers of scholarly information products and becoming a more broadly conceived information service, fully integrated into the University’s everyday life and functioning.

The UNR Libraries have taken and continue to take steps to make all facilities and collections available in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Since most campus library collections are housed in buildings that predate that law, some retrofitting has been necessary and some has not been possible due to limitations imposed by preexisting physical structures. However, the Knowledge Center will be fully ADA-compliant. As more and more of the library research collection moves to the online environment, it becomes increasingly accessible to those with physical limitations and those whose schedules do not mesh with the UNR Libraries’ hours of operation. Wherever possible, the Libraries purchase online products and resources that are in full compliance with Section 508 of the U.S. Rehabilitation Act.

Over the past decade, the University’s information resources have become increasingly popular not only among members of the campus community, but within the general community as well. While the UNR Libraries take seriously the University’s outreach mission as a land-grant institution and continue to seek opportunities to serve the city of Reno and the Northern Nevada region, the combination of limited resources and
a primary obligation to UNR’s faculty and staff (along with very real security concerns) combine to make it necessary to create a more secure mode of network access. Accordingly, the NetID system was put into place in 2003. This system requires all users of the campus network to log in with a University-supplied username and password. Students and employees have unlimited network access, while unaffiliated members of the community are allowed one hour of network access in any given 24-hour period. This system allows the general community to have a reasonable level of access to University resources, while preserving the lion’s share of access for UNR’s primary constituency.

An extraordinary number of IT initiatives carried out since the last accreditation report includes the following:

- Consolidation of primary access points for user assistance
- Improved incident response
- Implementation of a campus-wide standards as represented in the Supported Desktop Platform
- Participation in the implementation of a campus one-card system for purchase of copies, computer printouts, etc.
- Campus-wide management of software and virus protection updates
- Establishment of new policies and practices for secure server management
- Deployment of internal network firewalls
- Creation of backup plans for all core servers

Despite the explosive growth in and great popularity of electronic resources on the University campus, the Libraries — especially Getchell Library — remain an extraordinarily popular physical space for study, collaboration, and socializing (RE 5.3: Statistics on Library Use). Accordingly, Library management has made it a priority to expand and optimize the Libraries’ study spaces to the greatest degree possible, given existing physical constraints. As of 2006, the Libraries offer seating for 1,649 students and 331 computer workstations (an increase of 20 percent over 2005, and a four-fold increase since 1995). Getchell Library also offers a computer training lab, a projection room for lectures and video presentations, a video conferencing facility, and three group study rooms. The Libraries’ ongoing struggles with insufficient space, an idiosyncratic HVAC system, and a decades-old electrical infrastructure will be resolved by the move into the Knowledge Center in 2008 — a move that will also result in a dramatic increase in accommodating study spaces, student seating, ubiquitous computer access, and instructional facilities.

5.C.2 In cases of cooperative arrangements with other library and information resources, formal documented agreements are established. These cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources complement rather than substitute for the institution’s own adequate and accessible core collection and services.

As indicated in response to similar questions above, the UNR Libraries’ collections are fully sufficient to support the research and curriculum needs of the campus community. However, supplemental agreements are in place with other institutions in order to provide for occasional specific needs that may require materials outside the regular scope of the collections, and to make UNR Libraries materials accessible to collaborating partners. UNR is a member of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), a nonprofit library cooperative that administers a comprehensive union catalog and broker’s interlibrary loan, among many other services. The UNR Libraries — as a node in the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) Clearinghouse — provide metadata for and remote access to nearly 10,000 Geographic Information System files. Since 2003, the Libraries have also been members of LINK+, a group of 40 West Coast libraries that provide an expedited and nearly seamless interlibrary loan service to each other. As mentioned above, the UNR Libraries also participate in a number of local and regional consortia, through which they are able to leverage discounts and acquire access to many online resources that would otherwise be significantly more expensive or out of reach altogether.
These include:

- Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC)
- Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)
- Amigos
- Alliance for Innovation in Science and Technology Information (AISTI)
- EPSCoR Science Information Group (ESIG)

Some of these relationships are formal, and documents related to those are included with the exhibits; others proceed on an ad hoc or project-by-project basis (RE 5.11: Formal Agreements with Other Libraries).

**Standard 5.D — Personnel and Management**

**5.D.1** The institution employs a sufficient number of library and information resources staff to provide assistance to users of the library and to students at other learning resources sites.

Compared to peer institutions, the UNR Libraries are thinly staffed. As Table 5.5 illustrates, in a list that includes five peer institutions and UNR, the UNR Libraries are at the bottom in terms of staff levels.

Faced with a workforce that has remained relatively unchanged in numbers for more than 25 years, the UNR Libraries have worked assiduously to reinvent processes and procedures through streamlining workflows and improving services, realizing economies of scale wherever possible. The Libraries’ close relationship to Campus Computing and Teaching/Learning Technologies has made it possible to integrate many information services with the curriculum, and the Libraries continue to seek out and explore new ways of doing so. UNR’s organizational structure, which combines the Libraries and Information Technology units into a single division under the administrative oversight of a single vice president, has made it possible to blend information services and technological support in a way designed to make all of those services more transparent and easily accessible to students and faculty. Efforts to optimize and capitalize on inherent synergies among disparate information organizations are ongoing, and viewed as an organic organization that adapts readily in today’s rapidly changing information environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5</th>
<th>Staffing Levels at UNR and Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State U.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn U.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State U.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State U.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.D.2** Library and information resources staff include qualified professional and technical support staff, with required specific competencies, whose responsibilities are clearly defined.

The UNR Libraries’ 23 librarians are all fully qualified professionals with terminal degrees in the library and information science field (RD 5.10: Vitae of Professional Library Staff). Professional development is both required as part of the tenure-track system, and encouraged as a matter of culture in the Libraries; in recent years librarians have written several books and scores of articles in peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed professional journals. Tenure requirements are included as part of CD 5.4, as are current job descriptions for all professional librarian positions.
5.D.3 The institution provides opportunities for professional growth for library and information resources professional staff.

Librarians attend regional, national, and international conferences and publish regularly in refereed and non-refereed professional journals. As illustrated by the librarians’ curricula vitae (RD 5.10: Vitae of Professional Library Staff), members of the Library faculty are invited to join advisory boards, to provide consulting services, and to present papers at national and international conferences on a regular basis. The University Libraries provide annual funding of $25,596 in support of staff travel to conferences and other professional meetings, and library administration encourages the professional staff to seek out opportunities for externally supported participation in such events as well.

5.D.4 Library and information resources and services are organized to support the accomplishment of institutional mission and goals. Organizational arrangements recognize the need for service linkage among complementary resource bases (e.g. libraries, computing facilities, instructional media and telecommunication centers).

The University of Nevada, Reno has long recognized the logical connection between campus information systems and services in general and library services in particular. In the mid-1990s, the University institutionalized that relationship, merging the University Libraries and Information Technology into a single division. Although the structural organization within the division has changed over more than a decade, the Vice President for Information Technology/Dean of University Libraries has reported to the President of the University throughout this time. This arrangement has made possible an unusually close relationship between those charged with acquiring and providing access to information resources and those who maintain the systems through which the resources are delivered. The Vice President for IT/Dean of Libraries meets regularly with managers in both areas. A current organization chart is included as RE 5.8.

5.D.5 The institution consults library and information resources staff in curriculum development.

As indicated above (in response to 5.A.3), UNR has a procedure in place to ensure that UNR Libraries staff are consulted whenever a new class is added to the curriculum. In addition, librarians serve on such University committees as the Core Curriculum Board and the University Courses and Curriculum Committee; at least one librarian always serves as a member of the Faculty Senate as well, ensuring that the Libraries are kept up-to-date on more general conversations and trends relating to the University curriculum.

5.D.6 The institution provides sufficient financial support for library and information resources and services, and for their maintenance and security.

Compared to peer institutions, the UNR Libraries are funded at an average level, though the rate of growth in funding has slowed over the past several years. As Table 5.6 illustrates, the 2006-07 budgets for the UNR Libraries place UNR fourth in rank in a list including five peer institutions. A detailed budget is presented in RE 5.9: Comprehensive Budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn U.</td>
<td>$12,342,094</td>
<td>$4,414,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State U.</td>
<td>$10,544,416</td>
<td>$5,061,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State U.</td>
<td>$10,474,916</td>
<td>$5,385,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>$9,007,464</td>
<td>$4,583,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State U.</td>
<td>$7,309,100</td>
<td>$3,173,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>$6,814,882</td>
<td>$2,489,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 5.E — Planning and Evaluation

5.E.1 The institution has a planning process that involves users, library and information resource staff, faculty, and administrators.

Since 2001, the University Libraries have devoted considerable time and effort to strategic planning, and have produced several iterations of detailed strategic plan documents (the most recent of which is included as CD 5.1: IT/Library Strategic Plan).

For the past seven years, planning for the University Libraries has meant planning for the construction of and the move into the Knowledge Center. All UNR constituencies have been involved, at various levels, throughout the planning process. This active solicitation of campus involvement continues, and will be expanded as the move into the new building approaches. Planned strategies include:

- Recruiting UNR students to join formal planning groups as paid participants, with a particular focus on Technology/Multimedia Services, Communications/Events, and the Knowledge Center Website
- Recruiting faculty involvement in planning groups for Art, Communications/Events, Building Operations, Faculty/Graduate Reading Room, and Public Spaces
- Inviting UNR students, faculty, and staff to test furnishings being considered for the Knowledge Center’s public areas

5.E.2 The institution, in its planning, recognizes the need for management and technical linkages among information resource bases (e.g., libraries, instructional computing, media production and distribution centers, and telecommunications networks).

In recognition of this need, UNR has integrated the University Libraries and Information Technologies (including Campus Computing, Campus Information Systems, Teaching & Learning Technologies, the Multimedia Center, public radio KUNR, and networking and the campus telephone system), under the direction of a single administrator, under whom planning for all areas proceeds with a unified view of the needs of the campus community. This vision of integrated information systems and services deeply informed the physical design of the Knowledge Center and will do the same for its organizational structure (which is currently in the process of revision).

5.E.3 The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, and utilization of its library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, and at all locations where courses, programs, or degrees are offered. The institution uses the results of the evaluations to improve the effectiveness of these resources.

As noted in response to 5.B.4 above, in 2005 the University Libraries conducted an extensive examination of the quality of its resources and services using the Association of Research Libraries’ LibQUAL survey tool (the report is included as RE 5.14: Studies of Library and Information Resources). The input received from that survey, along with input solicited from the UNR community during preparation for the move into the Knowledge Center, will continue to inform the Libraries’ ongoing quality initiatives.
Standard Five Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

Strengths: Library and Information Resources

- Strong and expanding online resources and services
- Exciting vision for the future, as embodied in the Knowledge Center
- Experienced staff with strong connections to academic departments and programs

Challenges: Library and Information Resources

- Anticipating and responding to a dramatically changing research environment
- High rate of inflation in costs of resource materials
- Chronic understaffing of libraries; this is particularly acute in light of the fall 2008 opening of the Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center

Recommendations: Library and Information Resources

- Fund Libraries with the full amount the state provides to the campus based on the funding generated by the state's formula for academic library resources. Presently, the campus uses a significant portion of the funds the library formula generates for other purposes.
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Standard Six — Governance and Administration

Standard 6.A — Governance System

The institution’s system of governance facilitates the successful accomplishment of its mission and goals.

6.A.1 The system of governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in a constitution, charter, bylaws, or equivalent policy document.

The University of Nevada was established by the Constitution of the State of Nevada, which provides at Article 11, Section 4 that the University shall “… be controlled by a Board of Regents whose duties shall be prescribed by Law.” The 13 Regents represent geographically defined districts that are equally apportioned by population and are elected to six-year terms of office (RD 6.1: Board Membership). The Regents set policies and approve budgets for Nevada’s entire public system of higher education which consists of four community colleges, a state college, two universities and one research institute. The system changed its name in 2005 to Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to reflect the diversity of institutions.

The governing documents for the system are found in the Board of Regents Handbook (RE 6.2a). It is comprised of five titles that describe the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among the governing board and the institutions, and their constituents. Title 1 includes the Bylaws, Title 2 is the NSHE CODE, the governing policies for the system, Title 3 is the Legal Status of the System, Title 4 includes Codification of the Board of Regents Policies, and Title 5 includes the governing documents of each of the institutions. These documents are subject to amendment and approval by the Board of Regents. The documents are easily accessed online at the NSHE website www.system.nevada.edu.

The Chancellor of the NSHE, the chief executive officer for the system, carries out the policies and decisions of the Regents. The Chancellor heads a system staff of Vice Chancellors and their staffs and oversees the Presidents of the institutions. The Chancellor has also received new responsibilities as the Regents have further clarified their role as policy makers and delegated more administrative authority to the Chancellor. The organizational charts for the system and UNR further define reporting lines and responsibilities (RD 6.2: Organizational Charts: BOR and UNR).

The Regents Handbook defines the overall institutional organization for the system and member institutions. The UNR Bylaws, also subject to Regent approval, provide organizational detail specific to UNR (RE 6.1: University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws). The University Administrative Manual (RE 6.3) details the procedures that carry out the specifics of the Handbook and Bylaws. The UNR Bylaws have recently undergone revision and await formal approval from the President and BOR. The University Administrative Manual is continuously revised. The Regents Handbook defines faculty and student roles. It also delineates provisions for faculty and student governance.

6.A.2 The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff and students understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth by the governance system's official documents.

The Mission Statement of the Board of Regents states: “The Board of Regents wishes to advance student learning to the highest level, foster the expansion of knowledge through teaching and research, encourage community service, and enrich the lives of our students, our communities, our state, and the nation. In fulfillment of this purpose, we hold the following values at the center of our endeavor: Integrity, Excellence,
Accountability, Inclusiveness, Creativity and Innovation.”

The Board of Regents convenes approximately eight times per year to meet the needs of the system and to fulfill their responsibilities. The agenda covers all areas of responsibility for the system and addresses the issues of each individual institution. Typically a standard agenda will address: informational items from the Chancellor, staff, and invited guests; action items pertaining to handbook changes, policy reviews, approval of subcommittee recommendations, and expenditures; reports from staff and Presidents; approval of certain contracts and salaries; and review of Regent actions (RE 6.2b: Board of Regents Meeting Agendas and Meeting Minutes). The standing committees of the Regents (CD 6.1: Regents Committees) address important system and institutional issues such as academic and student affairs and provide fiscal oversight. New committees are convened to address important issues such as the committee on Diversity and Security, and the Committee on Research and Economic Development. In addition, special committees are convened for purposes of Presidential evaluation and system searches (Chancellor and Presidents) and ad hoc committees constituted to address specific items (past committees on health care workforce, faculty workload and current committees on Information Technology and Health Sciences Center). All recommendations of the committees are voted on by the full board. Minutes of all board meetings are available online.

The University administration, headed by the President, is responsible for the functioning of the campus as delegated in the Regents Handbook. The President creates the administrative structure that best serves the administrative needs of the campus. The President reports to the Chancellor and through him, to the Regents. The President also serves as an Officer of NSHE and has the responsibility to carry out the policies approved by the Regents. UNR Bylaws, which are consistent with the Regents Handbook, provide more detailed policies of the campus. The University Administrative Manual details procedures. The college and departments bylaws (under the purview of faculty committees) provide further specifics, defining many areas of faculty performance and detailing the level of achievement for promotion and tenure. In addition, college and department bylaws identify administrative functions and operating policies, student admission and performance criteria, faculty and student committee structures, and committee functions. College and department bylaws, which now follow a Faculty Senate-created Bylaw Template, are reviewed as needed.

UNR committees, the Faculty Senate and its committees, the Staff Employees’ Council (SEC) and staff committees, and the Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN) are all authorized and active in the governance process. The roles of administrators, faculty, staff and students are included in the governing documents at the system, University, and department levels. Committee reports, Faculty Senate minutes, ASUN activities, and revised UNR bylaws all attest to the active participation and understanding of roles and responsibilities of the campus community.

6.A.3 The system of governance makes provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest.

In the Regents Handbook, Title 1, Bylaws, Chapter V, Section 11, the procedures for campus, faculty and student input are defined for Board of Regent consideration (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook). At all Regents meetings, the Faculty Senate chairs and the Student Association presidents are acknowledged and officially seated. The Chancellor (or designee) routinely briefs the Faculty Senate chairs (Council of Faculty Senate Chairs) about upcoming issues and seeks input prior to each Regent meeting. CODE and policy changes that involve faculty are discussed and jointly worked on. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs briefs the Student Association presidents on upcoming issues regarding students and solicits their input. Faculty and students introduce changes for Regent consideration through their Presidents. Recent
examples of major changes initiated by University faculty and students include:

- Faculty-initiated CODE changes occurred with revision of evaluation criteria for academic faculty (2004);
- Students at UNR received approval for construction of a new student union (funded with student fees) from the Regents (2004).

Representatives of staff employees do not regularly attend BOR meetings as they are technically state employees and not governed directly by the Regents. Employment rights for staff are covered under the Nevada Administrative Code, although traditional “academic freedom” rights are also extended to staff through the Regents Handbook. In cases where policy affecting staff is being considered, representatives of staff employees will attend BOR meetings.

There are clear procedural guarantees for faculty, student, and to a lesser extent staff input into the Regent’s decision-making. In the campus accreditation survey, faculty and staff overwhelmingly view the role of the BOR as providing representation for the needs of UNR within the overall state system. However, faculty and staff are less certain about the level of communication between UNR and the BOR (Table 6.1).

### Table 6.1
Campus Accreditation Survey: Role of the Regents (Percentage of respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents role is to attend to the needs of UNR within the system of higher education. n=1285</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between UNR and the Board of Regents. n=1285</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.A.4 In a multi-unit governance system (state or district), the division of authority, and responsibility between the central system office and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered. The division of authority and responsibility between the NSHE office and campus is a changing area. The Chancellor, as CEO of the system, has defined a more centralized process for many decisions and procedures. Although the Regents Handbook clearly states areas of responsibility and authority for UNR, centralized processes for contracting, budget development, capital prioritization, and real estate management do reduce some of the authority of UNR administration. As part of the accreditation review, all Deans and Vice Presidents at UNR were interviewed and specifically asked about various aspects of communication and cooperation between the campus and the system office (CD 6.2: Executive Administrators Survey Instrument). Nearly all of these upper-level administrators reported there are good working relationships between NSHE staff and UNR administration, but centralized procedures slow administrative activities and reduce autonomy. A recent system decision made without sufficient University input or consultation negatively impacted virtually all aspects of the University. As a result of the System implementing a policy to reduce tuition rates for California students as part of WUE, the University faced a reduction of mid-year revenue, and all colleges and administration — without sufficient notice — had to shrink their budgets. Although it reflects a good neighbor policy for the system, this critical decision was not adequately discussed with UNR, thus creating negative feelings about cooperation. The UNR administration recognizes this example as a symptom of the growing pains of the system requiring work to improve and clarify the division of authority.
Most policies and procedures are consistent throughout the system, but some are specific to the universities, the community colleges, the state college, and the research institute. Between the universities there are concerns about equitable administration of system policies. Although relatively minor, inconsistencies in application of rules for hosting (table purchases in support of community activities), athletic department activities, and audit procedures create some ill-will. Perhaps the most major difference in implementation of policy concerns interpretation by legal counsel. Each campus has separate legal counsel and aspects of policies and procedures can be interpreted differently at each campus. For the vast majority of functions, however, the system policies are clear and apply to all campuses equally.

Standard 6.B — Governing Board

The governing board is ultimately responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution (or institutions in the case of the multi-unit system). The Board selects a chief executive officer, considers and approves the mission of the institution, is concerned with the provision of adequate funds, and exercises broad-based oversight to ensure compliance with institutional policies. The board establishes broad institutional policies, and delegates to the chief executive officer the responsibility to implement and administer these policies.

6.B.1 The board includes adequate representation of the public interest and/or the diverse elements of the institution’s constituencies and does not include a predominant representation by employees of the institution. The president may be an ex officio member of the board, but not its chair. Policies are in place that provide for continuity and change of board membership.

The Board of Regents of the NSHE is composed of elected representatives from districts defined by the Legislature. The districts are based on population density. The majority of the Regents are elected from the Las Vegas area with one regent position designated as a rural representative. Redistricting is done by the Legislature every ten years and follows closely the federal census report. Currently, 13 Regents serve for six years with staggered terms to ensure continuity. No rules preclude faculty from being elected to the Board of Regents: currently one Regent is a professor on the UNR campus. All Presidents, including the UNR President, serve as Officers of the System and are advisory to the Regents with no voting privileges.

6.B.2 The board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the board acts in place of the board except by formal delegation of authority.

