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FOCUSED INTERIM REPORT TO NWCCU
MARCH 2009

INTRODUCTION

The fall 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Report for the University of Nevada, Reno from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities contained several recommendations that required this focused interim report and a visit by a Commission representative in spring 2009.

This Focused Interim Report has been prepared by documenting the accomplishments expected in each of the recommendations and related standards.

When the Comprehensive Evaluation Report was received, appropriate faculty and staff were advised of the importance of meeting the expectations. Work started immediately to meet the expectations, and each of the recommendations was assigned to a person responsible for compiling the information needed to verify compliance with the recommendations.

The report has been reviewed and input received from the University’s President, Provost, Faculty Senate Executive Board and Academic Leadership Council (consisting of college deans and other campus academic leaders).

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report consists of stating each recommendation followed by a brief narrative describing the work that has been done and the outcomes. Critical appendices are included. Additional information and documentation will be provided as exhibits at the time of the visit. Examples of accomplishments or detail on those accomplishments will be the focus of the exhibits.

The recommendations are listed by their number in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report: 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11, and the appendices to each of the recommendations are given numbers consisting of the recommendation number and consecutive letters: 3A. There are other recommendations that will be addressed in a report due in 2010.

The response to recommendation 3 regarding assessment is necessarily the longest due to the magnitude of work that is being done as the University approaches 100 percent involvement in the assessment expectations. This section has two distinct parts. The first part is a narrative report on the University’s progress on assessment
of academic programs in the various colleges and departments. The second part describes the progress of assessment in the Core Curriculum.
Recommendation 3
The Committee acknowledges progress made university-wide in defining and publishing student learning outcomes but recommends nonetheless that steps be taken to ensure that all academic programs (including the Core Curriculum) are completing fully the process of evaluation, analysis of results, and demonstrating that curricular changes are made as needed. (Standard 2.B and Policy 2.2)

STANDARD TWO, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS; POLICY 2.2, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT (ACADEMIC PROGRAMS)

Introduction
In both the Five-Year Interim Report (2002) and Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report (2007), the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)\(^1\) noted that much progress had been made regarding outcomes assessment at the University of Nevada, Reno. Also noted in each report was that such progress should continue toward realizing the goal, clearly stated in the 2007 report, of demonstrating “institution-wide practice whereby student learning outcomes are clearly and consistently stated, student performance is assessed relative to expected outcomes, and the results of assessment informs curricular and related requirements.” In the 2007 report it was further recommended that “...steps be taken to ensure that all academic programs . . . are completing fully the process of evaluation, analysis of results, and demonstrating that curriculum changes are made as needed.” The remainder of this section describes the major steps that have been taken, including those subsequent to the Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report, to ensure Standard 2.2 is met. The specific, positive results of those steps will be described briefly in the narrative and fully documented in the appendices and in exhibits that will be available during the site visit.

Background
The University of Nevada, Reno Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (Appendix 3A) identifies the academic-degree program as the focal unit and clearly calls for all programs to engage in an ongoing cycle of assessment. That cycle, which is being implemented by all UNR programs, begins with a program assessment plan and culminates with faculty decisions regarding program modifications to enhance student learning. The offices of the President, Provost and Vice President for Student Services, as well as the Assessment Advisory Committee, have been consistent in their support of this plan. All three offices, speaking to the entire University community, have emphasized both the importance of assessment and the need for faculty to engage in and support it. The substantial progress made in the

---

\(^1\) In 2002, NWCCU existed as the Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities.
development and implementation of the UNR Assessment Plan is attributable to the specifics of the University’s support, including:

- Creating the Office of University Assessment (OUA) and staffing it with three full-time professionals, one .5 FTE Programmer Analyst and a 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant;

- Providing the OUA with resources sufficient for activities such as the National Survey of Student Engagement and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement;

- Supporting OUA’s proposal to initiate comprehensive surveys of both UNR alumni and, for those alumni who are employed, their immediate supervisors;

- Supporting faculty assessment efforts through “mini-grants,” attendance at professional meetings and workshops, and participation in the Northern Nevada Assessment Conference.

The OUA has used the above support to develop an infrastructure to assist programs as they develop their assessment plans and implement the assessment cycle. The assessment infrastructure, developed and managed by OUA, includes:

- A cadre of Assessment Coordinators, a faculty member designated by each program, to both facilitate assessment within the program and serve as liaison to the OUA;

- A combination of assessment guidelines, templates, examples and specific tools, such as Curriculum Mapping, which are offered to all programs as support materials and through professional development workshops;

- A set of Web interfaces enabling programs to submit and revise assessment plans and reports and to provide faculty access to considerable assessment information, links and tools, enabling the public to view program assessment plans and reports2;

- A searchable database (also on the Web site) enabling access to information specific to a respective program, e.g., alumni and employer survey data, current assessment plans and reports, all provided at the University, college, department and individual program levels;

---

2 Assessment plans from all programs are published on the OUA Web site; however, program assessment reports are published only for those programs electing to do so. The absence of an assessment report on the OUA Web site in no way indicates that the program has not submitted reports.
• An annual professional meeting, The Northern Nevada Assessment Conference, cosponsored by UNR, Truckee Meadows Community College and Western Nevada College, that encourages faculty to share their own assessment work, to learn about the work of others and to discuss assessment issues and strategies with their colleagues;

• Helping program assessment activities to be as efficient and effective as possible through individual support to each program in the form of written reviews in response to submitted assessment plans and reports, meetings with program and department faculty and one-on-one meetings with Assessment Coordinators, Department Chairs, Deans and other faculty.

Assessment: College and School Perspectives
Although the focus of student outcomes assessment is at the program level, individual colleges and schools provide the organizational framework for these programs and influence various aspects of assessment. The 2007 Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report included commentary on assessment specific to each college, as well as on UNR’s interdisciplinary degree programs. A sample response (from the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources) to the contents of the report is included in Appendix 3B. The electronic version of the report, however, includes all the College and School responses.

Also worth noting are ways in which the University Assessment Plan allows for adjustments to accommodate the needs of individual colleges. The following examples involve the College of Engineering, College of Science and College of Business Administration. Undergraduate Engineering programs in both the College of Engineering and the College of Science have very specific concerns related to addressing the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) standards. Consequently, the Alumni Survey was modified to elicit information from graduates of those programs that will help inform ABET’s student learning outcomes standards, and Engineering programs in both colleges have customized their assessment plans to better fit those standards.

Assessment work done by the College of Business Administration’s undergraduate programs is even more far reaching. The entire college is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The College, in a major collaborative effort among faculty from all departments, has developed a comprehensive assessment of its “core business curriculum.” The core requirement must be completed by all students majoring in any of the college’s undergraduate programs. Assessing their core business curriculum is a key objective of the college, and an “assessment day” is held each semester for that purpose. Clearly, the College of Business Administration is committed to assessment; as stated in the Executive Summary of their assessment document:

*While the College of Business assessment effort is relatively new, the honesty and detailed critiques provided in the most recent assessment...*
documents show the determination with which improvement of both courses and the assessment process is being pursued. These analyses, written by faculty teaching the assessed courses, not only present remediation efforts that are being pursued in response to assessment feedback, but they also frequently suggest changes to the learning objective subcategories to give greater precision to the assessment. (Appendix 3B)

New Initiatives
All elements of the institutional support and infrastructure described above continue; however, since the 2007 NWCCU report, UNR has taken the following additional steps to ensure that all programs are fully completing the assessment cycle and that a more complete description of assessment at UNR is documented:

- The University Assessment Advisory Committee has been made permanent. When the University Outcomes Assessment Plan was being developed, an ad-hoc advisory committee was established that broadly represented faculty and key administrative units. Once the important work of that committee’s mission was completed, the committee disbanded. The recently established committee is charged with helping to ensure all University programs are completing the assessment cycle and the results of their efforts are duly reported. The composition of the Advisory Committee consists primarily of Associate Deans from the University’s schools and colleges, the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice Provost for Instruction and Undergraduate Programs (Appendix 3C). The Associate Dean is in the most strategic position to help departments and programs understand and implement the assessment mission of the respective college, as well as of the University. The Advisory Committee is engaged in this process and is advancing assessment overall by proactively communicating with the department chairs and assessment coordinators in their respective colleges.

- All undergraduate programs were asked to evaluate their Assessment Plans and the implementation status of those plans, and report their findings using the Program Assessment Self-Appraisal (Appendix 3D). This activity was an important step taken subsequent to the NWCCU 2007 report. The Advisory Committee, when asked for guidance and support on this initiative, actively responded by taking leadership roles in their respective colleges. The Self-Appraisal and the involvement of the Associate Deans are achieving five objectives:

  1. To enable programs to “step back” and take a broader look at the design, process and effectiveness of their overall assessment endeavor;

3 An exhibit of the full College of Business Administration Core Curriculum document will be available on campus for the evaluator.
2. To engage program faculty in a purposeful discussion of the program’s assessment activities, as experience indicates that such discussions are keys to optimal program-level assessment;

3. To emphasize, partly through the involvement of the Associate Dean, that outcomes assessment is valued by the college and the University and that it needs be an ongoing process of completed assessment cycles;

4. To ensure that the OUA is aware of the good work, particularly program modifications influenced by assessment results, that some programs may not have included in their annual Assessment Reports;

5. To request assistance from the OUA should the faculty discussion of the *Self-Appraisal* suggest that specific assistance might be helpful.

Both of these new initiatives have been well received. The Advisory Committee continues to be very supportive and involved. The Committee’s leadership within their colleges has resulted in largely achieving the five objectives above. The OUA and the Associate Deans reviewed each program’s Self-Appraisal for the college, followed by meetings with key faculty as needed. Office of University Assessment staff have been invited to meet with department chairs, to attend faculty meetings to discuss specific concerns about assessment and to offer suggestions about how program assessment plans can be made more efficient and effective.

In the future, the OUA will ask assistance from the Advisory Committee in areas such as: extending the Program Assessment Self-Appraisal to graduate and interdisciplinary programs; guiding use of the student learning outcomes component of the College Portrait [UNR is participating in the Voluntary System of Accountability project partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)]; exploring new ways to use assessment data to enhance institutional effectiveness; reviewing and evaluating the University’s Student Outcomes Assessment Plan and the support provided by the Office of University Assessment.

**Completing the Assessment Cycle: Institutional Effectiveness**

The University of Nevada, Reno currently has 183 graduate and undergraduate degree programs. Each of these programs is expected to develop and implement a student outcomes assessment plan. Fully implementing assessment means completing the assessment cycle from plan development, to evaluating results, to making decisions about program improvement. Taken collectively, the success of the University’s academic programs in completing the assessment cycle becomes a measure of institutional effectiveness regarding outcomes assessment. Consequently, the current state of institutional effectiveness can be demonstrated by providing documentary evidence of accomplishment, at the University level, for each of the four reporting benchmarks in the assessment cycle:
1. Developing/modifying program assessment plans;
2. Identifying key findings in assessment results;
3. Describing subsequent program modifications under consideration;
4. Describing actual program modifications made to enhance student learning.

Evidence of Completion
This assessment cycle becomes an upward spiral at the program level; for example, programmatic modifications will be monitored for impact in the next iteration of the assessment cycle. At the institutional level, however, documenting aggregated program success at each of these benchmarks is documenting University success.

The following diagram depicts this benchmark cycle and references the documentary evidence for each step.
Create/Modify Assessment Plan – Of UNR’s 183 academic programs expected to have operational outcomes assessment plans in place, 100 percent have successfully developed and submitted such plans. In many instances these have been modified one or more times. In fact, modifying Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment Methods or other plan elements is among the kinds of program modifications seen in the final benchmark—Changes Made. A full listing of the current version of every assessment plan, organized by college, department and program, is provided in Appendix 3E4 and online at http://www.unr.edu/assess.

Report Key Findings – Each program is asked to complete an annual Assessment Report that includes, among other information, the conclusions of the program faculty’s review, analysis and an evaluation of assessment data collected during the previous academic year. (Assessment Reports are scheduled for submission in the fall semester.) The conclusions faculty identify as significant are designated as Key Findings in their program’s Assessment Report. Assessment Reports have been submitted by 167 programs from which reports are expected5. Each of these reports (100 percent) has documented Key Findings. A full listing of reported program-level Key Findings, organized by degree, college, department and program, is provided in Appendix 3F6.