The Board of Regents can conduct business only as a full committee as stated in the Bylaws (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 1). The subcommittees, each chaired by a Regent, hold meetings and vote to bring recommendations for full board discussion and vote. No recommendation becomes policy until voted on by a quorum of the Board. The Chair and Vice Chair are elected annually by the Regents and can be elected to more than one term. The Board Chair appoints the chairs of all the subcommittees, is responsible for the agenda and presiding over the meetings, and is delegated authority to serve as board spokesperson.

6.B.3 The duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board are clearly defined in a published policy document.

The Regent’s duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure and operating procedures are found in various titles and sections of the Regents Handbook (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook). The Bylaws (Title 1) define major responsibilities, the CODE provides more detail, and Title 4 provides most of the operating detail including an ethical requirement section (Title 4, Chapter 2). In addition, the Regents Handbook underwent a reorganization in 2005 that took out many of the procedures found in Title 4 and put them into a Procedures and Guidelines Manual (CD 6.3).
All these materials are online in a searchable database. Amendments to the Regents Handbook, which occur periodically, require two Board hearings of the proposed changes, usually in two consecutive meetings, and require a 2/3 majority of the Board for most sections. Amended sections of the Regents Handbook become policy when approved and a notation of the amendment date in parenthesis follows the amended sections.

As elected officials, the Board operates under the open meeting laws of Nevada (CD 6.4: Nevada Revised Statutes, 241.010-241.040) which makes the Board publicly accountable to the citizens of Nevada. The operational procedures of the Board have been revised to strengthen this procedure and chief counsel is always present during all deliberations. All meetings of all committees and the full board, must be properly announced in advance of the meetings so that the public may attend. The agendas also undergo legal review to ensure that all Nevada State and Board of Regent laws and/or policies are followed. The need to enforce all nuances of the open meeting law for the Regents was spurred by legal suits and allegations of improper deliberation surrounding the termination of a Community College President four years ago. A negotiated agreement with the Attorney General and appointment of a new chief counsel has substantially reduced such problems.

6.B.4 Consistent with established board policy, the board selects, appoints, and regularly evaluates the chief executive officer.

The Regent Bylaws establish the policy for Presidential appointment and evaluation. The CODE, Section 1.5.3, defines the process for selection of a President. The Board of Regents is responsible for this function. Each Presidential search committee is composed of six Regents and the Board Chair selects the Search Committee Chair. A campus committee composed of faculty, staff, students and administrators advises the Regent search committee. The Chancellor’s office coordinates the search for the Regents, typically through a national search, and top candidates are brought forward to the committee for review. With the open meeting law, only the top 5 or 6 candidates are brought to the open meeting for discussion. The presence of the open meeting law has been felt to hamper some searches because a candidate cannot remain anonymous in the process. However, candidates who do agree to the process are supportive of the environment and have been of excellent caliber. Faculty, staff and students are part of the search process as open meetings are scheduled and formal interviews are held with faculty and student representatives as well as internal and external members of the campus community. Faculty and staff are encouraged to submit written evaluation comments to the search committee. The Regent search committee makes the recommendation for hire, after consideration of the campus committee advisory vote, and the Chancellor negotiates the contract. The Board of Regents must approve the contract for hire at a full board meeting. This meeting can be conducted as a special meeting to ensure timeliness. UNR’s new President, Dr. Milton Glick, was recently appointed (August 2006) after a search that took approximately nine months and that closely followed the procedure outlined above.

Presidents undergo annual self-evaluations that are reviewed by the Chancellor. Every three years the Board of Regents conducts a formal review. The procedure for this review, which was most recently amended in 2003 under the then-Chancellor’s direction, can be found in the Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 2, Section 2 (CD 6.3). A specially appointed Regent committee is selected, typically composed of three Regents and campus and community representatives. It is chaired by an outside evaluator selected from among knowledgeable peers. The Chancellor (or designee) acts as an ex officio member of the committee. With the open meeting law requirements, a legal counsel is present for all meetings, and interviews — considered closed sessions — are conducted to gain information only. When the evaluation committee convenes to deliberate and discuss, the meeting is opened and minutes are taken. The evaluation committee chair summarizes the results of the evaluation and presents them to the Board in
a regular open meeting. Based on the evaluation findings, contract details are discussed and voted on. The last Presidential evaluation at UNR was conducted with Dr. John Lilley in 2005 and resulted in a contract renewal and increase in pay. Dr. Milton Glick will be evaluated in 2009.

6.B.5 The board regularly reviews and approves the institution’s mission. It approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas. It approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs.

The Board of Regents regularly reviews the University’s programs of study, degrees, certificates and diplomas through the Academic and Student Affairs subcommittee of the Board. This subcommittee is staffed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who convenes the Academic Vice Presidents and Provosts in the academic affairs council to more fully discuss academic initiatives. By the time a proposal for a new or amended program reaches the Regents, it has already undergone campus review on multiple levels (departmental review, college review, UNR Course and Curriculum Committee) with approval by the Provost and/or President. The proposal for program, degree and/or certificate, must be presented in a set format and justified to the Regents in terms of mission, strategic direction, student need, financing and resource needs (CD 6.3: Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 6, Academic Procedures).

Strategic planning, done periodically by all campuses, is reviewed by the Regents. The current University of Nevada, Reno Strategic Plan was presented by Dr. Lilley in 2004 and proposed substantial changes for campus mission and planning for a five-year period. The Plan was approved by the Regents in 2004. Following this substantive proposal for change, The University’s College of Arts and Science split to form the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science. The School of Mines became a program under the College of Science. Departments were reorganized into Science, Liberal Arts, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources or Engineering. Additionally, the College of Education underwent reorganization. These changes were all presented, discussed and approved by the Regents. To assess implementation and problems, the Board often requests follow-ups on major program revisions. For example, because the Mackay School of Mines had a rocky integration into the College of Science, the Board requested reports on this at least two times.

6.B.6 The board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

The Board of Regents adopted a Master Plan for the NSHE that was revised in 2005 (CD 6.5: System Master Plan). The plan clearly delineates goals and objectives for the higher educational system and sets benchmarks and timelines for achievement. The progress towards these goals is evaluated annually. The Board of Regents routinely evaluates the effectiveness and accountability of both its internal policies and external initiatives. Amendments to the Regents Handbook are regularly proposed. As discussed in 6.B.3 the Regents Handbook underwent a reorganization in 2005 that took out many of the procedures found in Title 4 and put them into a Procedures and Guidelines Manual (CD 6.3). The impetus for this change came from system staff and institutional administrators who felt that procedural changes, not policy changes, could more effectively and efficiently be done through the Chancellor’s office with institutional advisory committee input. The Regents agreed and this change has worked well.

Board members attend national conferences to keep abreast of issues facing higher education, and board development training is conducted annually. For example, in response to national concerns about gender and diversity within systems of higher education and NSHE in particular, the Board reconvened the committee for Cultural Diversity and Security. To address the severe shortage of health professionals within the state, the Board convened a Health Professions
committee and requested a report for recommendations to address this workforce problem at a system-level. Institutions were charged to report on ways to address the problem of increasing the number of nurses, dentists, and pharmacists in Nevada including necessary financial support. Budgeting priorities follow system initiatives. At the last legislative session (2005), for instance, a consolidated budget request supported all the institutions in their efforts to expand the number of nursing graduates.

With the close relationship between the Legislature and the Board of Regents, many legislative responsibilities carry direct consequences for the NSHE. Most importantly, the Legislature approves the budget request for the NSHE. The Board has revised and strengthened its lobbying policy, with the Chancellor designated as the director of the lobbying efforts (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Section 24). This policy has proven effective and efficient in outcome and in implementation. The Regents’ decisions are clearly communicated to the Legislature, allowing for consistent and responsive contact.

6.B.7 The board ensures that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size and complexity. It approves an academic and administrative structure or organization to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management.

The Board of Regents hires the President to ensure effective and efficient management and “To provide leadership in the planning and implementation necessary for successful operation of the member institution and to ensure that the institution develops to its potential. (B/R 9/05)” (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 1, Article 7). The President is responsible for hiring administrative staff with the exception of Vice Presidents, which must be approved by the Chancellor. Each campus President defines administrative structure and administers the budget to provide needed functions, with the authority and responsibility for institutional management. Presidents report significant changes and introduce new administrators to the BOR.

The funding formula that drives the NSHE budget (see Standard Seven) covers administrative costs. The academic organization is laid out in the UNR bylaws that are approved by the President and Board of Regents. The chief administrative officers of the colleges or schools are Deans and/or Directors and they are hired by and report to the Provost/President without Regents approval.

6.B.8 The board approves the annual budget and the long-range financial plan, and reviews periodic fiscal audit reports.

Through the Budget and Finance Committee, the Board oversees the preparation of the bi-annual budget request that goes before the Legislature for approval. The budget includes all institutions with formula funding based on student FTE and type of programs (lower- or upper-level courses, undergraduate or graduate courses) for the base budget. In addition, a number of UNR programs are funded through line items including the School of Medicine, Cooperative Extension, and Agricultural Experiment Stations. Budget enhancements and capital budgets for construction for specific UNR programs are voted on and prioritized by the Regents. Once the budget is done — a process that involves all the financial officers of the institutions — the NSHE Vice Chancellor for finance, the Presidents, government affairs staff, and the Regents discuss and vote on the final budget before forwarding it to the Legislature through the Governor. The Chancellor heads the lobbying effort to promote
full funding of the budget. UNR works with NSHE staff throughout the year to review budget expenditures and long-term financial plans. The Regents, through their audit committee, regularly schedule fiscal audits at UNR (CD 6.6: Schedule of Audits). Budget reconciliations are followed routinely by the Budget and Finance subcommittee of the Regents.

6.B.9 The board is knowledgeable of the institution's accreditation status and is involved, as appropriate, in the accrediting process.

The Board has been apprised of the on-going self-study for accreditation and will meet with reviewers during the site visit. The final Accreditation report will likely be reviewed and discussed during a Regents’ meeting. The Regents will make recommendations and will oversee follow-up.

Standard 6.C — Leadership and Management

The chief executive officer provides leadership through the definition of institutional goals, establishment of priorities, and the development of plans. The administration and staff are organized to support the teaching and learning environment which results in the achievement of the institution’s mission and goals.

6.C.1 The chief executive officer’s full-time responsibility is to the institution.

As stated in the UNR Bylaws and Board of Regents Handbook, the President is the chief executive officer of the University. The duties of the President are outlined in the Regents Handbook (RE 6.2: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 1, Chapter 1, Article 7, Section 4) and in contract statements. The President has a full-time employment contract.

6.C.2 The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of the institution's administrators are clearly defined and published. Administrators act in a manner consistent with them.

As chief executive officer, the President hires and defines the jobs for the Executive Vice President/Provost and other Vice Presidents. Under President Lilley, there was a reorganization in the administrative offices that included: creation of an Office of Informational Technology with a new Vice President reporting to the President, separation of the Development Office from the Office of Marketing and Communication, creation of a Vice President for Health Sciences (Dean of School of Medicine), conversion to on-campus legal counsel and creation of a Provost position from the Vice President for academic affairs position (RD 6.2: Organizational Charts: UNR). The Executive VP/Provost position was charged with all internal affairs including academic affairs, faculty hiring and contracts, and day-to-day oversight of the Deans. The new President, Dr. Glick, has indicated that he intends to be more involved in campus affairs and is working with the Provost to clarify his expectations. Any administrative changes in this position will be communicated to the campus community.

The Vice Presidents (VPs) with executive administrative positions are responsible for assisting the President in administering the institution. Their jobs are defined and approved by the President. The Vice Presidents meet with the President to clarify and update their roles. Typically, the VPs have either role statements from annual evaluations (personnel document and confidential) or job descriptions from their public hiring, both of which are written (RE 6.4: Administrative Position Descriptions). PDQs (position description questionnaires) define the positions under the VPs and Deans. These are updated annually and published, although they are not yet online. It is anticipated that all these positions will be available online during the next two years.
From interviews linked to the accreditation process, the Deans indicated that official job descriptions existed in ¾ths of colleges, either as a separate job description or identified by role statements. Although not published, the Deans felt they had a good understanding of expectations by the Provost that were defined in goals (role statements) for each year. New hires had descriptions of their jobs in the job offer. Since role statements are part of the personnel process, they are confidential. College bylaws often contain the broad duties of a Dean (five Deans mentioned this). All Deans felt that the goals set between them and the Provost/President defined their jobs, but they had flexibility to achieve these goals as they could within their colleges. The only ambiguity in job descriptions was voiced by the three Deans who also serve as Vice Presidents (Graduate School Dean/VP for Research, SOM Dean/VP for Health Sciences, Dean of Libraries/VP of IT). They were unclear about which job description was best, and agreed with the other Deans that goal achievement was a better way to define their jobs.

Current policies on ethical conduct apply to all faculty and administrators. These policies include a conflict of interest statement that must be signed by faculty (CD 6.7: Conflict of Interest Form), a signed statement regarding nepotism (CD 6.8: Nepotism Form), the oath administered to all faculty employees (CD 6.9: Faculty Oath), and a signed statement on hire that all materials (transcripts, degrees, etc.) submitted in support of the position are true (CD 6.10: Personal Certification of Documents Form). All VPs understand the high standards they work under and their accountability to the public through the President and Regents. Deans, who work under no stated separate ethical requirements, felt bound by an implied ethical standard defined in state law and in the NSHE CODE.

As “customers” of administration, the Deans agreed that the Vice Presidents were professionals who supported the schools and colleges. All Deans felt they had a good relationship with UNR Administration (either good or mostly good) and most of the Deans felt that the central administration effectively supported the institution and their colleges/schools. President Lilley, during his tenure, centralized many activities into the newly created Provost’s office. The four years of Dr. Lilley’s administration were a transition for the Deans as they were asked to give up some of their traditional roles (i.e. elements of budget control with a changed salary savings policy) and refocus on other roles (i.e. external fundraising). These role redefinitions required the Deans to develop a new relationship with the Provost and to work under new procedures. They learned to use the Provost’s office staff effectively and were complimentary of the efforts of that staff. The Deans agreed for the most part that they had a very good relationship with the Provost. Not surprisingly, the Deans with the longest tenure were less pleased with the arrangement than new Deans hired over the last four years. The majority of Deans were satisfied with the current centralized administration with the exception of the budget process and lengthy legal reviews and approvals.

6.C.3 Administrators are qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management. The chief executive officer is responsible for implementing appropriate procedures to evaluate administrators regularly.

Executive administrative positions require experienced and highly qualified applicants; thus, the stated qualifications for each job were uniformly felt to sufficiently provide for effective leadership. With the exception of the Provost, all current Vice Presidents were recruited from outside the institution, most from national searches. Examples of recent searches and outcomes: President, Dr. Milton Glick; Marketing and Communications Vice President, Cindy Pollard; Health Sciences/SOM Dean, John A. McDonald, MD, PhD; Development and Alumni Affairs Vice President, John Carothers (originally hired for the Associate VP position in a national search and subsequently appointed to the VP position by Dr. Lilley). The Provost, the first for UNR, was recruited from the College of Science and provided context and information for Dr. Lilley as a new President. In some areas, administrators interviewed for the accreditation felt it
was hard to recruit candidates because of salary ranges and the high cost-of-living (development in particular) but others felt that because UNR was a preferred organization to work for, the position searches drew highly skilled individuals.

As mandated in the CODE and UNR bylaws, all administrators are evaluated annually. The process of evaluation for executive administrators must include input from the staff employed in each unit. Each Vice President submits a yearly evaluation that includes the accomplishments of the prior year based on previous goals and suggests goals for the upcoming year (role or goal statement). Half of the Vice Presidents have a personnel committee within their office that contributes to their evaluation. The evaluations of the VPs are reviewed by the President who agrees with or suggests goals for the upcoming year. The annual evaluation and role statement is considered a personnel document and thus is not made public.

The Provost or President (most recently, the Provost) evaluates Deans. All Deans use role statements as the basis for their self evaluation. During the evaluative process, the Provost consults with the faculty of the unit, which is, in some cases, a personnel committee or other formal structure. This process has been better standardized over the last five years with CODE changes and UNR bylaw reviews. The results of the evaluation are confidential; however, the Deans consider a variety of other efforts as public evidence of accomplishment. Two Deans share their evaluation with their Advisory group for the college. Colleges with annual or public reports feel the college accomplishments reflect well on their administrative efforts. The Deans conduct annual evaluations of their associate and assistant Deans and other directly reporting lines annually.

6.C.4 Institutional advancement activities (which may include development and fund raising, institutional relations, alumni and parent programs) are clearly and directly related to the mission and goals of the institution.

There is a direct correlation between institutional advancement and the goals and missions of the institution and its respective units. Capital needs are directly tied to the missions of the institution for education and research, especially with the increasing number of students. While there is no stated policy, the operating expectation of the Regents and NSHE is that institutions must raise matching funds for building projects. Development staff is challenged to provide the means to do this and the policy puts a premium on the President as the primary voice of the campus to potential donors. Within the past three years, an intensive campaign has been conducted for the new state-of-the-art Knowledge Center, considered essential to support the academic mission. In all, $28 million was raised for the building to be completed in 2008. Following approval in the last Legislative session, fundraising has commenced for the new Math and Science building, which will include office space, laboratories and class rooms. The goal for this campaign is $22 million. In addition to capital campaigns, funds raised through institutional advancement also support student scholarships, faculty research, and outreach efforts.

The Office of Development and Alumni Affairs underwent reorganization during Dr. Lilley’s tenure, separating from the Office of Marketing and Communication. This separation provides more focus on fundraising and centralizes fundraising efforts. The President, who sets the Development goals, is actively involved in fundraising efforts. To organize donor and alumni information, data systems were purchased and implemented; experienced development officers were recruited; and effective management practices were implemented for Foundation activities.

Established in May 1981, the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation attracts private financial support and manages assets for the maximum benefit of the University. The Foundation is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of alumni, community leaders, business leaders and other friends of the University. The Foundation is a 501(c)3 organization. The staff of the University supports the Foundation’s operation. The Foundation is the central fundraising organization for all academic and public service pro-
grams. Within most colleges or like academic units on campus, a development officer works with the central office to assist academic Deans in support of development and advancement goals. The development officers report both to the Dean and to the VP for Development and Alumni Affairs.

The Alumni Office, part of the Development Office, has grown to advance ongoing relationships with alumni through support of the alumni association and community outreach. Alumni populate the Legislature, businesses throughout the state, and influential positions nationally.

6.C.5 Administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely.

During Dr. Lilley’s tenure, many support services were centralized under the direction of the Provost and designated administrative offices. This changed an established decision-making process that had previously focused on the President making most final decisions and Deans granted more autonomy in daily decisions (a decentralized model). The results of these organizational and decision-making changes have been mixed. Overall, the centralized model provided improvement in timeliness and effectiveness from central administrative offices but reduced consultation. In interviews conducted for the accreditation, most Deans felt that central administration has attempted to “balance quick decisions with fall out,” but fall out from quick decisions occurred primarily when policy changes were not adequately vetted. Communication across campus also lagged behind implementation, and consultations were not publicized which produced a perception that some policy changes occurred with no meaningful faculty and staff input. As Table 6.2 illustrates, more than half of campus faculty and staff disagreed with the statement that policy changes were clearly explained in advance or that faculty and staff were sufficiently involved with campus decision-making.

Timely decision-making has depended on the topic. For example, tenure decisions are made rapidly, since criteria are governed and delineated by the CODE. Conversely, UNR reorganization required a very slow and deliberate process governed by the Regents Handbook, the UNR bylaws and Faculty Senate bylaws with multiple levels of consultation. It took about 15 months before decisions were made and implementation started. NSHE processes for legal review of contracts, for centralized signature authority, and for capital project management have hampered timeliness.

For policy matters over which UNR administrators exercise more direct control, many central administrative offices hold themselves to a goal of an improved turnaround time. Examples include the 24-hour turnaround for requests or procedures for Administration and Finance and the 30-day turnaround goal for E-searches from Personnel. In general, Vice Presidents prepare in advance of anticipated changes so that the process goes faster. Some offices use joint decision-making with staff input and delegate decision-making to the lowest level where the most information is available.

| Table 6.2 Campus Accreditation Survey: Communication and Involvement with Policy Changes (Percentage of respondents) |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Changes in University policy have been clearly explained in advance to faculty/staff. n=1270 | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Faculty/staff are sufficiently involved in campus decision-making. n=1313 | 2.0 | 39.8 | 43.5 | 14.7 |
| | 1.8 | 38.1 | 47.0 | 13.2 |

Most Deans felt that central administration effectively supported their needs and that decisions were made in a timely fashion; however, some problem areas were defined. Lack of consultation and feedback concerning budget preparation was cited as especially problematic. NSHE processes for contract review and legal interpretation for a variety of issues at both the
system and University-level have impacted unit-level decision-making. The Deans all see the Dean’s Council mechanism recently started by the Provost and supported by the President as a positive means to introduce more consultation and joint decision-making, particularly for budget planning.