Report Planned Changes – In their Assessment Report, each program is asked to describe program modifications influenced by Key Findings from the assessment data. The program may indicate that these modifications are in the planning stage. In some cases the program has preparatory work to do, e.g., develop a new course and submit it to the University Courses and Curriculum Committee for approval. In other instances, the program reports the need to obtain additional data before final decisions about modifications can be made. Such program modifications are categorized as Planned Changes. Assessment Reports received from 64 percent of programs identified Changes characterized as planned. A full listing of reported Planned Changes, organized by degree, college, department and program, is provided in Appendix 3G7.

---

4 An exhibit that includes copies of all program Assessment Plans and all Assessment Reports, organized by college, department and program, will be available on campus for the evaluator. The contents of this exhibit also are provided as an electronic document accompanying this report.

5 Some programs have been so recently established or affected by reorganization that no Assessment Reports are expected from them at the present time.

6 The printed appendix of this report has a sample of Key Findings from one college. The electronic version of this report has Key Findings from all colleges, and these will also be available as an exhibit during the site reviewer visit on April 27, 2009.

7 The printed appendix of this report has a sample of Planned Changes from one college. The electronic version of this report has Planned Changes from all colleges, and these will also be available as an exhibit during the site reviewer visit on April 27, 2009.
Report Changes Made – Programs that ultimately make curricular or other changes influenced by Key Findings have “closed the loop” in the assessment cycle. Such changes are identified in their Assessment Report. This year undergraduate programs also reported similar actions in the Program Assessment Self-Appraisal (Appendix 3D) described earlier. Of the Assessment Reports and undergraduate Program Assessment Self-Appraisals received from programs with Assessment Plans, 70 percent of those programs have identified Changes Made to their program. A full listing of reported Changes Made, organized by degree, college, department and program, is provided in Appendix 3H.

Most of UNR’s academic programs existed for years, often decades, prior to implementation of the University Outcomes Assessment Plan, and very likely engaged in self-reflection and program improvement during that time. For example, all academic programs are subject to the Program Review process required by the Nevada System of Higher Education every 10 years, though UNR expects each program to conduct a review at approximately seven year intervals. UNR’s Program Review Guidelines were revised in 2005 to include student outcomes assessment. While the assessment plans and reports prepared by each program contribute significantly to this process, the inclusion of student outcomes assessment in program review adds important data and perspective regarding a program’s efficacy in supporting the University’s educational mission. Additionally, many programs and some entire schools and colleges are accredited by entities in their respective disciplines. In nearly all instances, these specialized accreditation requirements include reporting on assessment of student learning outcomes and the use of assessment results for program improvement. An outgrowth of this history of program improvement is that the typical program modifications, whether Planned Changes or Changes Made, are relatively small and incremental. This observation is both expected and reasonable. In some instances, of course, more dramatic changes occur, but these tend to be the exception.

While reporting Changes Made is a key metric for demonstrating completing an iteration of the assessment cycle, it is not the only metric. Fully implementing the assessment process means that a program has reviewed, analyzed and evaluated the assessment data resulting from implementation of their Assessment Plan. If the result of that evaluation is that no change is warranted at the time, then that conclusion demonstrates completion of the assessment cycle just as much as a Change Made. The same can be said for programs reporting Planned Changes. Deciding that a change will be implemented in the future or that more data need to be collected to inform a specific change is the result of faculty reviewing and evaluating assessment results. In so doing, they have fully implemented the assessment process by completing the assessment cycle. The following chart

---

8 The printed appendix of this report has a sample of Changes Made from one college. The electronic version of this report has Changes Made from all colleges, and these will also be available as an exhibit during the site reviewer visit on April 27, 2009.
shows that, over time, the aggregate of University programs completing the assessment cycle is trending upward.

The following excerpt from the Bachelors program in Geography illustrates the process of faculty analysis, evaluation and reflection essential in completing the assessment cycle, even though the process does not result in dramatic program changes:

*Department faculty reviewed the assessment findings at the Geography faculty retreat on August 22, 2008, and at the first faculty meeting of the Fall Semester, 2008. Results of the performance indicators for student learning outcomes 2, 3 and 4 suggest that students are doing very well in developing their analytical skills and increasing their disciplinary knowledge as well as capitalizing on their overall learning experiences in the major.*

*Furthermore, many of the professional skills seem to be well developed, including: writing; visual communication; library and archival research; qualitative analysis; and accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy. The discussion focused on how skills in verbal presentation, field work, computing and quantitative analysis might be better developed for geography majors, particularly given that deficiencies in these areas were noted in last year’s assessment as well as this year’s. For some other skills, such as computing, at this time it was not a high priority for each and every core course because this is a more focused goal, and not expected to appear in every core course.*
A few ideas were generated that will be explored in the upcoming academic year, with the caveat that not all skills need to be extensively developed in each of the required classes. For verbal presentation, it was suggested that in Geog 103 might add discussion sections and short verbal presentation in the labs. We instituted a second semester of offerings in GEOG 314, Field Methods, and that offered students with another means of meeting the fieldwork component of their work. We agreed, as a faculty, to offer this course each semester, and to rotate the faculty who teach that course. We are in agreement, as a faculty, that anyone should be able to teach the "Field Methods," or the "Research Methods" and "Geographical Thought" courses; therefore, those are being rotated on an irregular schedule.

Finally, over time Geography core courses will continue to be assessed and curriculum modified in relation to the student experience as they move through the major.

Clearly, the undergraduate Geography program has engaged in a deliberate and thoughtful process to assess student learning. The Geography faculty concluded that students were performing well overall but identified some concerns that will be addressed. The faculty also noted adding new course offerings. If and when the program does make changes based on their continued evaluation, those changes will show up in subsequent Assessment Reports as Changes Made. Other programs frequently report similar actions and have documented them as Planned Changes (Appendix 3G)9, as well as Changes Made (Appendix 3H)10. The combined categories (Planned Changes and Changes Made) demonstrate that 91 percent of programs report having successfully completed the assessment cycle.

Assessment Reports currently are expected from 171 of the 183 academic programs; reports have been received from 97 percent of these programs11.

---

9 The printed appendix of this report has a sample of Planned Changes from one college. The electronic version of this report has Planned Changes from all colleges, and these will also be available as an exhibit during the site reviewer visit on April 27, 2009.

10 The printed appendix of this report has a sample of Changes Made from one college. The electronic version of this report has Changes Made from all colleges, and these will also be available as an exhibit during the site reviewer visit on April 27, 2009.

11 Some programs have been so recently established or affected by reorganization that no Assessment Reports are expected from them at the present time.
**Institutional Assessment Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Assessment Cycle</th>
<th>Academic Programs Reporting</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmarks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benchmark Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Modify Program</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Key Findings from</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Planned Changes from</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Changes Made from</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Cycle Completion</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The University of Nevada, Reno fully supports the goal that all academic programs will complete the assessment cycle using the following general paradigm:

1. **Design the assessment plan** – The program faculty agrees on the student learning outcomes, measurable student performance indicators and assessment methods that will constitute the essential features of the Assessment Plan.

2. **Implement the plan** – The program faculty plans and executes procedures to implement the Assessment Plan, and in so doing collects and organizes student performance data tied to the plan.

3. **Faculty review assessment results** – The faculty reviews and evaluates assessment findings ascertained and consideration is given to the implications and options for program improvement modifications.

4. **Make program modifications** – The assessment cycle culminates when faculty recommend specific program modifications, either immediate or planned, or determine that no modifications are indicated at that time.

The outcomes of program modifications are assessed as the assessment plan continues in an ongoing annual cycle.

Achieving this goal, as guided by the UNR’s *Student Outcomes Assessment Plan*, has required significant institutional support and infrastructure development, along with professionalism and commitment from hundreds of academic and administrative faculty. The University has developed and staffed the Office of University
Assessment, funded many assessment activities (notably the Alumni Survey and the Employer Survey that directly serve every program), established a network of assessment coordinators representing every program, created a strong Web presence that also serves as the interface to an assessment database accessible by every program and, not least, the vocal support for assessment by University administration essential to promote cultural change. The efforts to strengthen assessment continue as evidenced by the establishment of a permanent Assessment Advisory Committee and a kind of “program review”—the Program Assessment Self-Appraisal.

The University’s commitment to student outcomes assessment, including the substantial contribution of resources and support, continues to pay off as documented by the very large percent of programs that have submitted assessment activity reports. Programs are not only assessing student performance, but they are completing the assessment cycle in ways that help ensure continued program refinement as the campus norm. Another look at just a few statistics shows this clearly to be the case:

- 100 percent of academic programs have developed and implemented current assessment plans;

- 100 percent of programs have reported key findings after having reviewed assessment data collected via their assessment plans;

- 91 percent of programs, as a consequence of evaluating their findings, have reported program modifications they have implemented or are planning to implement, thus completing the assessment cycle or “closing the loop.”

All academic program faculty, as well as department and college leaders, are aware that assessment is an essential component of continuous program improvement. The number of programs engaged in assessment and the number showing they are completing the assessment cycle demonstrate that the University has effectively, achieved and documented that the Standard of ensuring student outcomes assessment is being used for program improvement has been met.
STANDARD TWO, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS; POLICY 2.2, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT (CORE CURRICULUM)

Introduction
In the 2007 Full-Scale Evaluation Committee Report, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Evaluation Committee noted that assessment activities had been undertaken for aspects of the core curriculum writing and mathematics courses, but found other assessment activities for core curriculum courses to be “sorely lacking.” Since the Accreditation visit in October 2007, the Office of the Core Curriculum has continued to promote existing assessment efforts plus new initiatives in general education assessment.

Historically, assessment in the foundational skills areas of the Core—writing and mathematics—have been relatively strong. Since the Accreditation visit, the Core Writing Program completed a new assessment of writing and critical thinking in ENG 101. The Core Math program has continued assessment of curriculum alignment in the algebra/pre-calculus curriculum. The Core Humanities program has completed a cycle of assessment that began in spring 2008. A detailed report on this is included here as Appendix 3I. Complete documentation of each of these assessments will be available as exhibits during the April visit.

The Office of the Core Curriculum has offered summer stipends for assessment development in the Natural and Social Sciences and organized assessment workshops for faculty. Course embedded assessments have been piloted for selected Core Natural and Social Sciences courses. A draft diversity assessment rubric has been developed and an assessment inventory in the senior-level capstone course has been conducted. Information on these activities will be available as exhibits during the evaluator visit as well. The Director of the Writing Center, who is a writing across the curriculum scholar, is collaborating on a writing and critical thinking assessment project with the capstone subcommittee.

Significant progress has been made in the last year. In addition to the formal assessment activity, communication regarding Core assessment has also improved across the university campus. Overarching Core Curriculum learning objectives are now published in the General Catalog. Learning outcomes for Core and pre-Core writing and mathematics courses are now available online for review by students and faculty (see http://www.unr.edu/cla/engl/cwp/assessment/Index.htm and http://www.unr.edu/math/core/index.html). The Core Humanities program has an assessment Web site (http://www.unr.edu/cla/ch/main_assess.htm) listing learning outcomes for each of the courses and current assessment activities. The Core Curriculum now has a presence on the Office of University Assessment Web site (http://www.unr.edu/assess). Finally, the recent refilling of the Assessment Coordinator position which provides assistance to the Core in the area of assessment is providing additional impetus to Core assessment activities.
Background
The Office of the Core Curriculum, with the support of the Office of University Assessment, continues to support all faculty teaching core curriculum courses in engaging in an ongoing cycle of assessment. As is the case with university-wide assessment, the assessment cycle for core curriculum courses begins with a course plan and concludes with faculty-derived adjustments in pedagogy that better support student learning.