6.C.6 Administrators facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment.

A number of councils and committees facilitate cooperative working relationships and promote coordination. Among those councils organized by administration are the Academic Leadership Council, Dean’s Council and the President’s Executive Council. The Provost generally convenes and sets the agenda for the Academic Leadership Council that meets every two weeks and involves Vice Presidents, Deans/Directors, occasionally the President and others. The minutes are published online to provide wider campus access. This council often focuses on information-sharing rather than decision-making. The newer Dean’s Council, now meeting every week with the Provost, provides a smaller venue for enhanced cooperation among Deans who respect each other and work effectively together. The smaller group is intended to promote frank discussion and shared decision-making. The President’s Executive Council (VPs, legal, government affairs) is seen as a positive group for organization, communication and goal setting.

The Faculty Senate, Graduate Council and student associations are delineated in the Regents Handbook. (More information about the important role of the faculty and student associations in promotion of cooperation and communication is in the next two sections.) The Graduate Council is an important group for discussing all unit graduate programs and for providing cooperation for the expanding interdisciplinary programs. The interdisciplinary programs do not easily fit within current administrative organizations. (RE 6.9: Faculty and Staff Organizations)

The University Planning Council (UPC) composed of faculty, VP representatives, chair representatives, Dean representatives, SEC, undergraduate and graduate students, was convened during Dr. Lilley’s tenure to review strategic planning and provide recommendations for support of selected campus plans. All minutes of this group were public, and the process was intended to foster more communication and cooperation among the various campus communities and to foster shared decision-making. The UPC was viewed either positively as being a cooperative effort of the campus community or negatively as being an elite group that made decisions without enough consultation. This very active group was disbanded as strategic planning and implementation advanced. The Dean’s felt the UPC (which provided a major coordinated effort) hasn’t been fully replaced and look to the new Dean’s Council as being one replacement component.

There are numerous campus committees with participation of faculty, staff and students (RE 6.10: Current Campus Committees and Task Forces). All colleges on campus have personnel and finance administrators who participate in campus-wide human resources (HR) and finance meetings. Newsletters are becoming more frequent to keep communication open between all campus components and with the broader community (SM 6.1: Reports to Constituencies). More focused activities to promote cooperation and coordination include: attendance by the Provost at college meetings; informal Chairs lunches; and monthly Presidential meetings with students. As part of their campus function, the Office of Student Affairs coordinates with all the unit-based student affairs programs to support them in the colleges, particularly with recruitment and advising. Administration and Finance provides training opportunities for staff at the unit level.

6.C.7 Administrators responsible for institutional research ensure that the results are widely distributed to inform planning and subsequent decisions that contribute to the improvement of the teaching-learning process.
Institutional Research and Analysis disseminates information via web-based communication (alerts to faculty about reports on the web) and through focused data searches. The office provides high-quality information that is used in planning throughout the University. Information is also reported to NSHE on faculty productivity (mandated by the Legislature), student numbers and demographics (for funding requests), and faculty demographics (including gender and ethnicity reporting for Regents’ committees). This information is used in a number of ways, including: the University’s Development Office for brochures; Student Affairs for defining student demographics for recruitment and retention activities; and Finance and Administration for responding to queries on personnel. All Deans and senior administrators interviewed provided very positive feedback on the quality of work and the responsiveness to requests.

6.C.8 Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed.

UNR policies, which are in accordance with the Regents Handbook, cover appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion and/or termination (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook). The policies are published and accessible via multiple medium, particularly via both the NSHE and University web pages. The policies specific for UNR reside in the University Administrative Manual (RE 6.3), which are found online at www.unr.edu/business_finance/forms/uam.pdf.

This manual is regularly reviewed by a University Administrative Manual committee composed of faculty and staff with is a monthly cycle for review. The entire classified section of the manual was reviewed and updated last year. On a system level, the System HR Advisory Council, composed of all Chief HR directors from the campuses, reviews NSHE policies and procedures.

6.C.9 Administrators’ and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

The University has implemented compensation models — one for academic faculty and one for administrative positions — that allow for assessment of faculty salary levels as well as for assessment of systemic inequities in regard to race, gender and age of faculty. The studies from this point forward will be completed every two years with adjustments being made when financial resources are available. The studies completed twice thus far have detected no biases, but rather have helped the University to maintain competitive salaries. The addition of the executive-level administrative salaries has been beneficial in aligning salaries for top-level administrators with comparable salaries in the market. All institutions work together on salary levels to maintain equity across like institutions (university to university or community college to community college) within NSHE. Presidential salaries have become more competitive with the ability to use Foundation funds as part of a salary package in addition to the base salary from the institution’s budget.

For highly skilled professionals, such as professionals in the development field, the salary ranges are not quite high enough. For most others, it is competitive. HR reviewed all administrative and executive salaries in 2003-2004, and salary adjustments were made to move salaries closer to the community/professional standards. Because benefits are set for state employees in general, there is no modification for NSHE professional employees, and thus some benefits — primarily health insurance — have been problematic. However, current attractive retirement benefits do offset some of the other issues with health benefits.

Classified staff are governed by state personnel regulations and not UNR regulations. As with administrative and professional positions, health benefits are viewed as problematic and have been subject to policy change at the state level. In the campus accreditation survey a majority of
staff respondents (59.6 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they were “satisfied with the salary and benefit levels at UNR.”

Overall, with a few exceptions, the salaries and benefits are felt to be adequate to attract and retain experienced and desired personnel (RE 6.6: Salary Data). Continued challenges include the relatively high cost-of-living in the area and the inability to set benefits specifically for NSHE. In addition, the classified staff rules don’t allow for adjustments to be made in salary for the sometimes greater demands of working for NSHE. This has frustrated attempts to hire well qualified personnel at a specific level, requiring reclassification efforts.

**Standard 6.D — Faculty Role in Governance**

The role of faculty in institutional governance, planning, budgeting and policy development is made clear and public; faculty are supported in that role.

The Regents Handbook authorizes the creation of a Faculty Senate that represents all faculty at each institution. The UNR Faculty Senate, which is governed by the Regents Handbook, operates under Faculty Senate bylaws (RE 6.9: Faculty and Staff Organizations) that are published online. Faculty senators are elected by their units, both academic and administrative, in proportion to the number of faculty and serve for a three-year period. The Senate oversees a number of campus committees that cover all aspects of campus life (RE 6.10: Current Campus Committees and Task Forces). The Senate oversees the appeal process for faculty “due process” for promotion and tenure decisions and for section 6 disciplinary actions. The UNR Faculty Senate meets monthly and over the last three years agendas have covered significant campus issues including CODE changes for faculty evaluation, UNR bylaw changes, and campus morale issues (RE 6.9: Faculty and Staff Organizations). Senate meeting minutes can be found on the Faculty Senate website and periodic messages from the Senate chair alert faculty to important events, voting opportunities and campus concerns. The Faculty Senate elects an executive committee that meets weekly to do initial work on new issues, develop priorities for the year, determine Senate committee membership and charges, and provide a readily available group to address administration questions and concerns.

The Senate plays a direct role in planning and policy development for the campus through its lead role in amending the UNR bylaws, overseeing organizational changes, and voting on campus initiatives. The role played in budgeting is less direct but is influenced by the Senate’s participation in campus policy changes (merit pay schedules, review of salary ranges for academic and administrative faculty) as well as involvement in the system-level budget process through ability to comment during Board of Regents meetings. The Faculty Senate is acknowledged as “an effective voice for faculty” by 58 percent of academic faculty surveyed in the campus accreditation survey.

The Faculty Senate has had important and visible support from UNR administration. In addition to monthly meetings with the Senate’s executive committee, the President and/or Provost often seek advice on campus issues from the Senate chair. The President (or designee) often addresses the Faculty Senate and asks for input on campus concerns. The administration budgets resources for Faculty Senate expenses and provides support for a full-time administrator and administrative assistant. The Faculty Senate chair and vice chair attend all Regent meetings and work with other institutional faculty leadership from the NSHE to advance important faculty issues for system discussion and decision.

Faculty participation on the Faculty Senate and with Senate committees is supported by the Deans who feel that such service is important in evaluations. Typically faculty more advanced in their tenure process are encouraged to run for Faculty Senate, since the time commitment can be substantial. The Senate, however, has been concerned about this trend because it dilutes the representation from faculty who are assistant professors, and thus may diminish the Senate’s
ability to address important issues for faculty who are working towards tenure.

Another important faculty group is the Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA). Although they are not officially authorized by the Regents Handbook, this statewide organization is acknowledged as an important voice by UNR administration and faculty. The NFA is a branch of the American Alliance of University Professors (AAUP) that brings a different perspective to faculty and campus concerns. All faculty are eligible to become members with minimal membership fees. The NFA publishes a newsletter twice a year with topical articles on statewide issues of concern to all faculty. Statewide leadership of the NFA alternates among campuses of the NSHE, but the chief lobbyist is a member of the UNR faculty. In addition, a local chapter at UNR is important in ensuring that faculty perspectives are voiced and any decisions detrimental to faculty are challenged. They work in a different but complimentary manner with the Faculty Senate.

Standard 6.E — Student Role in Governance

The role of students in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public; students are supported in fulfilling that role.

The Regents Handbook (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 5, Chapter 16) authorizes the creation and organization of the student government, known on the UNR campus as Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN). The Association is governed by a constitution (approved by the Board of Regents) that can be amended through student vote and approval by the Regents (SM 6.2: ASUN and GSA Constitutions and Bylaws).

The ASUN has Senate Statutes that govern the conduct of the Senate; election statutes that define election procedures; and bylaws for the Fiscal Allocation Board, Clubs and Organizations Board, Publication Board, and Programming Board. The Statutes and Bylaws can be amended by the student senate. Students are obviously integral to the campus and provide important voices in campus affairs. They participate in NSHE and UNR committees and provide important financial support for campus functions that enhance the student experience.

The ASUN is strongly supported by the Office of Student Affairs with institutional personnel and guidance, but it operates with much autonomy. Graduate Students are represented by a separate organization, the Graduate Student Association (GSA). This organization which has official recognition and funding from UNR provides a specific voice for graduate student concerns (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 5, Chapter 18).

Policy 6.1 Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination

The NSHE has an affirmative action and nondiscrimination policy that is regularly updated and revised (RE 6.2a: Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 8). The principle is applicable to every member of the Nevada System of Higher Education community, both students and employed personnel at every level, and to all units, facilities, and services of the Nevada System of Higher Education (B/R 3/93). At UNR, Affirmative Action is part of the Office of Administration and Finance with compliance overseen by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. An Affirmative Action plan is on file and updated regularly (CD 6.11: UNR Nondiscrimination Policy).

Policy 6.2 Collective Bargaining

Not applicable.
**Standard Six Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations**

**Strengths: Governance and Administration**

- There are clear and definitive bylaws and procedures governing all aspects of the administrative, academic, faculty and student roles.

- UNR has a long history of shared governance that helped craft the solutions to many of the problems resulting from significant campus reorganization.

- A more centralized administrative core has strived to develop better service models aimed at improving service in a consumer focused manner.

- Data and analytical resources have vastly improved to support campus decision-making.

**Challenges: Governance and Administration**

- There is a need to better define the roles of the system administration and campus administration.

- Campus fundraising is challenged by increasing demands for matching funds for capital projects from the BOR.

- The expanding campus community must become more completely engaged in active participation.

**Recommendations: Governance and Administration**

- The Dean’s Council should continue to evolve to increase joint decision-making.

- The President and high level administrators within UNR should work within their NSHE committees to clarify administrative processes and improve efficiency and ensure adequate two-way communication.

- NSHE and UNR legal counsel need to standardize interpretation of policies, bylaws, and establish better timelines for review.

- All executive job descriptions, administrative rules, and guidelines should be available online and updated regularly (continuing current efforts).
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Standard Seven — Finance

Standard 7.A — Financial Planning

Financial planning and budgeting are ongoing, realistic, and based upon the mission and goals of the institution.

7.A.1 Governing Boards and, where applicable, state agencies have given the institution appropriate autonomy in financial planning and budgeting matters within overall mandates and priorities.

The University of Nevada, Reno is governed by a 13-member elected Board of Regents which provides oversight and approval of institutional financial plans and budgets. The Board has established strategic directions for the system providing a framework for the development of campus plans and budgets (CD: 7.1: NSHE Strategic Plan). The Board meets approximately eight times annually and has, as part of its organizational structure, a subcommittee dedicated solely to matters of budget and finance. This committee is responsible for reviewing the annual operating budgets, biennial budget requests, long-term capital financing plans, and modifications to tuition and fee schedules.1

1 In addition to the items identified above, the campuses prepare and submit several other financial reports to the system office. These reports provide the Regents with detailed information concerning the allocation of appropriated funds (Accountability Reports), year-end expenditure variances for state and self-supporting accounts (Budget to Actual), and self-supporting accounts with negative cash balances exceeding $5,000 (Fiscal Exception Report). Board policy also requires the campuses to report certain budget transfers among functional categories (i.e., Instruction, Research, Academic Support), transfers of expenses from non-state to state accounts occurring after May 1st, and self-supporting budget revisions exceeding 10% of the approved budget or $50,000. Board members also request ad hoc reports periodically on various aspects of campus operation.

While the Board establishes system-wide expenditure priorities, the University is given substantial latitude to develop its own financial plans and budgets. For the University of Nevada, Reno the budgeting process is guided largely by the University’s strategic plan. Although the strategic plan was reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents, the specifics of its implementation have been left to the campus to develop. In recent years, the University has upgraded its computing and research infrastructure, allocated resources to areas of institutional strength or emerging areas (e.g., Academy for the Environment), reinforced its commitment to undergraduate instruction through the Core Curriculum, expanded funding for Development and Alumni Relations, and enhanced compensation for graduate students. Each of these budgetary decisions, and many others like them, were driven by the campus with only the occasional involvement of the Board of Regents. For the most part, the Board of Regents and the Chancellor have resisted the temptation to micromanage the financial or budgetary operations of the institution.

The state of Nevada operates on a biennial budget cycle. Every two years the legislature meets to consider capital and operating budget requests submitted by state agencies, K-12, and higher education. The Board of Regents initiates this process by providing the campuses with clear priorities for the legislative session. These priorities are translated by the campuses into budget requests, or enhancements, which are submitted to the Board for consideration. The Board reviews the campus enhancement proposals refining them into a consolidated budget request which is submitted to the Governor. The Governor is charged with recommending a balanced budget consistent with revenue projections developed by an independent Economic Forum. The Governor’s budget, not surprisingly, generally includes only a small fraction of the enhancement requests submitted by the Board. The Executive budget is released in advance of the legislative session and provides the platform for subsequent budgetary hearings and decisions.
The annual operating budget for the University consists of eight individual and distinct appropriation areas. Each of these appropriations is a line-item in the final legislative appropriation meaning that the funding is intended to be expended for these units and may not be reallocated or transferred to another appropriation unit without legislative approval. The eight state-funded appropriation units for the University of Nevada, Reno are:

1. University of Nevada — Instruction
2. University of Nevada School of Medicine
3. Intercollegiate Athletics
4. Statewide Programs
5. Agricultural Experiment Station
6. Cooperative Extension Service
7. Business Center North
8. State Health Laboratory

State funding for Nevada’s universities, state college and community colleges is determined, in large part, by the higher education funding formula. The funding formula is enrollment-driven, using a three-year weighted average of actual enrollments to project future year (funded) enrollments. The formula differentiates between NSHE campuses by recognizing cost differentials by discipline and level of instruction; providing enhanced funding for enrollments in high-cost programs such as engineering, physical sciences and nursing as well as those enrollments in the upper-division and graduate courses. The funding formula also addresses economies of scale, marginal costs, and age of facilities as part of the calculations. There are individual formulas for the Instruction function, Graduate Assistants, Academic Administration, Libraries, Student Services, Institutional Support and Operation and Maintenance of Plant. This version of the funding formula, which was designed to achieve equitable funding among the NSHE institutions, has been in place since Fiscal 2002 (CD 7.2: Higher Education Funding Study). In addition to the overall funding of the University, seven other units administered by the University (items listed as 2-8 above) receive separate appropriations. These separate appropriation lines are developed using a basic incremental budgeting process.

NSHE has experienced substantial increases in state funding since the implementation of the funding formula. For the five-year period beginning in FY 2002, Nevada has led the nation in percentage increase in appropriations of state tax funds for operating funds. While the funding formula provides a consistent and largely predictable funding base, the formula is rarely funded at 100 percent. Currently (2006) the formula is funded at 84.5 percent. If enrollments (based on a three-year rolling average) flatten or even dip, an institution could receive an appropriation less than its current year funding level. In most fiscal years the legislature has approved “hold-harmless” funding insuring that institutions do not receive less than their current funding level. However, if such “hold-harmless” appropriations are not passed, the institutions must make up for the difference from their own source funds or cut expenditures.

The Legislature fully expects that funds appropriated in specific decision units will be budgeted and expended consistent with legislative intent. Beyond these few line-item decision units, the state allows the University substantial latitude over the use of its appropriation. New funding generated as a result of the funding formula may be budgeted by the campus in whatever manner is deemed most necessary to address the needs of the campus. In exchange for this flexibility, the University submits accountability reports through the Board of Regents to the Governor and the Legislative Council Bureau identifying how appropriated funds were actually allocated and expended.

---

2 Center for the Study of Educational Policy, Illinois State University. State funds for Higher Education Operating Expenses, 2005-2006. Figures include state tax funds appropriated for colleges and universities, for student financial aid, and for governing and coordinating bodies. They do not include funds for capital outlays and money from sources other than state taxes. See Table 7.1.
7.A.2 The institution demonstrates that financial planning for the future is a strategically guided process. This planning includes a minimum of a three-year projection of major categories of income, specific plans for major categories of expenditures, and plans for the management of capital revenue and expenditures. Short and long-range capital budgets reflect the institution’s goals and objectives and relate to the plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment.

Since Fiscal 2001, the University has been engaged in a campus-wide process of evaluation, reorganization, and strategic planning. This process was designed to enhance areas of existing strength and to develop and invest in programs with significant potential for the future. The strategic plans included detailed resource requests by fiscal year for major categories of expense including new faculty positions, classified staff, graduate teaching and research assistants, operating and equipment. As part of the planning process the units were asked to indicate whether their requests would require funding from new institutional sources or could be accommodated through reallocation within the department or college. The linkage between strategic objectives and funding is discussed in the Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006 (CD 7.3: Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006).

Each of the eight state-appropriated funding lines covered in 7.A.1 is projected forward for three years (current plus two out years) as part of the campus planning/budget request process. Included in the budget projections for each appropriation area are estimates of the following major categories of expenditure:

- Salary and fringe for state-funded faculty and classified positions
- Faculty merit and cost-of-living
- Classified merit, longevity, and cost-of-living
- Graduate Assistant and student wages
- Anticipated increases to fringe benefit rates — mainly health insurance
- Departmental operating budgets
- Short-term capital replacement budget
- Inflationary adjustments for utilities and library materials
- Adjustments to property and liability insurance premiums
- Increases in the State Personnel Division Assessment and Retired Employees Group Insurance

The expenditure plans are compared against projected sources of income to determine what additional resources may be necessary from the state.

In recent years the University has significantly improved its planning processes in regard to faculty start-up commitments. Beginning in Fiscal 2006, the Vice President for Research budgeted $700,000 for his/her share of faculty start-up commitments. This pool will be incremented each year by $700,000 bringing the total VPR funds committed to faculty start-up to $2.1 million by Fiscal 2008. These funds are matched by college resources resulting in a total funding allocation of nearly $3.0 million annually. Each year, the Vice Provost, Associate Vice President for Research, and the Assistant Vice President for Planning, Budget and Analysis (AVP PBA) meet to review college requests for start-up. Since most start-up commitments are multi-year in nature, the AVP PBA maintains a four-year planning spreadsheet detailing both anticipated revenues and current and projected commitments (CD 7.4: Faculty Start-up Commitments). The requests for start-up are evaluated on the basis of their congruence with college and institutional strategic goals. New commitments are capped at $700,000 to ensure the available funding throughout the duration of the start-up period. The annual budget commitments are distributed in full to the faculty start-up accounts—there is no float. Any unexpended funds at the conclusion of the start-up period revert to the Vice President for Research.

The University continues to budget $400,000 annually for short-term capital equipment replacement from its state instructional appropriation. Most recently, this funding has been used to address equipment-related issues identified in the College of Engineering’s accreditation report.
and to aid in the purchase of a new campus-wide telephone system, a key element of the institution’s overall strategic plan.