The most tangible evidence of the university’s ongoing commitment to assessment, even with a strategic hiring “freeze,” is the fact that the vacant Core Assessment Coordinator position was filled in January 2009. This position became vacant in April 2008, and this search was one of the first to be released. This position will play a critical role in sustaining existing, and facilitating new, assessment activities in the Core Curriculum. In addition the Office of the Core Curriculum has presented assessment workshops and offered summer stipends to stimulate assessment in the Natural and Social Sciences. The Core Curriculum, Math and Natural Science, Diversity, and Capstone sub-committees are charged with monitoring and promoting assessment. The Core Writing Program is a campus exemplar, and in fall 2008 completed a second portfolio assessment, this time focusing on writing and critical thinking skills in ENG 101, the first in a sequence of two freshman college writing courses. Core Humanities has adopted an assessment plan, designed and approved by the program faculty, targeting learning outcomes published on their assessment Web site.

Core Curriculum Assessment
While the support for assessment activities described above is available to all departments and instructors who teach core curriculum courses, broader, comprehensive assessment of specific core curriculum areas has necessitated a specific process. The Core Writing, Core Mathematics and Core Humanities sections of the core curriculum have completed large-scale assessment activities because two fundamental resources have been made available: 1) a director who coordinates and leads assessment efforts in each section, and 2) the funds necessary to support assessment activities (including faculty release-time, instructor or evaluator stipends, workshops to develop assessment tools, etc.). The implementation of this “formula for successful assessment” has yielded formal assessment of over eleven courses impacting approximately 6000 students per semester.

The broad assessment process has enabled faculty to make informed decisions regarding modifications in pedagogy and instruction of core curriculum courses. Some of the changes that have been implemented include curriculum alignment in core writing and core mathematics, the development of recitations (discussion sections) for mathematics, the development of a rubric to assess critical thinking in core humanities, and the careful training of instructors in assessment procedures.
Informational exhibits on these assessment activities will be available during the evaluator visit.

**New Initiatives**

In accordance with the university’s policy of periodic review for all its programs and departments, and led by the Core Assessment Advisory Group (CAAG), the Office of the Core Curriculum has begun a formal review of the core curriculum. Currently (spring 2009), the CAAG is establishing a process and timeline for the program review, including gathering input from the larger university community. The last formal programmatic review of the Core Curriculum was completed in 1999.

Some new initiatives targeting core curriculum assessment have been implemented since the accreditation visit in 2007, including:

- The development of writing assessment in core capstone courses.
- The development of assessment tools to measure gains in writing and critical thinking skills across the core curriculum.
- The establishment of a Core Assessment Advisory Group.
- The posting of core curriculum student learning objectives across various university Web sites.
- Systematic support for instructors who teach core courses in the form of focused, one-on-one guidance available throughout the assessment cycle.

The implementation of assessment of writing and critical thinking across the core curriculum will necessitate some creative modifications due to the budget cuts facing the Office of the Core Curriculum. The Core Board and the CAAG, with support from the Office of University Assessment, are in the process of developing a workable implementation plan for this important assessment activity.

Review of individual core curriculum courses is scheduled to begin in fall 2009. The purpose of targeting individual courses is to continue to ensure that all courses offered as part of the core curriculum maintain the established student learning outcomes required for all courses in this program.

**Moving Forward with Assessment**

In times of budget constraints and with the disappearance of some student support programs such as the Writing Center, the focus on student assessment is even more critical. While the Office of the Core Curriculum will be unable to provide the same level of resource support to faculty due to its reduced operating budget, there are assessment initiatives in place that continue to receive the support of the Core office and the University administration. In fact, the University continues to support these initiatives by committing resources to the re-filling of the Assessment Coordinator position. This individual will work primarily with Core Curriculum assessment.

The Office of the Core Curriculum continues to set priorities to carry on improvements in general education at UNR. This is possible because a culture of assessment is in place, sustained by the support of the Core Board, the Core
Assessment Advisory Group, the Office of University Assessment and the University administration.
STANDARD FOUR, FACULTY SELECTION, EVALUATION, ROLES, WELFARE, AND DEVELOPMENT, POLICY 4.1, FACULTY EVALUATION

Each academic dean was asked to summarize the policy and practice within their college for the performance review of Letter of Appointment faculty, Graduate Teaching Assistants, and Lecturers. Each dean, in turn, requested this information from the departmental chairs. Reports have been submitted by all colleges. In all cases, non-tenure-track instructors are treated the same as all faculty, i.e., all classes and instructors are assessed with a student evaluation form, the numerical averages and comments are shared with the instructor and reviewed by the department chair. Those instructors with apparent issues are met by the department chair for a discussion about instructional improvement, and, in the case of temporary instructors rehiring decisions are based on student and chair reviews. In most cases, syllabi are reviewed by either the department chair or group teaching leader, e.g., in core writing, to assure that the class structure and content meet the objectives of the course. In a substantial number of cases, new temporary instructors are assigned an experienced mentor to help the new instructor get off to a good start. The policy of the university on student evaluation of courses and department chair responsibility for maintenance of teaching quality is comprehensive and does not distinguish between full-time and part-time faculty. By practice, there is a consistent, institution-wide procedure for evaluation of non-regular faculty members. (Individual departmental responses are contained in Appendix 5A.)

For the past two years, there has been an orientation session for new, part-time instructors which had attendance of about 25 each year. A planned program was provided with information about expectations, tools for teaching and the culture of University of Nevada students. In addition, several programs which use a large number of part-time instructors, e.g., English, also run orientations for their part-time faculty to assure compliance with course objectives and suggest teaching methods. Mathematics has developed materials, course objectives, and common final examinations so that instruction is more consistent even when part-time instructors are used. When performance is substandard, appropriate actions are taken.