Capital renovation and construction projects are coordinated by the NSHE system office and each institution prepares and submits a 10-year plan (CD 7.5: Capital Projects Forecast). A summary of actual and projected capital investments is shown in RD 7.10: Capital Investments. Projects currently under construction or in the near term planning queue include the Knowledge Center, Joe Crowley Student Union, Center for Molecular Medicine, Science and Math Building, and Church Fine Arts (planning). With the exception of the Knowledge Center, each of these projects emerged from the strategic planning process. As part of its capital planning process, the University engaged Sasaki Associates, Inc. to conduct a comprehensive campus master planning effort designed to strategize the physical growth of the campus and determine future needs for physical facilities as the enrollment increases.

While the University has actively engaged in campus-wide strategic planning over the period of review, this process has lost momentum in recent years. In part, this is due to the lack of new resources to fund college and unit priorities. Without new funding, the University has had to rely mainly upon reallocation of existing resources to continue progress towards its strategic goals and objectives. This much slower process has resulted in some frustration with the entire strategic planning effort.

7.A.3 The institution publishes an annual budget distributed to appropriate constituencies, and the policies, guidelines, and processes for developing the budget are clearly defined and followed. Budget revisions are made promptly, and, when necessary, revised budget or schedule of budget changes is developed and distributed to appropriate constituencies.

3 The Knowledge Center was planned and approved prior to the initiation of the campus-wide strategic planning initiative in Fiscal 2001.

The University publishes an annual budget which includes both state-appropriated and self-supporting accounts (RE 7.3: Current Operating Budget). The published budget provides summary revenue and expenditure tables as well as detailed budgets, by department, for each of its eight appropriation areas. The document also displays the revenue and expenditure detail for more than 400 budgeted self-supporting accounts. The University publishes a companion document, the Comprehensive Position List, that provides position detail for the faculty and classified employees budgeted to each account. Copies of the budget are available on-line and in hardcopy. The budget and position list are also available in the library and, according to the documents librarian, are among the most frequently accessed publications.

The University Administrative Manual, Sections 1,701-1,704, provides brief definitions of state-appropriated and self-supporting budgets. However, the University Administrative Manual does not include references to key budgetary proc-
esses such as position control, salary sweeps, comprehensive position lists, or year-end close. These topics are typically discussed at the monthly meetings of the Personnel, Controllers, and Budget committee and/or the Academic Leadership Council. Information regarding the instructional funding formula and instructions for preparing self-supporting budgets can be found through the Planning, Budget and Analysis website (www.unr.edu/vpaf/pba/index.html).

Budget revisions, which are generally initiated at the college or departmental level are typically reviewed and processed by Planning, Budget and Analysis the day of their receipt. Most departments have the ability to submit budget revisions electronically. Electronic processing can result in requested changes being entered into the financial system within minutes of their approval at the Dean’s level. Revisions are posted to the financial system and the data warehouse where anyone with appropriate security access can review them.

Significant revisions to the budget plan, (i.e. utility overruns, revenue shortfalls, hiring freeze) are communicated and explained through multiple avenues: Academic Leadership Council, Faculty Senate, ASUN/GSA, and general campus announcements (CD 7.6: Provost Budget Memos).

7.A.4 Debt for capital outlay purposes is periodically reviewed, carefully controlled, and justified, so as not to create an unreasonable drain on resources available for educational purposes. The institution has a governing board policy guiding use and limit on debt.

Nevada Revised Statutes, Universities Securities Law, requires that all external university borrowing be approved by the Board of Regents. The statutes also require minimum debt service coverage based on pledged revenues and annual debt service payments. Pledged revenues must be identified and approved by the Regents prior to debt issuance. JNA Consulting Group LLC., debt management consultants retained by NSHE for all debt issues, work with the Vice President for Finance and Administration and staff to develop debt structures that ensure the proposed revenue streams are adequate funds for repayment over the life of the debt. Reviews of existing debt levels are performed by the debt management consultants before any new debt issuance is considered. In addition, any precipitous drop in the University’s student enrollments would trigger a review of debt service loads (many of which are serviced through student fees). RD 7.12 provides a schedule of debt service obligations for the past three years as well as future commitments.

NSHE debt policy guidelines covering institutional loans, bonds, leases, and other debt are administered through the NSHE Banking and Investment Office. In addition, the office coordinates all interaction with national credit rating agencies which review and rate each new public debt offering. The University/NSHE has an AA- rating.


The adequacy of financial resources is judged in relation to the mission and goals of the institution, the scope and diversity of its programs and services, as well as the number and kind of its students.

7.B.1 The institution provides evidence that it seeks and utilizes different sources of funds adequate to support its programs and services. The commitment of those resources among programs and services reflects appropriately the mission and goals and priorities of the institution.

The annual budget for the University for Fiscal 2007 is approximately $509 million. Of this amount, state appropriations total $198 million, or 39 percent of the annual operating revenue. Federal Funds, Grants and Contracts, Student Fees, Sales and Service Income, and Private Gifts account for the remaining 61 percent of the budget (RD 7.1: Current Fund Revenues). Funding generated from Federal, State, and Lo-
cal government grants and contracts has been growing significantly (approximately 12 percent annually between fiscal 2004 and 2006). The commitment of these resources is consistent with national patterns of expenditure and reflects the mission, goals, and priorities of the institution (RD 7.2: Current Fund Expenditures).

The University aggressively seeks to expand each of its primary sources of revenue. The budget request submitted to the legislature for the 2007—2009 biennium includes $28 million in additional funding which, if funded, will be used to enhance campus and NSHE priorities. Any additional state funding will be used to fund new faculty positions, expand graduate programs, enhance student counseling and advising services, and increase salaries for part-time instructors. Student registration fees will increase approximately 22 percent in the next two years, while non-resident tuition will rise 12 percent over the same period. The additional funds generated as a result of the fee increase will be used to fund scholarships, library materials, and funding for expansion of study abroad opportunities for students.

An area of concern for the University is the manner in which it funds much of its lower-division instruction. The University relies heavily upon temporary instructors to deliver nearly two-thirds of its lower-division sections. For the most part, temporary instructors are not specifically funded anywhere in the operating budget. Instead, the campus uses salary savings from vacant faculty and staff positions which it “sweeps” to a central account for subsequent reallocation to the colleges and administrative units. The centralized salary savings sweep policy was developed as part of strategic planning. The goal was to better allocate funds specifically in support of instruction and University Core Curriculum requirements. This process can be problematic when salary savings are not sufficient to cover instructional or other institutional commitments as was the case for Fiscal 2007. In order to match the projected salary savings cash flow, the instructional units were required to reduce their spring semester budgets by $700,000 (CD 7.7: Salary Savings). The salary savings sweep policy is currently under review.

7.B.2 Adequate resources are available to meet debt service requirements of short-term and long-term indebtedness without adversely affecting the quality of educational programs. A minimum of three years’ history of the amount borrowed (whether internally or externally) for capital outlay and for operating funds is maintained. A five-year projection of future debt payments is maintained.

The University engages debt management consultants who work with the Vice President for Administration and Finance and his staff prior to debt issuance to develop debt structures that match the proposed revenue to insure adequate funds for repayment exist over the life of the debt as well as overall compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes, Universities Securities Law. Debt schedules and future payments due for long-term debt are maintained by the Controller’s Office and displayed in the University’s financial statement footnotes (RE 7.2: Latest Audited Financial Statement and RD 7.12: Debt Service Schedule). Transfers to debt service funds are made every six months as required by bond covenants. Bond and note payments are made by the NSHE Banking and Investment Office and managed and recorded by the Controller’s Office.

7.B.3 Financial statements indicate a history of financial stability for the past five years. If an accumulated deficit has been recorded, a realistic plan to eliminate the deficit is approved by the governing board.

The net assets of the University have increased over the past five years, growing from $396.8 million in FY 2002 to $536.1 million for FY 2006. Increases have occurred in cash and short-term investments as well as in capital assets and endowment investments.

The University’s Fire Science Academy (FSA) has an accumulated operating deficit of approximately $11.0 million. This deficit developed when the FSA moved from Reno to its present location in Carlin, Nevada, and has
continued to grow over the past five years. Much of the deficit can be traced to a 21-month closure of the facility, which was necessary to address construction defects. The FSA prepared and submitted a business plan (CD 7.8: Fire Science Academy Business Plan) which was approved by the Board of Regents in 2003. The FSA continues to provide regular status reports to the Board, and, as of Fiscal 2006, was performing ahead of projections contained in the business plan. It is expected that the FSA will break-even by Fiscal 2008 and that positive operating balances will be applied against the deficit. The University administration and management of the FSA are also working closely with governmental agencies and the private sector to explore various means of reducing the accumulated deficit.

7.B.4 Transfers among the major funds and interfund borrowing are legal and guided by clearly stated policies in accordance with prudent financial planning and control.

Transfers among major funds are legal and are guided by the Board of Regent and institutional policies. Transfers between funds must be approved by the authorized signer on the account being charged and the controller. Interfund borrowing occurs infrequently; however, the University has a formal process in place. Any interfund borrowing is documented by a written memorandum of understanding between the parties, which is reviewed, approved and kept on file in the office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance (CD 7.9: Interfund Borrowing).

7.B.5 The institution demonstrates the adequacy of financial resources for the support of all of its offerings including specialized occupational, technical, and professional programs.

Table 7.A shows expenditures per student FTE for accredited institutions within the region, many of which have similar technical and professional programs as are offered on this campus. The table demonstrates that the financial resources per student FTE at the University of Nevada, Reno are well above the median for the region.

### Table 7.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FTE Enrollment</th>
<th>Expenditures Per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>1,977,350,296</td>
<td>36,932</td>
<td>53,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>1,016,385,000</td>
<td>26,744</td>
<td>36,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>1,076,550,000</td>
<td>28,777</td>
<td>37,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico – Main</td>
<td>741,266,688</td>
<td>21,204</td>
<td>34,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>402,312,242</td>
<td>12,951</td>
<td>31,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>599,000,718</td>
<td>20,172</td>
<td>30,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>485,119,896</td>
<td>17,836</td>
<td>27,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>361,062,931</td>
<td>13,560</td>
<td>26,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State Univ. – Main</td>
<td>355,640,103</td>
<td>13,357</td>
<td>26,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>275,143,761</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>25,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>263,989,381</td>
<td>10,472</td>
<td>25,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State Univ. – Bozeman</td>
<td>258,426,684</td>
<td>10,528</td>
<td>24,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado – Boulder</td>
<td>667,541,302</td>
<td>23,121</td>
<td>23,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ. Fort Collins</td>
<td>496,449,803</td>
<td>23,121</td>
<td>21,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>851,730,000</td>
<td>41,319</td>
<td>20,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>351,815,363</td>
<td>20,255</td>
<td>17,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>203,319,652</td>
<td>12,408</td>
<td>16,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>164,201,407</td>
<td>10,432</td>
<td>15,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System

7.B.6 The institution identifies the sources of its student financial aid for current enrollments and provides evidence of planning for future financial aid for projected enrollments. It monitors and controls the relationship between unfunded student financial aid and tuition revenues.
The institution receives the Federal allocation of financial aid (work study, supplemental educational opportunity grants and Perkins Loans) in the spring prior to the academic year; however, there is very little fluctuation in the amount the campus receives, regardless of enrollment changes at the institution (RD 7.4: Sources of Financial Aid). The institution also has allocations from state funds for various aid programs which have remained at roughly the same level for several years. Three years ago, NSHE created a student fee based financial aid allocation (which is awarded 90 percent based on need and 10 percent in a discretionary manner). This is the one source of financial aid that changes based on enrollments. With a fairly constant pool of funds available to service a growing student population, the student financial aid office runs various ‘what if’ scenarios each year in order to best align the award packages with the student recruitment and retention priorities. Projections are typically made for three years.

In addition to these funds administered by student financial aid, the University has funded accounts for grants-in-aid for faculty, classified staff and graduate assistants.

In 1999, Governor Guinn’s Millennium Scholarship initiative was enacted into law by the Nevada Legislature; the legislation created the Millennium Scholarship trust fund to be administered by the State Treasurer. Since the inception of the program the University of Nevada, Reno has awarded funds to more than 13,000 students in excess of $60,000,000. Internal audit findings have shown that the University administers the program in accordance with the policies established by the Board of Regents (CD 7.10: Millennium Scholarship Report).

### 7.B.7 The institution maintains adequate financial reserves to meet fluctuations in operating revenue, expenses and debt service.

While the legislature establishes the expenditure authorization, the University can only spend to the level of the revenue it collects. The University receives no additional general fund allocation from the state in the event that non-general fund sources (i.e., tuition and fees and investment income) do not meet projected levels. Any shortfall in non-general fund revenues must be absorbed by the institution.

The University establishes a revenue shortfall reserve to mitigate potential fluctuations in non-general fund operating revenues. These funds are taken “off the top” of any legislative appropriation and set aside until it is clear whether or not revenues will be realized as anticipated. The University maintained a $1,000,000 tuition reserve in Fiscal 2006 and a $2.9 million reserve for Fiscal 2007 (RE 7.3: Current Operating Budget, p. 14). In addition, the University has used its equipment and desk-top replacement (approximately $900,000) budgets to address fluctuations in revenue or unexpected increases in expense categories. As noted in 7.B.2, the adequacy of debt service funding is reviewed for the entire term of the debt prior to issuance.

### Table 7.B
Auxiliary Account Cash Balances
Fiscal 2004-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND NAME</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASUN Bookstore</td>
<td>1,239,966</td>
<td>2,831,965</td>
<td>2,424,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUN Student Govt.</td>
<td>1,207,635</td>
<td>396,463</td>
<td>177,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jot Travis Student Union</td>
<td>304,441</td>
<td>329,922</td>
<td>381,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>53,004</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Inn</td>
<td>382,235</td>
<td>6,973</td>
<td>75,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>8,764,431</td>
<td>5,752,022</td>
<td>4,885,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Housing</td>
<td>4,176,923</td>
<td>3,685,276</td>
<td>4,053,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
<td>1,189,461</td>
<td>909,654</td>
<td>676,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawlor Events Center</td>
<td>1,242,725</td>
<td>1,170,409</td>
<td>1,099,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Association</td>
<td>81,747</td>
<td>69,986</td>
<td>61,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Rentals</td>
<td>77,912</td>
<td>106,465</td>
<td>50,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6,675</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,727,159</td>
<td>15,262,949</td>
<td>13,908,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University Records – Screen APP2
7.B.8 Institution demonstrates an understanding of the financial relationship between its education and general operations and its auxiliary enterprises and their respective contributions to the overall operations of the institution. This includes the institution’s recognition of whether it is dependent on auxiliary enterprise income to balance education and general operations or whether the institution has to use education and general operations income to balance auxiliary enterprises.

The University maintains a well-established system of fund accounting which has been thoroughly reviewed by internal and external auditors (RE 7.2: Latest Audited Financial Statement). Revenues and expenses associated with educational and general activities are separately recorded and distinguished from transactions impacting auxiliary enterprises. There is no commingling of revenues or expenses. Financially, the administrative functions such as Budget, Controllers, Human Resources and Payroll, are not paid for directly by the auxiliary enterprises; however, these enterprises indirectly contribute to these functions because half of the institutional investment income allocation earned on the cash balances in the auxiliary accounts is available for general institutional support (expenditures of these funds are directed or approved by the Provost/President).

Table 7.B clearly demonstrates substantial balances in the major auxiliary funds. The balances are sufficient to cover current operations, and to accommodate planned expansions (e.g. ASUN Bookstore, Food Services, and University Housing). The education and general accounts end the year with zero fund balances due to the requirement to revert unexpended funds to the state.

The University has occasionally borrowed from its auxiliary enterprises for very specific purposes. During Fiscal 2006, for example, the University borrowed $1,000,000 from Residential Life and Housing in order to provide short-term bridge financing for planning and design costs associated with the new Student Union construction project. The loan was repaid, with interest, from proceeds from the sale of construction bonds.

All auxiliary budgets (i.e. Residence Halls, Food Services, Lawlor Events Center, etc.) are classified as self-supporting budgets. The operations of each auxiliary enterprise are analyzed and reviewed at least annually to assure on-going financial viability. In addition, the Board of Regents requires that the campuses prepare and submit quarterly fiscal exception reports identifying self-supporting accounts with negative cash balances. The University ended Fiscal 2006 with five reportable accounts.

Standard 7.C — Financial Management

The financial organization and management, as well as the system of reporting, ensure the integrity of institutional finances, create appropriate control mechanisms, and provide a basis for sound financial decision-making.

7.C.1 The president reports regularly to the governing board about the financial adequacy and stability of the institution.

The University submits myriad financial reports to the NSHE system office including, but not limited to, its annual audited financial statements, detailed budget allocation reports (Accountability Report), year-end Budget to Actual expenditure summaries, and quarterly Fiscal Exception reports (copies appended). In addition, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships is required to submit an annual report to the Chan-

4 NSHE campuses must report self-supporting accounts to the Board of Regents if they end the fiscal year with a negative cash balance of $5,000 or more. The accounts reported to the Regents included Fire Science Academy Operating ($9,920,050), Fire Science Academy Construction Account ($1,593,446), SMS Clearing Account ($8,759), UMC Internal Medicine Faculty Support ($10,069), and Clark County Extension Service Salaries ($7,645).
cellor’s Office. This is a comprehensive report of all financial aid funds disbursed to students throughout the previous fiscal year. The report provides detail by type of aid, federal, state, institutional, and private funds for both need-based and non-need based financial aid (CD 7.11: Financial Aid Report). These reports, and others like them, provide the Board of Regents with a clear understanding of the institution’s finances and stability.

7.C.2 Financial functions are centralized and are under a single qualified financial officer responsible to the president. Institutional business functions are under one or more qualified officers, are well organized, and function effectively. The complexity of the business organization reflects the size of the institution and the significance of its transactions.

Most, but not all, of the University financial functions are organized and report to the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF). The VPAF has a direct reporting line to the University President. Functions reporting to the VPAF include cashiers, budget, accounts payable, accounting, internal audit, purchasing, and payroll. Other financial functions such as the Development and Foundation Accounting, student financial aid administration, and grants and contracts administration report outside the VPAF division. Please refer to chapter document for an organizational chart for the VPAF (CD 7.12: VPAF Organizational Chart).

While much of the institution’s financial activity is centralized, budget management has been successfully delegated to budget officers in each of the major appropriations (i.e. School of Medicine, Intercollegiate Athletics) and academic units. The budget officers report to their respective Dean or Director and not to the Vice President for Administration and Finance. Each unit budget officer is delegated responsibility to manage their organizational resources consistent with institutional policies and procedures. The Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis develops institutional budget allocations, monitors and tracks departmental spending, coordinates fiscal year-end closing and maintains a close working relationship with the college and appropriation area budget officers.

7.C.3 All expenditures and income from whatever source, and the administration of scholarships, grants in aid, loans, and student employment, are fully controlled by the institution and are included in its regular planning, budgeting, accounting and auditing procedures.

All expenditures and revenues, scholarships, grants-in-aid, loans and student employment are controlled by the institution.

Requests for federal financial aid funds are submitted with the annual FISAP report to the Department of Education each September. The institution participates in the FFELP program for Stafford Loans, and therefore has unlimited access to student loan funds. All federal funds are subject to an annual A-133 audit conducted by an independent accounting firm. Recently, an internal audit on the Millennium Scholarship awards was conducted. There is also an annual report to the Board of Regents regarding financial aid spending.

7.C.4 The institution has clearly defined and implemented policies regarding cash management and investments which have been approved by the governing board.

University operating and endowment funds are maintained in pools with funds from other NSHE institutions and managed by the NSHE Banking and Investments office. Management and investment of the funds is overseen by the Investment Committee of the Board of Regents. Board policy contains Statements of Investment Objectives and Policies for both endowment funds and operating funds. These policies can be found in the Board of Regents Handbook at system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Handbook/Title-4/T4-CH10.doc_cvt
7.C.5 The institution’s accounting system follows generally accepted principles of accounting.

The University’s accounting system follows generally accepted accounting principals. The accounting system and resulting financial statements are audited annually by external auditors as well as university and system internal auditors.

7.C.6 For independent institutions, the governing board is responsible for the selection of an auditing firm and receives the annual audit report.

Does not apply to the University of Nevada, Reno.

7.C.7 Independent institutions are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant and the audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The audit includes a management letter. A summary of the latest audited financial statement is made available to the public.

Does not apply to the University of Nevada, Reno.

7.C.8 A proprietary institution makes available annually a financial summary which includes, as a minimum, a list of company officers, a statement of profit and loss, expenditures, indebtedness, and companies which have a controlling interest in the institution.

Does not apply to the University of Nevada, Reno.

7.C.9 If public institutions are, by law, audited by a state agency, an independent audit is not required except for any funds not subject to the governmental audit.

The University is not regularly audited by the state; however, institutional financial statements are audited annually by an independent CPA firm (RE 7.2: Latest Audited Financial Statement).

7.C.10 All funds for financial aid and other specific programs not subject to governmental audit are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant and include a management letter.

All University funds, including financial aid, are audited annually by an independent CPA firm and a management letter is provided to the Board of Regents (RE 7.2: Latest Audited Financial Statement).