A workshop on annual faculty evaluation was provided for department chairs in January 2009, the beginning of the regular annual evaluation process. A main theme was evaluation of part-time faculty, and a panel of experienced chairs described their processes for evaluating part-time instructors. UNR also has a handbook for part-time instructors available on the university Web site at http://www.unr.edu/provost/forms/PartTimeFacHandbook%202008.pdf.
The second concern of the Evaluation Committee related to part-time instructors is the increased reliance on such instructors and the potential, adverse effect on quality of undergraduate instruction. During the April 2009 visit of a NWCCU representative, the “teaching resource management” exercise applied to selection of instructors for classes in 2009-10 will be described. The specific objective of the exercise is to have full-time faculty teach a significantly larger share of student credit hours. The proportion of students taught by full-time faculty will increase significantly and the number of part-time instructors on campus will be reduced. Additional objectives for increasing the proportion of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty include student retention, improved instruction, closer student-faculty interaction in the freshman and sophomore years, and budgetary savings.
Recommendation 6
The Committee recommends the University take steps to ensure sufficient library and information services staff, especially in light of the anticipated demands associated with the opening of the new Knowledge Center (Standard 5.D.1)

STANDARD FIVE, LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

In anticipation of the move into the Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center, the Libraries and Information Technology Division hired 11 staff in various information professions during the summer of 2008. Eight of these professionals were librarians. In addition, a highly skilled and experienced building operations manager and two media technology specialists to provide customer service in the popular media production area were added. Most of the positions were existing library positions that had been vacant for some time. Two were new positions created from an increase in student fees to the library. In addition, a generous gift from Mr. Mathewson will allow for the hiring of six additional staff members to meet rising expectations created by the new facility. Although these are limited term positions, it is expect that these positions will see the division through the serious economic downturn until other funds are identified.

The University’s efforts to support the Knowledge Center in a time of extraordinary financial distress allowed the Information Technology Division and Libraries an opportunity to craft positions and hire staff with skill sets that more closely meet the specific and evolving needs of a rapidly changing information resources and services environment. The new positions allow for a closer, more efficient match of information services requirements with advanced information skills. This, in turn, provided an opportunity to move many IT professionals into the building and to centralize IT related user services operations in the Knowledge Center. Some tasks previously performed by dedicated library staff have been absorbed into IT, which creates efficiencies and synergies. This has been one of the long-standing reasons for the success of this Division despite smaller staffs than comparable institutions.
At their August 7-8, 2008 meeting, the Board of Regents' Development Committee, along with the representatives from the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (AGB), discussed the benefits of facilitated discussion and satisfying the requirements of accrediting bodies such as the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. There was further discussion on the need for a continuing schedule of self-assessments and the most appropriate time of year to engage in self-assessment. The Committee moved for consideration by the Board of a recommendation that the Board of Regents work with AGB to conduct a formal self-assessment and two-day facilitated workshop to be held in August of 2009.

The full Board of Regents later authorized the Board Development Committee to work with AGB to conduct a formal self-assessment and a two-day facilitated workshop to be held in August of 2009. The portion of the Board of Regents' agenda and meeting minutes documenting this action and a letter from Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs Jane Nichols confirming this are included as Appendix 8A. The full set of minutes will be available as an exhibit during the April visit.

It is clearly the intent of the Board of Regents to meet the expectations described in Standard 6.B.6 and recommendation 8.

Recommendation 8
The Committee recommends that the Board of Regents engage in an evaluation of its performance and operations and make whatever adjustments are warranted. (Standard 6.B.6)
The Conflict of Interest policy has been approved. Section 2,691 (Appendix 11A) of the University Administrative Manual contains a summary of the policy and the link to the complete policy, which is housed on the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration Web site at http://www.unr.edu/ospa/website4/content/policy.htm. The complete policy is included as Appendix 11B.

A 0.5 FTE Conflict of Interest Officer has been appointed (Jacque Ewing Taylor), and a Conflict of Interest Committee has been formed to review potential conflicts. Finally, all faculty and staff were reminded of the policy requiring completion of the form, and the forms were collected in January of this year. (See Appendix 11C). Any potential conflicts reported on the forms were sent immediately to the Conflict of Interest Officer for her action. Currently, the Conflict of Interest Officer is following up with various campus offices regarding any missing or incomplete forms.

The actions the institution has taken meet the requirements set forth in Standard 9.A.2 and fully addresses recommendation 11.
The University of Nevada, Reno started responding to the NWCCU recommendations as soon as they were received in January 2008. Progress has been excellent on all 11 of the recommendations, 5 of which are included in this report for 2009. A report on the remaining 6 is due during 2010.

Assessment:
The University has been conducting learning outcomes assessment for many years and is approaching full involvement by the academic programs. As demonstrated in this report, over 90 percent of the academic programs have provided evidence of using assessment for program improvement. In addition, the following evidence of the University’s continued improvement in this area is discussed in this report:

- The President, Provost, Vice President of Student Services and Assessment Advisory Committee have continued to support the Office of University Assessment and its plans and efforts to fully implement the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan.

- In a time when the University is facing severe budget challenges, the Assessment infrastructure has been maintained.

- The University continues to support and encourage specialized accreditation; in addition, the UNR program review process, which includes review of the program’s assessment efforts, continues to be promoted and used.

- A broadly representative Assessment Advisory Committee was re-established to proactively communicate with department chairs and assessment coordinators within the various colleges.

- A Program Assessment Self-Appraisal was performed by all programs to confirm additional assessment results.

- 183 academic programs (100 percent) have successfully submitted operational outcomes assessment plans.

- Assessment Reports of improvements have been received by 91 percent of programs with Assessment Plans; each one of these reports has included Key Findings.

- The Core Curriculum continues to lead faculty efforts in assessment of the foundational skill areas of writing and mathematics and has moved forward with its plans for a program review and an implementation plan for new assessment initiatives.
Performance review of all part-time instructors:
A survey conducted by the Provost of how the Colleges and Departments handle performance review of part-time instructors indicated that most programs apply a consistent approach. As with full-time instructors, all part-time instructors have their class sections evaluated by students and/or peers, with appropriate follow-up. The need to employ evaluation processes for part-time instructors was reinforced at a workshop held on January 15, 2009.

Sufficient library and information services staff for the new Knowledge Center:
The division’s leadership evaluated all vacant positions in the fall of 2007 and recast them to meet the most urgent needs for the new facility. In addition, a gift from one of the new facility’s benefactors allowed for the hiring of six staff members to help meet the service demands placed upon the division. The administration continues to monitor the staffing needs of this division.