7.C.11 Institution demonstrates a well-organized program of internal audit (where appropriate) and control that complements the accounting system and the external audit.

Internal audit departments exist at both the University and NSHE. NSHE has a staff of nine auditors charged with reviewing various aspects of campus operations. The Director of Internal Audit prepares an annual audit schedule which is approved by the Audit Committee of the Board of Regents. Recent audits include Intercollegiate Athletics, Cooperative Extension Service, and the State Health Laboratory. On average, NSHE conducts approximately six new or follow-up audits of University operations annually. In addition, the University maintains its own internal audit staff (2.75 FTE) who report to the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance. The results of internal audits may drive changes in campus procedures; a recent example is requiring signatures on the purchasing card statements returned to the Controller’s office. Because the internal audits tend to focus on specific programs rather than general processes,
the external auditors perform their own review of internal controls rather than relying on the work of internal audit.

7.C.12 The institution demonstrates that recommendations in the auditor’s management letter accompanying the audit report have been adequately considered.

Both internal and external audit findings require written management response and follow-up until the finding has been resolved and closed. NSHE internal audit findings are presented to the Audit Committee of the Board of Regents.

7.C.13 Federal, state, external, and internal audit reports are made available for examination as part of any evaluation conducted by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.


Standard 7.D — Fundraising and Development

Any organized development program to seek financial support from outside sources is closely coordinated with academic planning and reflects the mission and goals of the institution.

7.D.1 All college/university fundraising activities are governed by institutional policies, comply with governmental requirements, and are conducted in a professional and ethical manner.

The central fundraising mission of the University is handled through the office of the Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations. The office is charged with the responsibility for financial oversight and integrity of the University related 501(c)3 organizations in accordance with board policy. The function of Development and Alumni Relations is to assure that there is an objectively measurable separation of these Foundations from the University; that the University assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition; that transactions with the Foundations are executed in accordance with Board of Regents’ institutional policies and Nevada Revised Statutes; that all transactions are properly recorded and reflected in audited financial statements; and that the Foundations are not used for the purpose of circumventing university, regents or state policies, rules and/or regulations.

Fundraising on campus is coordinated in a central/decentralized manner through the fundraising division of Development and Alumni Relations. All development staff directly report to this division but are housed across campus in various units and schools. Fundraising is coordinated through the academic units with the development division. Each unit/school meets with development staff annually to strategically plan their individual fundraising goals. These goals are then coordinated with the central campus to assure that they strategically fit the campus master plan. As the year progresses, development staff meet with the units/schools regularly to assess their progress and assign duties.

7.D.2 Endowment and life income funds and their investments are administered by an appropriate institutional officer, foundation, or committee designated by the governing board. The organization maintains complete records concerning these funds and complies with applicable legal requirements.

Endowments are established with each of the separate 501(c)3 organizations. These funds are segregated into separate accounts and invested in pooled endowment funds. They are managed by Investment Committee members who have experience managing investments. Staff assigned to assist the committee in the management of endowments includes senior level Foundation and institution officers. The separate entities are audited by external accounting firms annually and reports are issued to the Board of Regents. Please refer to RD 7.13: Endowment and Life Income Fund Report for a summary
of the past three fiscal years showing market value and income distributions by year.

7.D.3 The institution has a clearly defined relationship with any foundation bearing its name or which has as its major purpose the raising of funds for the institution.

The campus has several entities that are established for the sole purpose of soliciting private gifts for the University. The official entities are: the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation, the Athletic Association of Nevada (AAUN) and the AAUN Endowment. A 501(c)(3) for the School of Pharmacology has been recently established. The Board of Regents mandate that all of these entities follow all rules and guidelines established for the university system and that all of the entities are responsible for handling their financial accounting in a centralized manner. The University of Nevada, Reno Foundation is responsible for maintaining all financial and record keeping functions of these entities centrally.

Standard Seven Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

Strengths: Finance

- The State funding formula provides a reasonably predictable level of funding linked to enrollment that also recognizes cost differentials based upon discipline and level of instruction.
- Resources available to the University, per FTE student, are among the highest in the region.
- University financial management practices are conducted in a professional manner and regularly reviewed through independently conducted audits.
- The institution has developed a blend of centralized fiscal oversight with decentralized budget management at the colleges and major appropriation areas level.
- The institution carefully manages and controls faculty start-up commitments.
- The University/NSHE maintains an impressive AA- bond rating.

Challenges: Finance

- The strategic planning process has lost momentum as there are insufficient resources to fully implement college and unit plans.
- Lower-division instruction is funded mainly with temporary salary savings, a practice less stable than the demand for lower-division classes from an increasing student population.
- The Fire Science Academy is currently operating in debt.

Recommendations: Finance

- The institution should rethink and re-energize its strategic planning process. The institution should focus on measurable results linked to available resources.
- The institution should reallocate resources within the base budget to cover most, if not all, of the lower-division teaching rather than rely upon temporary salary savings.
- The institution should pay off the Fire Science Academy operating deficit as soon as possible.
### Table 7.1
Finance — Current Funds Revenues — Public Institutions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>46,886,310</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>52,461,266</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>59,002,507</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,280,635</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72,226,783</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79,912,032</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Pell Grants</td>
<td>4,246,985</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4,448,617</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4,108,018</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,211,118</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,316,806</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,425,147</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>166,021,748</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>169,607,940</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>183,254,281</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197,895,116</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207,789,872</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218,179,365</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>77,225,202</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>92,104,149</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>102,665,432</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103,692,086</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,729,007</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,870,877</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>14,622,807</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>15,292,348</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>15,365,318</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,518,971</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,674,161</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts, Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>13,951,997</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14,047,885</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14,961,050</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,110,661</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,261,767</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,414,385</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Educational Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>32,136,751</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>25,583,185</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>27,731,536</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,750,296</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,806,483</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>56,443,301</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>58,442,228</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>63,349,391</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66,516,861</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Funds Revenues</td>
<td>421,673,435</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>443,622,680</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>482,706,328</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509,367,227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>532,162,980</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>558,509,568</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Current Fund Revenues  ** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available  *** Budget for Current Year

7.14
## Table 7.2
Finance — Current Funds Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers — Public Institutions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and General Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>134,094,811 0.36</td>
<td>145,894,722 0.37</td>
<td>153,175,674 0.36</td>
<td>160,795,794 0.35</td>
<td>168,794,997 0.34</td>
<td>177,192,140 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>59,232,412 0.16</td>
<td>63,624,361 0.16</td>
<td>69,859,636 0.16</td>
<td>75,495,733 0.16</td>
<td>81,586,536 0.17</td>
<td>88,168,729 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>36,323,314 0.10</td>
<td>38,868,191 0.10</td>
<td>43,530,417 0.10</td>
<td>47,446,341 0.10</td>
<td>51,714,534 0.11</td>
<td>56,366,687 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support (Excluding Libraries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Expenditures</td>
<td>8,577,066 0.02</td>
<td>8,818,479 0.02</td>
<td>8,973,913 0.02</td>
<td>9,243,646 0.02</td>
<td>9,521,486 0.02</td>
<td>9,807,677 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>20,231,766 0.05</td>
<td>23,432,801 0.06</td>
<td>24,775,617 0.06</td>
<td>27,073,390 0.06</td>
<td>29,584,267 0.06</td>
<td>32,328,010 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>29,837,001 0.08</td>
<td>30,711,499 0.08</td>
<td>33,214,748 0.08</td>
<td>36,949,275 0.08</td>
<td>41,103,696 0.08</td>
<td>45,725,223 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>11,755,120 0.03</td>
<td>11,657,146 0.03</td>
<td>13,342,113 0.03</td>
<td>15,011,395 0.03</td>
<td>16,889,527 0.03</td>
<td>19,002,640 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Restricted Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational and General Expenditures / Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises (Including Transfers)</td>
<td>31,274,781 0.08</td>
<td>28,004,108 0.07</td>
<td>29,119,990 0.07</td>
<td>30,206,003 0.07</td>
<td>31,332,518 0.06</td>
<td>32,501,047 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals (Including Transfers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations (Including Transfers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Funds Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>375,796,077 1.00</td>
<td>399,030,130 1.00</td>
<td>427,750,950 1.00</td>
<td>458,398,271 1.00</td>
<td>491,521,837 1.00</td>
<td>527,341,825 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Current Fund Expenditures  ** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements available
*** Budget for Current Year

NOTE: Excludes depreciation
Table 7.4
Finance — Sources of Financial Aid — Public and Private Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Private</td>
<td>3,256,849</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2,776,251</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3,804,010</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental State Aid</td>
<td>25,125,767</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>27,969,348</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>31,619,863</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid (PELL, SEOG, WS)</td>
<td>41,178,150</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>42,594,053</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>42,852,990</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Earnings</td>
<td>1,867,638</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3,756,631</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4,553,754</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Foundation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Unfunded Aid</td>
<td>4,013,295</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4,399,118</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2,276,895</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Loans</td>
<td>539,665</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>417,669</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>220,150</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfederal Workstudy</td>
<td>7,026,299</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6,683,802</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4,793,712</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financial Aid</td>
<td>83,007,663</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>88,596,872</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90,121,374</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Financial Aid  ** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available  *** Budget for Current Year

Please note: Tables 7.3, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 are not applicable to the University of Nevada, Reno and are not included.
### Table 7.9
Finance — Operating Gifts and Endowments — Public and Private Institutions
(If Applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Gifts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Restricted</td>
<td>12,317,990</td>
<td>8,404,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Unrestricted</td>
<td>2,379,331</td>
<td>335,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowments Exclusive of Foundation Gifts</strong></td>
<td>2,412,946</td>
<td>6,273,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>15,211,766</td>
<td>4,580,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32,322,033</td>
<td>19,592,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio of Annual Gifts to E &amp; G</strong></td>
<td>32,322,033</td>
<td>19,592,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>156,957,614</td>
<td>175,969,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156,957,614</td>
<td>175,969,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available  **Budget for Current Year

Note: If applicable, explain/describe Foundation relationship and prepare separate statement for Foundation gifts to the institution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>56,049,954</td>
<td>67,497,362</td>
<td>71,086,905</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>11,447,408</td>
<td>3,589,543</td>
<td>3,148,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,998,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>67,497,362</td>
<td>71,086,905</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
<td>70,237,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>328,869,674</td>
<td>348,520,682</td>
<td>385,394,448</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>19,771,708</td>
<td>36,873,766</td>
<td>31,097,199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>120,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>348,520,682</td>
<td>385,394,448</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
<td>416,491,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furniture and Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>90,459,836</td>
<td>94,679,632</td>
<td>106,465,920</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>10,070,518</td>
<td>15,645,202</td>
<td>13,302,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>5,860,722</td>
<td>3,858,914</td>
<td>5,836,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>94,669,632</td>
<td>106,465,920</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
<td>113,932,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction in Progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>21,058,405</td>
<td>31,638,648</td>
<td>26,572,293</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>11,659,387</td>
<td>30,625,994</td>
<td>33,800,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>1,079,144</td>
<td>35,692,349</td>
<td>22,445,471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>31,638,648</td>
<td>26,572,293</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
<td>37,927,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>10,049,839</td>
<td>3,732,171</td>
<td>4,036,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4,924,219</td>
<td>5,763,588</td>
<td>7,452,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available ** Budget for Current Year
√ Briefly describe the nature of the projects under way and/or anticipated (e.g., dormitories, classroom facilities, auditorium). Also, indicate sources of funds for the project (i.e., fund raising programs, debt).

Please note: Table 7.11 is not applicable to the University of Nevada, Reno and is not included.
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Standard Eight — Physical Resources

Introduction

The University of Nevada is a constitutionally established, land-grant university. It was originally located in Elko, Nevada, but due to low enrollment, the state legislature voted to move it to Reno in 1885. Still in use, Morrill Hall, the first campus building, opened in 1887 to a class of 75 students. From a modest beginning, the main campus has grown to 218 acres and 79 buildings (RD 8.1: Campus Map). The attractive and well-kept main campus grounds are conveniently located just north of downtown Reno. The buildings span the University’s history in age and architecture, with the pervasive red brick façade providing a unifying theme.

The campus buildings have a total of 3,133,000 gross square feet (excluding residential student housing) with 1,953,794 square feet of assignable space. Including rental, support facilities and student housing, the campus totals 3,643,830 gross square feet. Approximately 11 percent of students enrolled at the University live on campus. In 2005-06, seven residence halls accommodated 1,763 students with 40 married student housing apartments available. Demand for student housing exceeds supply.

In addition to main campus facilities, the University of Nevada, Reno maintains facilities statewide to support and fulfill its land-grant mission. Every county has Cooperative Extension facilities. The University of Nevada School of Medicine and its Area Health Education Centers are spread throughout the State. Continuing and Distance Education (Extended Studies) can be found in multiple locations. The Small Business Development Centers have spread across the State to meet expanding needs for their services, as well. (RD 8.2: Statewide Program Sites)

Providing appropriate physical resources to meet instructional and research needs has been a challenge throughout the University’s history, particularly during the last 10 years of intense growth in student enrollment and research efforts. Over the last decade, building space on the main campus has grown by 18 percent. At the same time student enrollment has grown by 33 percent, and external funding for research has tripled. Overall, the institution has done a great deal with the limited resources at its disposal.

Making the best use of the available resources has been hampered by the cost of renovating older buildings for emerging programs, and by some of the historical restrictions placed on space and buildings. For example, areas such as the University Farm (McCarran Avenue/East Sparks) and the farm facilities on Valley Road have been restricted to specific agriculture applications. The University property in Stead, originally constructed as headquarters for an Army Air Force base in the 1940s, includes a large building with concrete walls more than 2 feet thick and almost no windows. Because of the age of campus buildings, renovation and retrofitting expenses generally include asbestos removal; renovation for ADA compliance; increases in heating, cooling and electrical capacity; and extensive data networking.

Although renovation and construction projects have not kept pace with the increased demands on facilities, there have been noticeable improvements and additions to the campus over the last decade. Examples are the beautiful renovations of the Frandsen Humanities building and the DeLaMare Library, the addition of Argenta residence hall whose rooms are the first choice of most residential students, and the increased availability of modern teaching space provided by the College of Education’s William J. Raggio Building. New, under-construction, and proposed projects for the near future are listed in RE 8.5: New Buildings, Acquisitions and Buildings Under Construction.

Conservative estimates indicate that student enrollment may almost double over the next 25 years, reaching 30,000 students. The research enterprise continues to grow rapidly, as well. To help develop strategies for using resources, comprehensive strategic planning was undertaken at all levels beginning in 2001 (CD 8.1:...
Strategic Planning Implementation Report, 2001-2006). Every program, unit, and college developed a five-year strategic plan. These plans have been reviewed and/or updated to various extents every year since then. The strategic planning process led to the formation of the University Planning Council that has been active in determining campus priorities.

To address future facility needs and establish a vision for campus growth consistent with campus priorities, a Comprehensive Master Plan for the University of Nevada, Reno was completed by the Provost’s office in consultation with the campus community and campus neighbors, and approved by the NSHE Board of Regents in 2004 (RE 8.3: University Master Plan). The success of this plan will depend on the continued support of the Reno-Sparks community, the institution’s ability to acquire property neighboring the campus, and the legislative support for new facility initiatives. Given the chronically difficult funding environment for bricks and mortar, the University must enhance alternative delivery formats for courses and degree programs to meet student demand.

## Standard 8.A — Instructional and Support Facilities

### 8.A.1 Instructional facilities are sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals.

Physical resources are currently sufficient in most all areas to meet the University’s instructional goals, although these resources are being challenged by increasing growth. (The sufficiency of research and faculty support space is discussed more specifically in section 8.A.3.) One hundred thirty-one (131) campus classrooms are centrally scheduled (SM 8.1a: Classroom and Laboratory Utilization Summary). Of these, 95 are high-tech or “smart” classrooms (Levels 3, 4 and 5) with fixed instructional technology (CD 8.2: Classroom Technology List). This number includes five distance-education classrooms fully equipped for interactive video (Level 5). Table 8.1 shows the growth of centrally scheduled classrooms, associated student seats, and the student headcount since 1998. Table 8.2 shows the growth in number and percentage of classrooms with fixed technology since 1998. In addition to the 95 classrooms with fixed technology, there are

- Several academic departments with dedicated portable technology carts,
- Eight conference/presentation rooms with fixed instructional technology,
- Instructional technology carts that can be delivered to a basic classroom upon request.

### Table 8.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5827</td>
<td>11952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>118 (+1%)</td>
<td>6003 (+3%)</td>
<td>12144 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>125 (+7%)</td>
<td>6288 (+8%)</td>
<td>12902 (+8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>127 (+9%)</td>
<td>6368 (+9%)</td>
<td>13913 (+16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>127 (+9%)</td>
<td>6615 (+14%)</td>
<td>14664 (+23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>122 (+4%)</td>
<td>6219 (+7%)</td>
<td>15176 (+27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>118 (+0%)</td>
<td>6092 (+5%)</td>
<td>15469 (+29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>131 (+12%)</td>
<td>6601 (+13%)</td>
<td>15901 (+33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Smart</th>
<th>% Smart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom utilization is calculated using the Regents’ Standard, which classifies a classroom as fully utilized when seats are 60 percent occupied. The Regents’ Standard, which is consistent with utilization standards used nationally, has been in use on the campus for nearly 30 years. Using the Regents’ Standard, utilization of classroom space increased during weekday daytime.
hours from 80 percent to 99 percent between 1998 and 2005 (SM 8.1a: Classroom and Laboratory Utilization Summary).

Demand for daytime classroom space has two peaks: 9-11 a.m. and 1-4 p.m. Data from spring 2007 class scheduling indicate more than 180 requests for classroom space were submitted for some peak period hours, including more than 120 requests for high technology classrooms. Efforts to shift classes to evening or weekend times have met with mixed results. The director of Facilities Planning and Analysis noted that approximately 60 percent of course offerings (4,272 class sections in 2006) are not centrally scheduled in the campus classroom pool (SM 8.1b: Utilization of Instructional Space, Fall 2005 Report). These alternatively scheduled classes include laboratory and seminar classes using specialized space. Nevertheless, this trend indicates that faculty, departments, and colleges have had to become more creative in finding class meeting space in recent years.

The data in Table 8.1 clearly show that student enrollment has been increasing more rapidly than classroom space. In 2003, the Provost’s office completed a comprehensive study of instructional space utilization and made several recommendations based on the data (SM 8.1c: Instructional Space Utilization Plan, April 2003). The report recommended using the existing classroom space more efficiently by adopting classroom scheduling software (Astra Scheduling), rather than relying on the University Admissions and Records office to juggle the handwritten requests of departments. Astra Scheduling was implemented in 2005 to optimize projected class size with the availability of appropriately sized classrooms. As might be expected, the implementation process was painful. Automated scheduling has shifted much control from academic departments and colleges to a central scheduling office. As a result, faculty members do not always teach in their traditionally assigned classrooms and may have to teach farther from their offices/departments than previously. On the other hand, Astra Scheduling has improved the match between classroom size and class enrollment.

The 2003 report (SM 8.1c: Instructional Space Utilization Plan, April 2003) also noted that “very small and very large classrooms generally generate poor utilization rates,” and recommended that some larger classrooms be renovated into two medium-sized classrooms. The situation has reversed in the last few years. The Director of Facilities Planning and Analysis noted the demand for large classrooms in the 200- to 400-seat range, and for small classrooms in the 15- to 20-seat range (all with fixed instructional technology) now exceeds the supply.

In 2005, the Redfield Campus opened at the south end of the Truckee Meadows approximately fourteen miles from the main campus. The Redfield Campus building has 12 high-tech classrooms, a Level 5 distance education classroom and two hands-on computer labs (32 seats and 34 seats). This building increased the University classroom count by 10 percent, and reduced the classroom utilization rate from 108 percent to 99 percent in one year (SM 8.1a: Classroom and Laboratory Utilization Summary). Unfortunately, part of the decrease in the utilization rate is due to the difficulty of scheduling classes at the Redfield Campus that do not require students and faculty to travel between campuses for back-to-back classes.

Even on the main campus the distance between the northern portion of campus (Medical School) and southern end of campus (biochemistry, biology and nursing) presents a challenge for students enrolling in life science courses. The campus shuttle bus service was expanded in the past year to reduce vehicle traffic around campus and help cut down on the travel time between classes (CD 8.3: Campus Shuttle Service).

The number of instructional laboratory classrooms has increased eight percent (75 to 81) since 1998 (SM 8.1a: Classroom and Laboratory Utilization Summary). However, the number of laboratory stations (student capacity) has actually decreased by seven percent, due in part to laboratory renovations to meet current fire and safety standards and to incorporate modern technology. Despite the loss of student stations, the lab utilization rate has stayed fairly constant at 50 percent, where the utilization rate
is calculated according to the Regents’ Standard of 60 percent capacity. The low laboratory utilization rate is somewhat misleading for a variety of reasons, including:

- It takes at least a day per week to dismantle and reassemble undergraduate lab experiences in physics.
- Highly specialized chemistry lab spaces can only be used for one or two classes.
- Science lab classes are scheduled for 2-3 hours limiting the number of sections that can be offered in a day.
- Many departments are section-limited by a shortage of the Graduate Teaching Assistants who generally teach these classes.
- Some science departments are reluctant to schedule labs at night due to safety and liability concerns. For example, the Student Health Center, which checks non-emergency injuries during the day, closes at 5 p.m. on weekdays and remains closed weekends and holidays.

In general, the science and engineering undergraduate labs need space and upgrades, and almost all academic units are requesting more computer lab space (CD 8.4: Reports from Colleges/Schools). The proposed new Davidson Mathematics and Science Center (scheduled to open in 2010) will help address the laboratory space and technology issue for biology, chemistry, and physics (CD 8.5: Davidson Mathematics and Science Center). However, the College of Engineering also has been having difficulty maintaining up-to-date technology in its laboratories. The most recent two ABET accreditation reviews have noted inadequacy in the laboratory facilities.

As enrollments continue to grow, developing and offering alternative delivery formats for traditional lecture classes (e.g., fully online courses) will be essential. While current space is in most aspects sufficient to meet the instructional needs of the University, it is also at or near capacity. New construction is not keeping up with growth. Nationally, the majority of academic leaders now believe that online learning outcomes are equal to face-to-face instruction (CD 8.21: Making the Grade, Online Education in the United States, 2006). Fully online courses and accompanying online student services, including tutoring, advisement, counseling, library resources, and a 24/7/365 Computing Help Desk, could help reduce the strain on physical facilities. Furthermore, the development of online services and classes broadens the University’s ability to serve the many rural Nevadans who cannot move to Reno to obtain an education (CD 8.22: Anytime, Anyplace Services for the 21st Century Student).

8.A.2 Facilities assigned to an instructional function are adequate for effective operation of that function.

At times there seems to be an infinite demand for what, in reality, is a finite resource. In addition, maintaining the quality of classroom space with an aging physical plant is a challenge; 27 percent of classrooms in the assignable pool are more than 20 years old (SM 8.1b: Utilization of Instructional Space, Fall 2005 Report). On the other hand, there have been some notable new building additions and renovations in the past 10 years. In 1997, the new William J. Raggio Building (College of Education) opened with 117,000 square feet and 17 high tech classrooms. In 1998, a major remodeling of Frandsen Humanities was completed (31,332 square feet and 11 high tech classrooms).

Generally speaking, the University facilities for teaching courses are adequately matched with teaching needs, but the situation varies widely across the University, as indicated by the responses generated by a request to every college/school for input for this accreditation report (CD 8.6: Sample Email to Colleges; CD 8.4: Reports from Colleges/Schools). Positive responses include:

- School of Social Work: “sufficient office and classroom space, computer-mediated access, or both to achieve the program’s goals and objectives.”
- School of the Arts: “A music practice room wing was added in 2003 that almost doubled the number of practice rooms available to students.”

8.4
School of Medicine: “The majority of School classrooms are adequately furnished to serve their purpose.”

The Writing Center: “offices (instead of carrels or cubbies) for tutoring, nearly state-of-the-art computer equipment, good conference room, and an excellent job of remodeling for effective use.”

On the negative side, three colleges/schools (Business Administration, Liberal Arts, Medicine) noted a shortage of appropriately-sized classrooms (both small and very large) to teach effectively and accommodate the growing student body. Among other deficiencies noted were:

- School of Medicine: Insufficient and/or inadequate wet laboratories.
- Child and Family Research Center: Lack of state-of-the-art observation facilities.
- College of Liberal Arts: Inadequate studio, gallery, rehearsal, and performance space; facilities that lack heating, air conditioning, proper ventilation, and acoustical separation; insufficient instructional computer and other lab space; clinical space with inadequate access; poor facility location for clients and students.
- College of Science: Department faculty offices spread across several buildings.

The replacement cycle for classroom instructional technology is five years for instructional technology and three years for classroom computers. Some colleges expressed satisfaction with classroom technology upgrades. The College of Liberal Arts noted that “the much-needed upgrading of classrooms to “smart” status (Level 4) in the years since the last accreditation review...has made a dramatic difference in the instructional program, as now nearly every instructor who needs a smart room...can have one.” However, some were concerned that more classrooms need to be upgraded. For example:

- School of Journalism: needs access to cable television in their building.
- College of Education: “Many of the classrooms in which faculty are assigned are not ‘smart’ classrooms. This makes it difficult to model technological strategies in the classroom.”
- School of the Arts: “Speech Communication students must deliver presentations in rooms without the instructional and practical advantages of even the most basic current technologies.”

Recently, two surveys gathered input from faculty. One survey in spring 2006 by the Campus Technology Committee reporting to the Faculty Senate had 514 responses (SM 8.2a: IT Satisfaction Survey). The response to a question regarding “support for classroom technology” was 92.7 percent either satisfied or somewhat satisfied. On the question “Technology meets your needs for teaching in the classroom,” the responses were 89.5 percent either satisfied or somewhat satisfied.

A second survey of faculty was done in fall 2006 as part of this Northwest reaccreditation self-study (SM 8.2b: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006: Academic Faculty Survey). The Academic Faculty Survey asked 122 questions. For the question, “There is adequate support for integrating technology in my teaching,” 70.6 percent either agreed or strongly agreed.

8.A.3 The institution’s facilities are furnished adequately for work, study, and research by students, faculty, and staff.

Surveys to determine if users are satisfied with their facilities indicate that instructional facilities are generally satisfactory. The Instructional Technology survey in spring 2006 was positive. On the question posed to faculty of whether “technology meets my students’ needs,” 89.8 percent were satisfied or somewhat satisfied.

The Academic Faculty Accreditation Survey (SM 8.2b: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006: Academic Faculty Survey) generated the following responses:
• “UNR provides adequate facilities for my research” — 51.3 percent agree or strongly agree.
• “LOAs and TAs are adequately supported with office space, clerical support, technology, etc. to be effective teachers” — 25.5 percent agree or strongly agree.
• “I am satisfied with the quality of my office/lab space” — 60.1 percent agree or strongly agree.

LOAs, TAs and other part-time faculty typically get what is left after full-time faculty needs are met and, increasingly, full-time faculty needs consume all available space. Some colleges either provide no formal office space or require these temporary employees to share space (CD 8.4: Reports from Colleges/Schools).

Half of survey respondents were satisfied with research facilities. However, the need for new and renovated space is acute. The most recent negotiation with the federal government over the Facilities & Administration (F&A) rate to be charged to externally funded grants reduced the University’s F&A rate from 45 percent to 40 percent (CD 8.23: F&A Rate Agreement). This reduction was largely due to a space inventory that found that the University has grown its research output without increasing dedicated research space. Many of the buildings housing existing research space are old and in desperate need of renovation. These include Palmer Engineering, Scrugham Engineering, and Fleischmann Agriculture where the animal care facilities used by the Department of Biology are substandard, lacking environmental control, and saturated in terms of capacity (CD 8.4: Reports from Colleges/Schools).

A student survey in fall 2006 (SM 8.2c: College Student Survey Report 2006) used a national standardized instrument to compare responses to the same set of questions with students at other institutions. The survey was distributed to undergraduates at UNR and had 640 responses for a return rate of eight percent. The percentage of “satisfied” or “very satisfied” responses to questions about facilities include:

- laboratory facilities and equipment - 57.9%
- library facilities - 82.7%
- computer facilities - 84.3%
- student housing - 57.6%
- recreational facilities - 68.6%.

These responses are slightly lower than student responses at the national level.

8.4 The management, maintenance and operation of instructional facilities are adequate to ensure their continuing quality and safety necessary to support the educational programs and support services of the institution.

The Facilities Services Department is responsible for determining the maintenance needs for buildings and grounds. This department recommends priorities and implements changes to address building issues and upgrade existing facilities. A major challenge is maintaining aging buildings, many of which have serious deferred maintenance issues. Approximately 45 percent of campus buildings are 40 years old or older. These buildings are increasingly suffering catastrophic plumbing leaks; heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) problems; and leaking roofs.

The University receives Higher Education Capital Construction, Special Higher Education Capital Construction (HECC-SHECC) funds for renovations, repairs and improvements from the Nevada Legislature on a biennial basis. In 2005-2007, $5,800,000 were allocated and used for ADA and utility system upgrades, HVAC equipment replacement, roof and pavement repairs, and asbestos abatement. However, these funds were not adequate to mitigate the deferred maintenance backlog, as documented in the “Facility Condition Assessment” begun in 2006 (CD 8.16: Facility Condition Assessment Project). This project reviewed approximately 1,700,000 gross square feet in 30 campus buildings that were 25 years of age and older. Facilities Services recommends that the University receive three percent of the current replacement value of the physical plant annually for deferred maintenance, consistent with the national norm.
endorsed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

On a smaller scale, maintenance of the buildings includes custodial care. Increased enrollment corresponds to more cleaning to do per classroom and per building. Given the existing custodial staffing levels, the established campus standards for building cleanliness are more and more of a challenge to maintain.

The campus grounds are in many ways as critical to our University as what happens inside our classrooms and labs. For most of the year the campus is truly a picturesque place, with beautiful shade trees and flower gardens, and well-trimmed grass. But winter can be another situation entirely. Although the grounds shop has a 24-hour staff, snow and ice removal is unmanageable in a timely fashion with the available staff. Winter conditions particularly affect pedestrian walkways, sidewalks, parking lots and driveways, which are in constant need of repair. Examples of much needed campus repairs are along Cooper Court between 10th and 11th streets, and the walkway at the south end of Manzanita Lake.

The Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) office routinely surveys and evaluates existing University facilities to ensure that health and safety of students, faculty and staff are maintained. The Indoor Environmental Quality Policy, which is part of “Facilities Services Design and Construction Standards — Appendices (L)” provides for routine EH&S facility assessment and preventative maintenance of HVAC equipment (CD 8.7: Facilities Services; Design and Construction Standards). Additionally, the University of Nevada, Reno “Chemical Hygiene Plan” requires routine assessment of campus laboratory spaces for health and safety concerns (CD 8.8: Chemical Hygiene Plan).

Two groups oversee personal safety issues. Student Services examines student personal safety and generates the official “Crime Statistics” for the University (RE 8.1a: Campus Safety). Student Services has inaugurated a campus safety walk in which students, University Police, Facilities staff and Student Services staff walk the campus to see first-hand the issues that confront students navigating campus. The Administration and Finance division focuses on the personal safety of faculty and classified staff. A Campus Safety Subcommittee issues a yearly report to the Vice-President for Administration and Finance with a copy to the Director of University Police Services. A copy of the 2005 report and the fall 2006 update on concerns is included (CD 8.9: Campus Safety Concerns Subcommittee Reports).

8.A.5 Facilities are constructed and maintained with due regard for health and safety and for access by the physically disabled.

The construction process for campus facilities is described in the University of Nevada, Reno “Project Development Process” (CD 8.10: Project Development Process) and “Facilities Services Design and Construction Standards” (CD 8.7: Facilities Services; Design and Construction Standards). To ensure that facility health and safety issues are addressed, the “Project Development Process” requires EH&S to participate in and to review new construction projects. The “Facilities Services Design and Construction Standards” specify construction materials and methods to ensure health and safety of students, faculty and staff.

Materials used for new construction cannot contain asbestos. Maintenance and remodeling activities in older buildings always includes an initial identification of the presence and condition of asbestos-containing materials that might prove hazardous if disturbed. The University complies with local and state regulations that govern the management and removal of asbestos within campus facilities.

University facilities are built in compliance with building codes in force at the time of construction. In some cases, older buildings are grandfathered to the codes in place at the time of their construction, and facility safety features do not meet current codes, regulations, or best practices. For example, some laboratory facilities lack fire sprinklers (e.g., Chemistry Building)
and emergency eyewashes and showers. Additionally, emergency egress lighting is deficient in some buildings. Facility safety features are brought up to current requirements during facility renovations; otherwise, facility safety improvements are identified and upgraded as the budget allows. Currently, locations needing emergency eyewashes and showers are being identified with some eyewash and shower units now installed in deficient locations.

The number of students with physical disabilities continues to grow. In 2005 the number of students served by the Disability Resource Center increased by 20 percent to 890 students (CD 8.11: Disability Resource Center; Retention and Graduation Report 2005-06). In the past 10 years, Facilities Services has significantly improved the University’s compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by installing automatic doors and elevators, by retrofitting existing elevators, and constructing curb cuts and ramps throughout campus. The University is committed to bringing the campus into full compliance with ADA Accessibility Guidelines (RE 8.1b: ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities) as funding allows. In particular, emergency evacuation systems need to be upgraded to ensure the health and safety of people with hearing impairments, visual impairments and ambulatory disabilities.

8.A.6 When programs are offered off the primary campus, the physical facilities at these sites are appropriate to the programs offered.

As a land-grant university, The University of Nevada, Reno offers credit and non-credit courses and programs across Nevada and beyond. Program administrative staff members are responsible for placing off-campus classes in suitable facilities. Off-campus physical facilities may be owned and/or operated by the University (e.g., Cooperative Extension and School of Medicine sites, Carson City and Elko classrooms), or used occasionally on an “as needed” basis (e.g., NSHE community college and K-12 classrooms).

Commonplace campus classroom instructional technology standards are replicated at UNR off-campus locations. Design standards at the Redfield Campus matched standards that were in place on the primary campus. When Extended Studies offers courses in Elko and Carson City, the instructional technology is the same as the technology in a campus Level 5 classroom (CD 8.2: Classroom Technology List). Campus Teaching & Learning Technologies (TLT) staff members helped design instructional-presentation technology for Cooperative Extension at various locations state-wide. An engineer and a technical staff member from TLT assist with installation, maintenance and technical support requests.

The School of Medicine has been an exception to the use of established campus standards for instructional technology. In Las Vegas, the School of Medicine has chosen not to follow the standards used on the Reno campus. In some videoconferencing situations, the connection between north and south has broken down or the content shared was not the same, leading to strained relations.

8.A.7 When facilities owned and operated by other organizations or individuals are used by the institution for educational purposes, the facilities meet this standard.

When the University uses the facilities of other organizations, such as K-12 school district facilities, local hospitals, county departments and rural State agencies, instructional space standards that match campus standards cannot be ensured. However, all State-supported organizations adhere to the building standards outlined by the State of Nevada Public Works Board (SPWB). All new State-funded construction goes through an approval process with the SPWB. Physical accessibility and health and safety standards in public buildings are addressed by the SPWB as well.
University-sponsored presentations and courses conducted in shared facilities are sometimes coordinated by the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE). For example, an NSHE coordinator’s group focuses on Distance Education issues such as coordinated scheduling and policies for appropriate staffing and compensation for shared facilities. System Computing Services has worked with various state-wide groups to ensure compatibility of videoconferencing signals. The purchase of common technology (i.e., same manufacturer and model) has resulted in fewer technical failures for end-users. The NevadaNet (120-plus interactive video sites statewide) was built using a common technology standard.

One way to allow University staff to make off-campus presentations with the security of common technology standards is to make the presenter as self-contained as possible. TLT has a variety of lightweight presentation technology units that can be taken off-campus (CD 8.12: Technology Checkout Service). Presenters receive training in the use of this technology, and at nearby locations TLT staff can provide on-site assistance.

In some cases, instruction is provided to companies on a contract basis. Complete Master’s degree programs have been offered by the Department of Psychology to student cohorts in Toronto, Canada; St. Louis, Missouri; and Fort Lauderdale, Florida. In each case, the contracting company was responsible for providing suitable classroom space as part of the negotiated agreement between the University and the company.

In other cases, videoconferencing and web-based tools allow instructors to share information and course content regardless of the physical space occupied by students. Distance education classes have involved student cohorts as far away as Germany and the United Kingdom. Students have online access to university library resources and can deliver content (i.e., homework and discussion contributions) from a distance using web resources. Supported platforms include: WebCampus, Horizon-Wimba’s Live-Classroom and VoiceTools.

**Table 8.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computing Help Desk &amp; general use labs</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium computers &amp; classroom support</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/college computer labs</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA computer access</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network infrastructure</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming audio/video</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment for student loan</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network authentication</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning in fall 1999, a University-wide student technology fee of $4 per credit has been assessed. The funds collected provide support for various initiatives, as shown in Table 8.3 (CD 8.13: Student Technology Fee Guidelines; CD 8.14: Campus Computing Labs, Departmental Labs, Smart Classrooms).
Departmental requests routinely outstrip available funds by nearly a factor of two. An increase in the Student Technology Fee to $10 per credit would better accommodate the rapid adoption of technology for instruction and the speed at which technology becomes obsolete.

Computer lab access for off-campus students has been arranged as needed whenever possible. Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) institutions have reciprocal agreements to allow students access to computer labs around the state (which may be limited based on software license agreements). For example, arrangements were made for students in a university Social Work data analysis course to access computers with necessary software in Elko, Ely, Owyhee and Winnemucca, Nevada.

Beginning in 2001, the Disability Resource Center began using electronic text production, replacing the need for books on tape. Currently, they are using nationally recognized high volume document imaging to prepare classroom materials for students with print access disabilities. In fall 2005, the University recognized the need to expand assistive technology services and created a full-time administrative faculty position to meet that need. Students with disabilities have access to training and use of adaptive hardware and software through the Disability Resource Center’s assistive technology lab and at more than 500 workstations throughout the University (CD 8.15: Assistive Technology). However, special constituencies such as students with physical disabilities still lack full access to computing and classroom science laboratories both on and off campus.

The 81 campus instructional laboratories have a wide range of special applications. Each room typically has a narrow function that is keyed to the instructional needs of an academic unit that, in turn, has responsibility for maintaining and replacing the equipment. Because specialized science labs are difficult to replicate off campus, such course work is typically not taught off campus. Even on campus, the lack of new and renovated space is limiting some departments’ ability to offer modern laboratory experiences (e.g., Department of Chemistry; CD 8.4: Reports from Colleges/Schools).

Course fees set by the academic unit fund maintenance and replacement of standard and consumable items in instructional labs. Any lab fee above $50 must be justified and approved by the Board of Regents. The more specialized of the labs often came into being as a result of special grants or donations, and contain very sophisticated and expensive equipment. As this equipment ages it is difficult to maintain, replace, or modernize without some type of special funding. Contingency funds are sometimes available to meet these needs, but cannot be depended upon.

**8.B.2 Equipment is maintained in proper operating condition, is inventoried and controlled, and replaced or upgraded as needed.**

Instructional technology that is fixed in the classrooms or available to students and faculty through a checkout pool, is maintained, inventoried and replaced by IT’s Teaching & Learning Technologies (TLT). The Spring 2006 IT Satisfaction Survey included several questions related to support for classroom technology. In each case responses were highly favorable, with nearly 90 percent satisfaction (SM 8.2a: IT Satisfaction Survey). Annual inventorying of instructional technology is done by IT for the campus Purchasing Department (RE 8.2: Equipment Inventory Policy and Procedures).

Equipment acquired by individual units, departments, schools, and colleges is the responsibility of those entities. All entities on campus are subject to the Business Center North’s Purchasing Department policy on inventory (RE 8.2: Equipment Inventory Policy and Procedures). Regular audits by the Controller’s Office are a reminder that procedures are in place to account for state property.

IT and TLT have determined a five-year replacement cycle for instructional/presentation technology (e.g., LCD projectors) used in classrooms or in the technology checkout pool.
Classroom computers and laptops in the technology checkout pool have a three-year replacement cycle. IT has followed this replacement cycle for the past eight years. Replacement of office computers and laboratory equipment is dependent upon the unit, department, school or college’s ability to supply funds. IT recommends a four-year replacement cycle for the desktop computers of faculty and staff (see Standard Five). However, a reliable funding source for replacement of computing technology has yet to be identified. Also, some units have more robust computing needs than others. Past computer replacement initiatives have been limited to a fixed computer configuration.

8.B.3 Use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are in accordance with the institution’s prescribed procedures.

The Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) Department provides oversight of University operations involving hazardous chemicals, biological agents, and radioactive materials. All policies and programs involving these materials are formulated and conducted in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations. University policies and plans for accountability are listed in Table 8.4.

The University is classified as a large quantity generator of hazardous waste under the EPA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Hazardous wastes are handled and disposed of by the EH&S Department in accordance with state and federal EPA regulations. A State of Nevada, Division of Environmental Protection inspection report on hazardous waste operations at the University conducted in June 2006 found that the program was operating in compliance with applicable regulations (CD 8.16: Facility Condition Assessment Project).