Board of Regents should engage in an evaluation of its performance:
In response to the NWCCU visit and recommendation, the Nevada System of Higher Education Board of Regents solicited the advice of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (AGB) concerning evaluating its performance. As a result of that advice, a two-day facilitated workshop was approved by Regents in August 2008 and is scheduled for August 2009.

Implementation of the 2004 Conflict of Interest Policy:
The Conflict of Interest policy was approved in September 2008 and now appears as Section 2,691 of the University Administrative Manual. The policy has been implemented for all faculty and staff, and a permanent 0.5 FTE Conflict of Interest Officer has been appointed to ensure the processes required in the policy are used.
Appendix 3A

University of Nevada, Reno
Student Outcomes Assessment Plan

Introduction
This document presents a definition and a rationale for outcomes assessment at the University of Nevada, Reno, in addition to offering an assessment implementation plan. When considering the prospect of developing and carrying out on-going assessment, faculty and staff might reasonably ask two initial questions: “What is outcomes assessment?” and “Why should we do it?”

Many things can be assessed, from parking space availability to quality of food in the cafeterias. Assessment at the University of Nevada, Reno includes academic program reviews required of all programs by the University and Community College System of Nevada, the descriptive and analytical data from the Office of Institutional Analysis and the course and faculty evaluations completed by students. Assessing student learning and performance outcomes, however, is the focus of the University’s assessment plan and of the Office of University Assessment. Outcomes assessment at the University of Nevada, Reno refers to documenting student learning and behavior relative to goals and expectations. In academic programs, outcomes assessment provides evidence of what students know and are able to do at specific points in the curriculum compared to program-defined learning objectives. Student service programs may assess student behavior outcomes, that is, demonstrating benefits accruing to students who use those services, as well as the campus community at large.

Purpose
Assessment is intended to help the University fulfill its educational mission. Units of assessment range from individual academic and service programs to the University itself. At the program level, each program is expected to develop and implement a plan to assess student learning outcomes. At the school, college and University levels, University Assessment, Institutional Analysis and other offices will integrate learning outcomes data with other information to answer broader questions about how we are meeting our mission.

How will members of the University community benefit from assessment that justifies the time, effort and resources required? In a broad sense, assessment provides evidence of how well the University is fulfilling its mission, and helps identify areas where improvement may be indicated. The primary benefits of assessment are summarized in three professional and personal rationales.
Program Improvement

As part of its **mission**, the University of Nevada, Reno resolves to:

- Offer high-quality degree programs in the arts, sciences and in selected professions;
- Continually improve the quality of teaching, research and public service activities;
- Develop a curriculum that is sensitive to change, but which places a special value on a liberal arts foundation.

Assuring high quality education through continuous program improvement is perhaps the most compelling argument for outcomes assessment, as it goes to some of the University’s stated core **values**:

- An unmistakable emphasis on learning and thinking;
- High standards for all of us:  students, faculty and staff;
- Teaching that is clear, well organized, informed, relevant to students’ needs, aimed at helping student to learn and think;
- Programs that are well conceived, coherent, up-to-date, and centered on the needs of the participants;
- The celebration of achievement, giving recognition to our students, faculty and staff;
- Shared governance of the university so that all of us who have cast our lot with this enterprise can be participants both in determining our goals and in shouldering the responsibility to achieve these goals.

Evidence-based education is the principle where program improvement and assessment converge. Outcomes assessment, by documenting student performance, enables faculty and students to determine if learning objectives are being achieved and, if not, to guide discussion of what program modifications may be indicated. The assessment process is cyclical and on going. An active process aimed at continuous program improvement, one definition proposes that:

> Assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development. [Theodore Marchese]

Accountability

The University of Nevada, Reno provides important and valuable services and, as a public institution, is accountable to a number of agencies and constituencies regarding the quality and efficiency of those services. Documenting student learning and behavior through outcomes assessment will be an important focus of accountability requests.
Accreditation is one area of accountability where this emphasis is manifest. Professional accreditations of academic programs, as well as regional accreditation of the University itself, are areas where the importance of documenting student outcomes is being emphasized. Accrediting bodies are requiring evidence that assessment plans, similar to the Program Improvement process described above, are in place and being used effectively. In the past, such documentation mostly included “inputs,” e.g., curriculum descriptions, faculty qualifications, facilities, and “outputs” such as student retention rates, time to degree, etc. What was missing was evidence of outcomes - what students knew and were able to do as a result of their University experience. Now addressing accountability and accreditation requires documenting all three elements – inputs, outputs and outcomes. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, the organization that reviews The University of Nevada, Reno for accreditation, has published institutional requirements in the area of assessment that include the following:

- The Commission on Colleges expects each institution and program to adopt an assessment plan responsive to its mission and its needs. In so doing, the Commission urges the necessity of a continuing process of academic planning, the carrying out of those plans, the assessment of outcomes, and the influencing of the planning process by the assessment activities.

- . . . each institution has an obligation to plan carefully its courses of instruction to respond to student needs, to evaluate the effectiveness of that educational program in terms of the change it brings about in students, and to make improvements in the program dictated by the evaluative process. Assessment of educational quality has always been at the heart of the accreditation process.

- The intent of the Commission policy is to stress outcomes assessment as an essential part of the ongoing institutional self-study and accreditation process, to underline the necessity for each institution to formulate a plan which provides for a series of outcomes measures that are internally consistent and in accord with its mission and structure, and, finally, to provide some examples of a variety of successful plans for assessing educational outcomes.

University programs including engineering, education, business, nursing, journalism and more voluntarily submit to professional accreditation reviews. These specialized accreditations have recently included specific requirements for programs to document their specific learning objectives for students, how student learning is assessed relative to those objectives, and how the assessment results are used for program improvement.

Satisfaction

Faculty, staff and students all make significant personal commitments to their University experiences, and they all want those experiences to be successful and satisfying. Outcomes assessment has an important role to play in this regard. The larger context of the higher education experience and even of a specific program curriculum sometimes becomes lost amidst the narrow focus on individual courses, deadlines and requirements. Students can
easily lose their vision of the “big picture,” and not have a clear understanding of the thoughtful design underlying the curriculum and of what they will have learned, achieved and be able to do at its completion. In some ways this can happen to faculty as well. A program assessment plan makes explicit what the program intends to accomplish in terms of student outcomes. The faculty interaction and discussion that produces these outcomes often is very useful in affirming a clear, program-wide understanding of the program’s purpose, goals and specific objectives. As this information is shared with students, they are able to see the larger view and the logic behind how all the curriculum pieces fit together. Additionally, the assessment plan reassures faculty and students alike that the curriculum is both working and ever improving. Seeing their effort and commitment come to fruition is reinforcing and satisfying to all concerned.