### Table 8.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Control Plan/Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 8.8</td>
<td>Chemical Hygiene Plan</td>
<td>Laboratory use of hazardous chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE 8.1.3</td>
<td>Hazard Communication Program</td>
<td>Non-laboratory workplace use of chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE 8.1.4</td>
<td>Biosafety Manual</td>
<td>Laboratory use of biological chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE 8.1.5</td>
<td>Bloodborne Pathogens Exposure Control Plan</td>
<td>Occupational exposure to human bloodborne pathogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE 8.1.6</td>
<td>Radiation Safety Manual</td>
<td>Occupational exposure to radioactive materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EH&S Department provides regularly scheduled training courses on the safe use of hazardous materials. Basic laboratory safety training covers chemical and biological materials safety and is required of all faculty, students, and staff working in laboratories. Radiation safety training is required for persons using radioactive materials; hazard communication training is required for persons using chemicals in non-laboratory workplaces; and hazardous waste management training is required for laboratory personnel.

**Standard 8.C — Physical Resources Planning**

8.C.1 The master plan for campus physical development is consistent with the mission and the long-range educational plan of the institution, and the master plan is updated periodically.

The Board of Regents approved an extensive campus master plan (developed by the architectural firm of Sasaki Associates) for the University in 2004 (RE 8.3: University Master Plan). The plan’s projected time period was twenty-five years or nearly to the year 2030. It was based on the anticipation of extensive campus growth and enrollment growth to 30,000 students. A key element is a focus on mid-campus where the new student union and the new library (Knowledge Center) are being built. Other foci of the master plan include recreational facilities, residential facilities, health sciences facilities, parking, transportation, open spaces, pathways, mixed-use areas, and facilities development to support the academic mission of the University.

Expansion of the campus and student growth will have a significant impact on areas surrounding the existing campus. Thus, as the master plan was developed, a strong and positive working relationship with the City of Reno was also pursued. The 2004 Master Plan is currently under review.

8.C.2 Physical facilities development and major renovation planning include plans for the acquisition or allocation of the required capital and operating funds.

The Facilities Services Department is responsible for the construction, renovation, maintenance, repair and operation of buildings, facilities and utility systems, as well as capital improvement programs (CD 8.17: Facilities Design/Construction Policies and Procedures). The Facilities Services Department is organized into the following areas:

- Planning and Design
- Construction
- Maintenance
- Operations
- Parking & Transportation
- Real Estate/Rental Properties.

The Planning & Design and Construction units provide technical expertise in engineering and architecture in addition to providing project management, construction and inspection services. These groups provide initial planning and cost estimates for proposed renovations and capital improvements.

The Maintenance and Operations units provide day-to-day support, preventative maintenance, repairs, custodial services, and grounds maintenance. In 2003, an online software package (Maximo) was implemented to manage all aspects of work orders for the Maintenance and Operations units. This has streamlined and provided accountability for the activities of these units.

The Residential Life, Housing and Food Service Division provides maintenance and housekeeping for the residence halls. Food service is contracted to an outside vendor.

The capital construction process is outlined in the “Project Development Process” document (CD 8.17: Facilities Design/Construction Policies and Procedures). The Facilities Resource Committee reviews and approves projects under $1,000,000. Through 2005 capital construction
projects were reviewed by the University Planning Council (UPC), which identified and prioritized requests for submittal to the NSHE. The UPC has been disbanded and this past year saw a more informal review by members of the President’s Council conducting the final campus review. Once finalized on campus the University’s request is sent to the NSHE where it is reviewed and prioritized by the NSHE Chancellor and staff. The Regents then finalize capital requests for the entire system. While there is no stated policy, the operating expectation of the Regents and NSHE is that institutions must raise matching funds for building projects and this can greatly affect the prioritization of capital projects. The NSHE submits capital projects on a biennial basis to the State Public Works Board. From the State Public Works Board the recommended projects are forwarded to the Governor and then to the State Legislature for funding.

From 1997 to 2006, the University completed the following new buildings and structures:

- Argenta Residence Hall
- Dining Conference Center
- Fire Science Academy (Carlin, Nevada)
- Fitzgerald Student Services Building
- Legacy Hall
- Mackay Stadium Field House
- National Judicial College addition
- Nell J. Redfield Building
- Parking Services
- Pennington Medical Education Building
- School of Medicine Modular
- Sierra Street Parking Complex
- West Stadium Parking Complex
- Whalen Parking Complex
- William J. Raggio Building


Several buildings are in the construction or design phase including a student union, a library, a science and math building, a research building for the School of Medicine, green houses and an academic counseling center for athletes. Growing demand for on-campus residential housing has resulted in plans to convert the University Inn to housing for undergraduate students by the year 2008. This will add residential space for 300 students. Funding for Lincoln and Manzanita Residence Hall renovations is included in the University’s 2007-2009 capital projects request to the State Public Works Board.

In 2005, a seismic evaluation of all campus buildings (CD 8.18: Nevada Earthquake Safety Council Annual Report 2005) identified buildings requiring seismic upgrades. A “Facilities Condition Assessment” is underway to evaluate thirty buildings 25 years of age or older to determine deferred maintenance and capital renewal needs. In 2006, an evaluation of the campus utility system was completed that identified needed upgrades and replacements. A new central telephone system was installed on campus early in 2007.

8.C.3 Physical resource planning addresses access to institutional facilities for special constituencies including the physically impaired and provides for appropriate security arrangements.

The University’s physical resource planning, procurement process and procurement policy do not currently require departmental or unit purchasers to ensure access for special constituencies including the physically impaired. The Oregon State University Hardware and Software Access Guidelines (CD 8.11: Disability Resource Center; Retention and Graduation Report 2005-06) provide a model for purchasing and procurement that the Disability Resource Center recommends the University emulate.
The Student Services Division and the Administration and Finance Division track and plan for the personal safety of students, faculty and staff, including special constituencies (RE 8.1a: Campus Safety; CD 8.9: Campus Safety Concerns Subcommittee Reports). The Facilities Services Division provides for the security of campus property and appropriate access to physical facilities. Most buildings are accessed after hours using traditional keys, although some have been converted to access by card keys (CD 8.19: Key Control Policy). Card keys provide greater security and better access for the physically impaired, and are expected to become the norm over time. In addition, the primary entrances to some campus buildings are monitored by video surveillance in compliance with the campus policy on the installation and use of video and audio surveillance equipment (CD 8.20: Policy on Video and Audio Equipment Usage).

8.C.4 Governing board members and affected constituent groups are involved, as appropriate, in planning physical facilities.

The 10-person Facilities Resource Committee, which reports to the President of the University, is the primary body on campus that reviews space needs/requests and determines how space will be allocated. Six vice-presidents and the Provost serve on this committee. (SM 8.2d: Facilities Planning and Space Management Policy, and memo from Provost dated August 6, 2001). The University Administrative Manual outlines additional guidelines for allocation and use of space on campus. (RE 8.1g: Operation, Use and Maintenance of University Properties). Included is an “Environmental Policy” with sections on curriculum, natural features, energy, water consumption, transportation, hazardous materials, solid waste, buildings, life cycle cost analysis, indoor environmental quality, and purchasing. A separate Energy and Environment Committee that reports to the President and Provost is also described in this section of the University Administrative Manual. As described in section 8.C.2 and CD 8.17, the governing Board of Regents reviews and prioritizes all requests for capital construction projects.

Standard Eight Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations

Strengths: Physical Resources

- The location, grounds, and general appearance of the University campus are attractive and appropriate to a university environment.
- In the absence of adequate physical growth, University employees at all levels have pulled together to creatively maximize the existing resources. In the past 10 years, new programs have been incorporated and existing programs have expanded, largely in the absence of new space. University employees have been willing to accept less than ideal physical conditions for the betterment of the students and the campus as a whole. In summary, an amazing amount has been accomplished with existing resources.
- A number of very positive capital improvements have been completed in the past 10 years. Notable are completion of the William J. Raggio Building (Education) and the Pennington Building (Medicine), renovation of Frandsen Humanities, construction of Argenta Hall with the new dining commons, and creation of the Redfield Campus and the Fire Science Academy in Carlin, Nevada.
- Seventy-three percent of the scheduled classrooms now host modern teaching technology, and that percentage continues to grow. The Student Technology Fee ($4 per credit) funds design, support, and maintenance of these classrooms. Classroom technology is upgraded on a regular schedule.
Challenges: Physical Resources

- Existing instructional space cannot accommodate projected enrollment growth, and is rapidly reaching capacity. Existing classrooms with fixed technology do not meet the demand for large and small classroom requests.

- Lack of adequate research space is negatively impacting the University’s ability to compete for grants, contracts, and new faculty.

- Funding for technology expansion and replacement does not meet the demands of a modern campus.

- Student housing is inadequate for the University to develop from a “commuter college” to a residential campus.

Recommendations: Physical Resources

- Increase the funding for capital construction. Current and anticipated growth in the number of students, faculty and programs at the University cannot be accommodated adequately without renovation of older buildings and the addition of new space for instruction, research and student housing.

- Reuse the facilities to be vacated by the student union and the library. Jot Travis Student Union will be vacant fall 2007, and the Getchell Library will be vacant fall 2008. This space of more than 200,000 square feet could address some overcrowding and physical organization issues on campus.

- Increase the Student Technology Fee to $10 per credit. The requirements for instructional technology and support of this technology are increasing exponentially. An increased Student Technology Fee could help fund broader support for departmental or college computing needs as well as the specialized instructional technology labs across campus.

- Increase instruction delivered in alternative formats, and reward faculty who successfully teach in alternative formats. Expand online courses to reduce or flatten the demand for classroom space. Support faculty willing to invest in migrating existing instruction to web-based formats by providing technical support and a reward structure (e.g., consider an award for outstanding instructor using alternative delivery). Increase online student support services to match those available on campus.

- Review the process for assigning space on campus with the goal of increasing utilization. For example, entities that contribute to the campus community but do not directly support instruction and research could be located at sites other than the main campus (e.g., the University of Nevada Press, the public radio station (KUNR) and WICHE).
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Standard Nine — Institutional Integrity

The institution adheres to the highest ethical standards in its representation to its constituencies and the public; in its teaching, scholarship, and service; in its treatment of its students, faculty, and staff; and in its relationships with regulatory and accrediting agencies.

Overview

The University of Nevada, Reno has numerous policies that reflect a commitment to integrity. The institution also has a long history of active faculty and staff governance that serves as an important check on the implementation of these policies, including a history of reviewing and revising policies to meet changing needs and conditions. The subsections that follow address, in turn, each element of Standard Nine provided by the NWCCU.

Although the University of Nevada, Reno has numerous policies reflecting a commitment to integrity, the institutional climate of the University has been challenged in the past five years by an apparent disconnect between such policy statements and actual behavior. Lively conversations occurred both on and off campus about the consequences of some administrative decisions. Student and community newspapers reported on alleged wrong doings. These alleged wrong doings ran the gamut from the mistreatment of animals on a research farm to lawsuits claiming that the University violated the civil rights of faculty and staff. Campus groups, such as the Faculty Senate, struggled to address these concerns and as a result, corrective actions have been both proposed and implemented.

Within this context, the process of addressing the issues contained in Standard Nine began with two campus-wide forums (CD 9.4: Faculty and Staff Forums on Accreditation) specifically focused on institutional integrity. Participants at these forums discussed the importance of adhering to principles of institutional integrity and identified strengths, challenges and recommendations that helped shape the analysis contained in Standard Nine. This report also draws on information from numerous sources, included in the document list. Of particular use were the 2005 reports of the Faculty Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Morale and Task Force on Faculty Morale (CD 9.1: Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Morale (Faculty Morale Report)) and the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 which contained specific questions concerning institutional integrity and campus climate (CD 9.3: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006).

Despite the campus climate challenges of the past five years, the new President, the Faculty Senate, the Reno Chapter of the Nevada Faculty Alliance, and other individuals and groups have worked to strengthen the institution’s policies and commitment to institutional integrity. Given these ongoing efforts, it is important to emphasize that some of the report information, such as recommendations from the Committee on Faculty Morale, comes from studies undertaken during President Lilley’s tenure as head of the institution. Since August 2006, Dr. Milton Glick has assumed that role. Furthermore, the accreditation survey, conducted in October 2006, is also somewhat retrospective. Therefore, several of the issues highlighted in this report are already being addressed by the new President. For example, President Glick discussed his commitment to specific recommendations in the Faculty Morale Report at a December 8, 2006, meeting, hosted by the Nevada Faculty Alliance (CD 9.5: Nevada Faculty Alliance Report, December 8, 2006). As noted throughout the following sections, the University is also implementing specific policy revisions that link policy statements to improved policy action.
Standard 9.A — Institutional Integrity

9.A.1 The institution, including governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff, subscribes to, exemplifies, and advocates high ethical standards in the management and operations and in all of its dealings with students, the public, organizations and external agencies.

The University of Nevada, Reno’s commitment to high standards is clearly expressed in numerous documents, including the NSHE CODE (RE 9.1a), the UNR Bylaws (RE 9.2), the University Administrative Manual (RE 9.3), the Student Handbook (RE 9.4), the Honor Code (RE 9.5) and the University General Catalog, 2007-2008 (RE 9.6). These statements of values emphasize the commitment to quality expected in all the University’s activities, including an adherence to ethical standards (CD 9.2: University Values Statement). In particular, the University aims to maintain high standards for all students, faculty and staff: a caring environment; civility and graciousness in interacting with one another; equity in the treatment of all members; and shared governance. In the October 2006 Campus Accreditation Survey (CD 9.3), 86 percent of respondents indicated that UNR’s mission, goals, and values statement is appropriate.

In many areas, UNR exemplifies in its actions the standards it advocates. For example, 71 percent of respondents to the October 2006 Campus Accreditation Survey (CD 9.3) agree that the University is following its mission, goals, and values statement. More than 60 percent of survey respondents believe that the University has adequately codified processes and procedures to protect faculty and staff rights — and that these are applied consistently. In addition, 65 percent believe that UNR communicates well to its various constituencies. Despite these ethical strengths, UNR faces some key challenges, particularly in its approach to human resources. In the Faculty Morale Report of August 2005 (CD 9.1), faculty expressed dismay at — among other things — a climate of intimidation, fear and powerlessness; a lack of adherence to rules and policies; an environment of retaliation; unfairness in evaluations and merit; and an authoritarian rule. Several civil lawsuits grew out of this negative atmosphere. One example includes a University employee who received a jury award in 2005 of $209,000 over a First Amendment issue (CD 9.6: Jury Awards $209,000 to UNR).

Ongoing issues with morale and institutional climate were also documented in spring 2006 by the campus-wide forums conducted on April 21 and May 4 as part of the accreditation process (CD 9.4). The Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3), the most recent investigation, points to similar concerns which are highlighted in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.1</th>
<th>Key Challenges: Campus Accreditation Survey 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 57 % of respondents agreed ‘Morale is a problem on campus’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 49 % disagreed with the statement ‘Administrative/Academic faculty/Staff are free to express opinions critical of campus administrators without fear of retribution’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 60 % disagreed with the statement ‘Administrative/Academic faculty/Staff are sufficiently involved in campus decision-making’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 64 % disagreed with the statement ‘Major policy changes have included sufficient administrative/academic faculty input before being implemented’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 60 % disagreed with the statement ‘Institutional policies and procedures are consistently applied at all levels’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Faculty Morale Report and the Faculty Morale Task Force (CD 9.1 and CD 9.1a) made several recommendations relevant to ethical standards in their August 2005 and May 2006 reports. These recommendations would also contribute to institutional integrity at UNR. Several key recommendations are summarized in Table 9.2.
In addition, the campus-wide forum (May 4, 2006) to help improve institutional integrity at UNR (CD 9.4) resulted in these suggestions: using “integrity” as a criterion in selecting administrators; enforcing more consistently the bylaws of the University; providing reasons for administrative decisions; rewarding those who report bylaw violations; and, allowing employees to bring witnesses to meetings with administrators.

The implementation of these suggestions would move UNR beyond a concern for meeting only the minimal legal requirements and into a focus on pursuing the highest ethical standards. As President Glick has phrased it — [UNR should] do the “right” thing. These suggestions, which would strengthen the University’s approach to human resources, are consistent with NWCCU policy, which states that a college or university has “an obligation to protect faculty and students from inappropriate pressures or destructive harassments” (CD 9.7: NWCCU Standard Nine Institutional Integrity).

Even before the arrival of a new University President, faculty and staff actively identified and addressed campus climate and integrity issues. The arrival of President Glick has further strengthened the momentum to implement key policy initiatives. Indeed, at the end of 2006, several actions were underway to improve morale and institutional integrity as shown in Table 9.3.

The institution’s strong history of commitment to institutional integrity is evident in the actions of campus groups and individuals — not external forces — to identify and address issues.

9.A.2 The institution regularly evaluates and revises as necessary its policies, procedures, and publications to ensure continuing integrity throughout the institution.

University values, including a commitment to integrity, are reflected in policies and procedures that govern administrative practices. For example, UNR publishes, updates and makes available to the University community its University Administrative Manual (RE 9.3), UNR Bylaws (RE 9.2), NSHE CODE (RE 9.1a), and meeting minutes that deal with and contain policies, procedures, and associated publications setting forth rules and regulations. It specifies institutional goals that embody the pursuit of truth and the protection of academic freedom, including management practices that foster these traditions. Campus stakeholders are involved in ongoing efforts to update these policies and procedures.

Thanks to a strong culture of shared governance, the faculty and staff of the University are involved in the routine, organizational life of the institution. A majority of respondents (56.5 percent) to the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3) agree that the Faculty Senate and Staff Employees’ Council effectively articulate con-
stituent interests to the University. Some specific policies were mentioned in the survey. More than 79 percent of respondents believe the revised Conflict of Interest Policy (RE 9.7: Conflict of Interest Policy) is adequate and implemented fairly (more than 70 percent). Sixty percent agree that criteria for advancement and promotion, including annual evaluation criteria, are clearly stated. Moreover, more than 55 percent agree that the system of awarding merit pay is clearly stated. At the same time, however, 58 percent of survey respondents disagree that policy changes have been clearly explained in advance, and 64 percent disagree with the assertion that policy changes sufficiently involve faculty and staff input.

These examples and the process of addressing campus climate speak to the core integrity of the University. The entire campus community actively evaluates and revises policies and procedures to ensure that integrity is a cornerstone of institutional action.

### 9.A.3 The institution represents itself accurately and consistently to its constituencies, the public, and prospective students through its catalogs, publications, and official statements.

Marketing and Communications has numerous strategies and policies in place for communicating to our outside constituents. These include:

**Nevada News (RE 9.8)**

Nevada News is the University of Nevada, Reno’s up-to-date campus news source, which is available at [www.unr.edu/nevadanews/](http://www.unr.edu/nevadanews/). In addition, three email digest versions of Nevada News share headline news with specific audiences:
- Faculty and staff (sent weekly)
- Students (sent monthly or more often if warranted by news flow)
- University “friends and donors” (sent every other week)

**Events Calendar (RE 9.9)**

The University’s events calendar is maintained online at [www.unr.edu/events](http://www.unr.edu/events). Anyone may submit items online to the calendar.

**Our Workplace (RE 9.10)**

*Our Workplace* is an online, one-stop shop for news and information relevant to employees of the UNR throughout the state. An email digest version is sent to faculty and staff weekly at workplace.unr.edu/

**UNR Gateway Website (RE 9.11)**

The top-level pages of the University website ([www.unr.edu/](http://www.unr.edu/)), including the faculty profiles, as well as banner ads, *Nevada News* headlines and events, are maintained by Marketing and Communications.

Although past problems have surfaced with the top leadership’s pursuit and maintenance of academic integrity, there has been progress. For example, the institution — working collaboratively with student and faculty groups — revised its free speech policy to declare the entire campus a “free speech” zone. The University Faculty Senate collaborated with the Department of Public Safety to establish a video surveillance policy to comply with personal safety and hazardous materials regulations (RE 9.3a). The Kennedy Index, a study released in 2005, rated UNR as the “best in the nation” in providing opportunities for women in sports. In 2006, UNR was ranked in the top 10 of NCAA Division 1-A athletic departments in overall diversity excellence (CD 9.8: College Sports and Title IX). Additionally, student athlete graduation rates are higher than the general student body rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.3 Positive Actions Taking Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The Faculty Senate and the Administration worked together on the successful hiring of a University ombudsman (April 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human Resources’ Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force is reviewing the process of administrative faculty evaluation and proposing a revised process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Faculty Senate, working with the Administration, is addressing the issue of non-traditional faculty rights and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- President Glick and other University entities are working toward more transparent shared governance, including work with the Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevada Silver and Blue (RE 9.12)
Nevada Silver and Blue is a quarterly magazine for alumni, donors and others. Nevada Silver and Blue demonstrates the relevance, caliber and importance of the University's programs and faculty and connects alums to the University www.unr.edu/nevadasilverandblue/.

On-campus Video Monitor
Highlights from Nevada News and the online Events Calendar are posted on a video monitor in the Jot Travis Student Union. Through a cooperative venture with the Associated Students of University of Nevada (ASUN), this beta site will be expanded to encompass a network of video monitors in other campus locations in 2007.

News Releases (RE 9.13)
News releases are routinely developed and distributed to local, regional or national media. An archive of all university releases is available at www.unr.edu/marcomm/. News releases are also posted as news stories in Nevada News.

Specialty Publications and Collateral Materials
Marketing and Communications writes, edits and produces specialty publications for the University, including programs for events such as Commencement and Honor the Best. Marketing and Communications also partners with colleges, schools and administrative units to plan and create marketing collateral — brochures, fliers and the like — to reach relevant audiences. Examples include annual reports produced for University of Nevada Cooperative Extension and the Nevada Small Business Development Centers.

The Marketing and Communications office recently redesigned the University’s website (www.unr.edu/).

Other communication efforts are being made on campus. For example, Enrollment Services’ publications include recruitment materials directed at students, parents, and high school counselors. The University’s Office of Institutional Analysis provides the enrollment, retention, and graduation data included in these materials. Institutional Analysis also provides data on student/teacher ratios. Information on educational and housing costs comes from the Cashier’s office, and Residential Life, Housing and Food Services.

Admissions and Records (A&R) staff collaborate with the Provost’s Office to support the curriculum process. Admissions and Records staff serve as the secretary to the University Courses and Curriculum Committee (UCCC) and thus are responsible for assembling and distributing meeting agendas and minutes and for revising and publishing the general catalog. Meeting minutes are posted on the UCCC website maintained by A&R staff. As minutes of each meeting are approved and posted on the website, approved changes are implemented in the Student Information System (SIS), the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS), the class schedule, and the general catalog.

Data from the recent Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3) of faculty and staff indicate that a majority (65 percent) of respondents agree or strongly agree that “UNR represents itself accurately to all stakeholders (staff, faculty, students, and the external community) through its policies.” In addition, a majority (58 percent) of respondents also agree or strongly agree that “UNR represents itself accurately to all stakeholders through official actions.”

9.A.4 Institutional policy defines and prohibits conflict of interest on the part of governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff.

The Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, under the leadership of its Director, Cindy Kiel, developed a Conflict of Interest Policy (RE 9.7) for the University that applies to all of UNR, including the School of Medicine. It was approved by the Faculty Senate January 22, 2004, and signed by the President. In fall 2006, the Office of the Vice President for Research distributed a document, “Research Best Practices” (CD 9.9: Research Best Practices) that summarizes the above-referenced Conflict of Interest Policy. Although the revised Conflict of Interest Policy has not yet been incorporated into
the University Administrative Manual, it is considered UNR policy and its implementation began in 2005 through the Office of Sponsored Projects and Administration. The current Conflict of Interest Policy in the University Administrative Manual (2,000-2,999 Personnel) (RE 9.3c) will be updated by the new policy to conform to state and federal law. In the accreditation survey, 79 percent of respondents to the self-study survey indicated that the new policy was adequate, and more than 70 percent believe it is implemented fairly.

There are additional conflict of interest policies at UNR. One was developed for the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension (UNCE) to meet, among other things, USDA requirements (RE 9.14: Cooperative Extension’s Conflict of Interest Policy). This is a much more restrictive policy than the one developed for UNR as a whole. Title 4, Chapters 1, 2, 3, 10 of the Board of Regents Handbook (RE 9.1b) also codifies conflict of interest policy as it relates to the Board of Regents. UNR Bylaw 19c (RE 9.2a) covers conflict of interest regarding information on voting rights and promotion and tenure decisions. Conflict of Interest also is in UNR’s Grievance policy (RE 9.2b) stated in the UNR Bylaws regarding the University Grievance Committee (Bylaw 34). In addition, the University Administrative Manual (6,000-6,999 Course and Curricula, B7) (RE 9.3b) contains a brief statement that addresses research-related conflicts of interest. The Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3 (Tenure for University Faculty), contains the policy dealing with conflict of interest in the promotion and tenure process. The University Administrative Manual (2,000-2,999 Personnel) (RE 9.3c) also details UNR’s nepotism policy. Finally, the Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 14, Sec. 23 (NSHE Policy on Instructional Materials) (RE 9.1c) requires that each NSHE institution shall develop “a statement of professional and ethical guidelines relative to the selection of textbooks or other instructional materials.” The Student Life Office has drafted such a policy which is currently under review in the system office.

Most if not all areas of potential conflict of interest are covered in these policies. Thus, UNR has made excellent progress in developing and adopting significant and pertinent conflict of interest policies. However, more progress needs to be made in the implementation of the 2004 Conflict of Interest Policy (RE 9.7). Specifically, the policy is being implemented while it is still under review by UNR counsel. The policy is not yet functional because there is no chair or review committee to develop management plans. The same person serves as both the compliance and misconduct officer. No central office is charged with oversight responsibility for all of the conflict of interest policies that exist at UNR. These issues need to be addressed.

9.A.5 The institution demonstrates, through its policies and practices, its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.

The University’s commitment to academic freedom and the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge can be found within the numerous policy statements of the University, including NSHE CODE (RE 9.1a), University Administrative Manual (RE 9.3), and UNR Bylaws (RE 9.2). For example, UNR Bylaws contain policy statements regarding academic freedom in Bylaw 16c (i, ii), 18, 25, 41 and 56(a) (RE 9.2c) and Bylaw 25 states that “All members of the faculty and graduate fellows shall enjoy academic freedom in the exercise of their profession.” Bylaw 45 notes that “The major purpose of tenure is to ensure a faculty committed to excellence. Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically: 1) academic freedom for teaching, research and of extramural activities.” NSHE CODE states “Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and is applicable to both teaching and research” (RE 9.1a).

The Preamble (3401) to the Student Bill of Rights (RE 9.4) declares that the University exists for “the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students and the general well-being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable in the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students should be encour-
aged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The freedom to learn depends upon opportunities and conditions in the classroom, on the campus, and in the larger community."

Additional statements regarding academic freedom are found in the Policy on Video and Audio Equipment Usage (RE 9.3a); Titles 2 and 4 of the Regents Handbook (RE 9.1); and the Policy on the Use of Human Subjects in Research, Development, and Related Activities (RE 9.3d).

Much of what is contained in the above policies was affirmed by faculty in the recent Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3). Three faculty groups were asked to respond to the item: “UNR demonstrates a commitment to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.” The faculty groups included: (a) academic faculty; (b) administrative faculty; and (c) faculty in the Library, Medical School and Cooperative Extension. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.4</th>
<th>UNR Demonstrates a Commitment to the Pursuit and Dissemination of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Unit</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Faculty (N=363)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Faculty (N=356)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM, Library, UNCE Faculty (N=108)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly the vast number of faculty feel that there is a commitment to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Academic faculty and SOM (School of Medicine), Library, and Cooperative Extension Faculty were asked to respond to the item “Faculty are granted adequate autonomy and independence to conduct their research and teaching,” using the same scale. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.5</th>
<th>Faculty Granted Adequate Autonomy and Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Unit</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Faculty (N=360)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM, Library, UNCE Faculty (N=100)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here also, the majority of respondents believe that autonomy and independence in terms of research and teaching prevail at UNR.

Another item in the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3) allows for inferences to be drawn about academic freedom and the free pursuit of knowledge. That item was “I experience pressure to change my research agenda to fit in or make tenure.” The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.6</th>
<th>Experience Pressure to Change “My” Research Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Unit</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Faculty (N=334)</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM, Library, UNCE Faculty (N=93)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This item suggests that a small, but perhaps significant, group of faculty experience pressure to change or modify their research agendas. UNR should undertake additional analyses of the data to determine if such pressure is localized in certain fields. Further, future surveys should explore these issues in more detail.

The Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3) also revealed positive and negative attitudes regarding the current campus climate with clear implications for the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge at UNR. For example, several
semantic differential overall climate items (all on a scale from 1 to 6, with 3.5 being the midpoint) reveal that faculty and staff generally believe that the climate at UNR is caring as opposed to hostile (mean 4.12), tolerant as opposed to prejudiced (mean 4.23), and liberating as opposed to oppressive (mean 4.01). Other climate items were not as positive, with faculty and staff generally believing that UNR is impersonal as opposed to friendly (mean 2.64), intellectually stifling vs. intellectually stimulating (mean 2.94), and unethical vs. principled (mean .82).

As pointed out in section 9.1, the University has initiated recent actions to address many of these concerns. Some of these recommendations have been acted upon: the new President has encouraged communication and transparency; a person has been hired into the Ombudsman’s position; and the Faculty Senate has become more proactive in addressing campus-wide issues.

As part of the land-grant university system, The University of Nevada, Reno is committed to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge across the state and the globe. This commitment is evidenced by the active and vital community-based education components of UNR (e.g. UNCE, School of Medicine, Extended Studies), the numerous and vigorous international activities of the University; the growth in research and grant productivity by faculty; and the active service contributions of faculty, staff and students. While concerns remain about issues relating to academic freedom and the dissemination of knowledge, progress has nonetheless been made. It is hoped that the recommendations contained in this document, if implemented, will further the free exchange of ideas and information critical to the growth and prosperity of this institution.

**Standard Nine Summary: Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations**

Institutional integrity is a critical cornerstone supporting the organizational health of the University. While the University is making progress in a number of areas (strengths), specific actions (recommendations) address key challenges. When implemented, strategic actions will further strengthen the institutional integrity throughout the University’s on- and off-campus communities in Nevada.

**Strengths: Institutional Integrity**

- The University has implemented policies that attempt to create a climate for the highest ethical standards.
- The University has provided evidence for ensuring continuing integrity throughout the institution.
- The University has implemented strategies and policies for communicating to outside constituents.
- The University has taken steps to implement a conflict of interest policy.
- The University is making progress to demonstrate its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge consistent with its mission and goals.

**Challenges: Institutional Integrity**

- The University remains challenged by many of the issues and opportunities for change described in the Faculty Morale Report, the Faculty Morale Task Force report (CD 9.1 and CD 9.1a) and the Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3). While conditions have improved, the University needs to keep a continued focus on improving the integrity of the institution.
- The University needs to provide the leadership and organizational strength to ensure that the highest ethical standards for all students, faculty, and staff can be realized. The leadership must implement strategies to ensure a caring environment, civility, equity, and shared governance.

**Recommendations: Institutional Integrity**

- The University should continue to aggressively implement recommendations in the Faculty Morale Task Force (CD 9.1a), monitor its progress, and report progress in implementing these changes to the campus community. Additionally, it should continue to monitor morale and other climate issues identified in the recently conducted Campus Accreditation Survey 2006 (CD 9.3) by carrying out similar surveys on a regular basis. In the context of improving the campus climate, the University should implement steps to pursue mutually agreeable resolutions to the civil lawsuits filed by present and former university personnel.

- The University should continue to support the Faculty Senate, SEC, ASUN and GSA in efforts to provide participatory engagement processes (such as campus-wide forums) that ensure all employees and students the opportunities to be actively involved in campus decision-making.

- The University should institute an accountability procedure to ensure that university bylaws are enforced fairly and equitably, always with its institutional eye focused on integrity.

- The University should modify its mission statement to reflect the value and importance of academic freedom and the University’s commitment to the free dissemination of knowledge based on the land-grant heritage of the institution.

- The University should update the University Administrative Manual (RE 9.3) to incorporate the Conflict of Interest Policy (RE 9.7); additionally, it should provide an implementation and monitoring plan for carrying out the policy.
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Summary

It is often stated that the real value of programmatic self-studies is in the process itself. Through a process of self-examination an institution can engage its community, reaffirm core values, and identify areas of strength and areas where improvement can be pursued. The two-year effort reflected in the preceding self-study meets these goals for the University of Nevada, Reno. The self-study involved individuals from all parts of the campus. After nearly two years of meetings, discussion, collection and analysis of data, writing and review, the institution has a much better sense of its strengths and challenges. The University ends the formal self-study with a renewed sense of mission and a series of goals and recommendations to pursue.

The University of Nevada, Reno is committed to the values of accreditation. As noted in the very first document developed as part of this self-study, our effort was guided by the belief that “[A]ccreditation is one of the most basic activities conducted by American Universities. It is designed to sustain and enhance the quality of academic programs.” We noted, further, that our self-study would provide “an evidence based assessment that the institution operates with clearly defined and appropriate educational goals and is reasonably organized, staffed and supported to accomplish these goals.” (See: CD ES 1.1 Accreditation Overview). The commitment to accreditation does not end with the self-study. Rather, we will use the knowledge gained through this collaborative process to continuously seek to better develop the performance of the University.

Compliance with Eligibility Requirements and Standards

The self-study provides ample evidence that the University of Nevada, Reno meets eligibility requirements and standards for accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. In the Preface to the self-study we briefly summarized the institution’s compliance with the 20 eligibility requirements all institutions must achieve. These 20 general eligibility requirements are backed by more intensive discussion of multiple individual elements contained in nine standards of programmatic accomplishment in the self-study document. In summary form the following paragraphs highlight the University of Nevada Reno’s commitment and accomplishments.

The University is empowered through the State Constitution and under direction of an elected statewide Board of Regents to grant degrees and offer a wide range of academic programs from the baccalaureate through doctoral levels. The University of Nevada, Reno has been continuously providing higher education programs to the residents of the state since 1874. As a land-grant institution, the University maintains a statewide presence with programs and activities in all 17 counties of the state.

The institutional mission guides the goals and operation of the University. The goals of the mission emphasize high-quality degree programs in the arts, sciences and in selected professions. The mission also charges the University to contribute to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge that will help improve society at the state, regional and national levels. True to our land-grant status, educational and research programs also include community programs, including continuing education, cooperative extension, and many other specific programs within colleges and departments. Documentation demonstrates the University’s dedication to these goals and the widespread campus support for the stated mission and values of the University.
The University systematically plans for dedicating resources to achieve its mission. A comprehensive strategic planning process was adopted in 2001. While not without problems, the strategic planning process focused University resources and provided a means for continuous review of programmatic efforts. Indeed, the reaccreditation self-study process was designed to be an end point of that process and the beginning point for the next phase of University planning. The strengths, challenges, and recommendations of this self-study — as well as the analysis of both the strengths and shortcomings of our past strategic planning efforts — are already providing a framework for the emerging metrics-based next phase of University planning.

The programs offered by the University comply with Commission eligibility requirements across a range of evaluative criteria. Most important, University faculty have major control over the curriculum, and faculty and students enjoy extensive academic freedom to discover, produce and challenge knowledge in a wide range of disciplines. More than 200 academic programs offer specialized knowledge at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and a rigorous Core Curriculum provides all undergraduates with a skills-based foundation in the liberal arts and sciences. The University has also greatly enhanced its assessment efforts to insure that academic programs are both rigorous and honest in pursuing stated learning objectives. Programs of study are clearly and publicly defined. The University also offers a range of academic support services to enhance student achievement. Backed by a vibrant, creative and professional staff, the institution provides students with multiple services for advising, academic support, scholarship aid, student health, student safety and campus activities that enliven the student experience.

The University has built and continues to build a superb academic faculty, dedicated to teaching and distinguished for research, scholarship, and creative activity. Faculty are engaged as both teachers and researchers. Shared governance and academic freedom are central to the University’s governance.

Indeed, faculty and staff involvement in University governance was both tested and reaffirmed over the past 10 years as the University underwent significant change and reorganization. While some of the change resulted in a temporary ebbing of morale, the entire campus community worked to reverse lapses in communication and principles of shared governance.

Faculty participate in planning and decision-making at every level: departmental, college, university, and even have formal input at the system level. Staff and student involvement are also formally structured at every level of University governance. The administration of the University is professional and efficiently organized. University financial management practices are conducted in a professional manner and regularly reviewed through independently conducted audits.

The Next Steps for University Action

While the University of Nevada, Reno clearly meets all eligibility requirements for accreditation, we also recognize specific areas where improvement is needed. The Executive Summary of the Preface identifies overarching challenges and recommendations. Each standard report offers a series of more specific strengths, challenges and recommendations.

The University will address these challenges and recommendations through a number of actions at multiple levels of institutional governance. Reflecting the institution’s commitment to shared governance, the guiding principle for implementation is to empower the relevant level of decision-making to oversee the next steps of our continuing self-study. Indeed, President Glick has stated a goal to return as much decision-making authority as possible to the lowest level of responsibility. Such decentralization will lead
to quicker action on numerous recommendations identified in the self-study and flatten the administrative structure of the University, a specific recommendation in Standard Nine and in multiple forums linked to the accreditation self-study process.

In many cases where action can be taken by particular academic or administrative units, such action is already underway. For example, multiple recommendations in Standard Three concerning student services — especially in developing innovative programming in conjunction with the opening of the new Joe Crowley Student Union — are being developed. Colleges and departments, as well as the Core Curriculum, are working in conjunction with the Office of University Assessment to maintain and further improve assessment planning and reporting.

The larger recommendations presented in the self-study will require more integrative leadership. For each of these larger recommendations the lead or responsible individuals or groups have been identified. In some cases action is underway, but for many of these larger recommendations a process of consultation and policy development must occur over time.

Physical resources are the key challenge to the University. With increased enrollment growth and the demand for faculty research and creative activity space, the University must develop a multifaceted response. The lead actor for this recommendation is the University President. The most basic response — to secure increased capital funds — will come through presidential direction. The University must continue to support and pursue its vigorous efforts at private fundraising. Fundraising for prioritized projects is already underway. The President is also the University’s voice to the Regents and the Legislature. Discussions with the legislature to better capture tuition increases have already begun. Improved capture of tuition funds would provide support for facilities.

Increasing non-traditional instruction is another means by which both physical resources can be extended and new programs delivered. The lead actors here are the Provost and Deans working with Extended Studies to make non-traditional teaching formats more accessible (for both students and faculty) and better funded. Short course and “executive” degree programs are already being pursued with the College of Business Administration and College of Liberal Arts.

A revised strategic planning process is already under development. The lead actor will initially be the President but over time this must involve the whole campus. The President has held multiple town hall meetings with various campus constituencies to seek input on the means by which the University’s priorities can best be set and measured. Next steps will include development of selected indicators or metrics that state and measure University goals. The newly established Dean’s Council has begun to discuss these metrics and will work in concert with departments to develop strategies for accomplishing restated University goals.

While parts of the self-study can be interpreted as giving a negative review of the previous planning process, the effort did provide a baseline of data from which the University will be able to build and measure future progress. The new effort will be more streamlined. The conversation begun on campus about planning will build upon the conversation that resulted from faculty-led efforts to address morale issues. As the morale issues are already quickly fading, the improved sense of shared governance on campus will certainly guide the new strategic planning effort.

Reallocation of funds to support instruction is another area already under development. The President, working through the Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, and the Assistant Vice President for Planning, Budget and Analysis, are developing plans that will change the salary savings policy. Deans will become more directly involved, and state funds are likely to be shifted to cover ongoing instructional needs. Policy changes are underway and must be monitored to ensure that instructional hiring needs are improved, especially in areas related to the Core Curriculum.
Regular assessment of campus attitudes was identified in multiple standard reports as an area in which more data are needed. The responsible officer to begin the process of such data gathering is the Provost, acting with relevant campus bodies such as the Faculty Senate, Staff Employees’ Council, Office of University Assessment, and Institutional Analysis. Preliminary discussions of such efforts have begun in the Academic Leadership Council.

Increasing the technology fee to provide additional funds for technology enhancements must be a consultative process between the President and Provost working directly with student leadership from ASUN and GSA. This process can begin in the fall 2007 semester.

Improving administrative processes between the campus and NSHE involve multiple campus leaders reporting to the President.

Increasing commitments to graduate programs is a stated goal of the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the Graduate School. Program reviews are already underway, and different approaches to program funding and delivery are being developed. This must unfold with consultation between the responsible administrators and the Graduate Council and Graduate Student Association.

Conclusion

The University of Nevada, Reno is a vibrant academic institution that is well-situated to continue its impressive growth in student instruction and faculty research and creative activity. The University is well organized to meet its mission — a mission that enjoys widespread support across campus and within the state. The University has shown its commitment to the importance of accreditation through concrete actions addressing concerns raised in the 1997 accreditation evaluation. We show our continued commitment to the principles of accreditation with our comprehensive and multi-year self-study report. The institution meets the criteria for accreditation and is using the standards of the NWCCU to continuously enhance programs across the campus. The University of Nevada, Reno will continue to build on its multiple strengths across each and every standard articulated by the NWCCU and is now pursuing a programmatic response to recommendations outlined in our self-study assessment. As noted at the outset of this Summary, the institution has used the self-study process to explore and revitalize itself while demonstrating that all aspects of accreditation eligibility are addressed.

The arrival of a new president coupled with the campus review of all aspects of University governance growing from the accreditation process provides a positive base from which the University of Nevada, Reno will undoubtedly move forward over the next decade.