Outcomes Assessment At The University of Nevada

The Assessment Plan for the University of Nevada, Reno is based on several assumptions, concepts and principles that help guide its design and implementation.

- As required for accreditation by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, all undergraduate and graduate degree programs, including interdisciplinary programs, and key student services programs are expected to design and implement an outcomes assessment plan.
- Outcomes assessment is intended for programs to engage in a continuous improvement process and to document their successes.
- Outcomes assessment information may be aggregated and combined with other information to help schools, colleges and the University assess how well they are fulfilling their missions; it is not used to review individual faculty members or courses.
- Programs are in charge of designing, developing and implementing their outcomes assessment plans.
- Outcomes assessment is ongoing, a continuous improvement process, rather than episodic.
- Assessments should ideally include a variety of measures that evaluate current students, graduates and employers.
- Intended learning outcomes should be communicated to students in the program.
- Program assessment plans and annual summary reports should be accessible to the University community.
- To the extent possible, the University will provide support to programs in the development and implementation of assessment plans.
We believe that the individual program is the proper unit of focus for assuring high quality student learning. Consequently, the program is the focus of our assessment efforts. The following diagram displays how data from the various assessment activities are translated into useful information which, in turn, flows into individual programs.

* The Core Curriculum, as a unique program, is described in Appendix A.
All elements of the University Assessment Plan are reportable at the individual program level. These elements include data from:

- **Student outcomes assessment plans**
  - Designed and implemented by each undergraduate, graduate and student services program
  - Used for program improvement
  - Results reported annually

- **Alumni surveys**
  - All alumni surveyed by telephone one, three and five years after graduation
  - Data gathered on demographics, employment, continuing education, preparation in the major at the University and preparation in the Core Curriculum at the University of Nevada, Reno.

- **Employer surveys**
  - Supervisors of employed alumni (with permission from each alumnus) are surveyed by telephone one year after graduation
  - Data gathered relate to University’s education of the alumnus in relation to the performance requirements expected by the employer at the time the alumnus was hired.

- **The National Survey of Student Engagement**
  - Data on student behaviors in areas correlated with academic success.

- **The Graduate Record Examination**
  - Scores on the general GRE exam for all University of Nevada, Reno students taking the exam.

The Office of University Assessment is responsible for providing assessment data to programs for all the above except the Student Outcomes Assessment Plans. While the Office of University Assessment provides workshop and consultation support, along with detailed review and comment of every plan, the Outcomes Assessment Plans are developed and implemented by program faculty and staff. These plans are the foundation of student outcomes assessment at University of Nevada, Reno. The following section provides more explanation of these plans.

**Program Assessment Plans**

Each program is expected to prepare and implement a plan to assess student performance outcomes. Academic programs naturally are primarily concerned with student learning, while service programs often focus more on student behaviors, attitudes, experiences, etc. Faculty and staff in each program are in control of defining what student outcomes are most
important and how they will be assessed. Each program also is responsible for development, implementation and reporting aspects of their respective plans in accordance with the above timeframe.

The Office of University Assessment will coordinate resources to assist programs in the development, implementation and reporting of assessment plans, including offering workshops to help faculty and staff understand assessment and develop program assessment plans. The Office of University Assessment also is available to consult with individual programs. To facilitate describing assessment plans clearly and consistently, the Office of University Assessment provides programs with templates for submitting their plans and their reports.

A program assessment plan includes the following elements.

**Defining student performance outcomes or competencies**

**Step One** - *Program faculty and staff discuss and reach agreement on written statements of intended student performance outcomes.*

The discussions that produce outcomes statements are sometimes difficult, but also may be most enlightening and beneficial explorations of the program’s educational mission. As faculty explicitly share assumptions, values and beliefs about how students are expected to benefit from the program, a collective and refined sense of the program’s intentions and expectations may emerge. The outcomes statements are of utmost importance as they form the foundation on which the rest of the assessment plan is built.

Types of student performance will be different for service programs than for academic programs. In both cases, statements of performance outcomes describe what students actually demonstrate they know and do -- whether participating in career services programs or designing a physics experiment. Outcomes statements focus on student behavior -- knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and skills -- rather than on instructors, activities or curricula provided for them. The latter are important, of course. They make up the programs designed to enable students to achieve those outcomes. As programs develop outcomes statements, they also must be guided by expectations from professional associations and accrediting agencies, many of which are increasingly emphasizing outcomes assessment as critical to informing program evaluation and improvement. Outcomes assessment tells us how well students are doing, but in so doing it also tells us how well we are doing.

**Identifying student performance indicators and assessment methods**

**Step Two** – *For each student learning outcome, program faculty and staff discuss and reach agreement on actual student performance that will be assessed and on the assessment*
instruments and processes that will provide clear and useful information regarding student performance.

Assessing student performance, though only one element of a program assessment plan, is critical. Clearly, to understand how well program components, as well as the program overall, are working requires assessing student performance. Assessment is an integral and essential part of the educational process. Most programs have some evidence of effectiveness in the form of course-based assessments, student ratings of services received, courses completed, faculty, etc. Even so, the purpose of outcomes assessment is broader than any course or program component and is not satisfied by simply aggregating them. This is particularly true in academic programs where the underlying principles assume synergistic benefits for students who complete the curricula.

Consequently, assessing student performance outcomes, from the program perspective, calls for assessments that require students to demonstrate a synthesis of the various courses, field experiences, self-directed learning and other contributions to education. Although the focus is on outcomes for students completing a degree program or participating in a service program, benefits to the program will be greatly enhanced by using mid-program assessments as well. Applying the same outcomes assessment principles to identifying how well students are able to perform at a specific point partway through the program provides formative evaluation data that often enable program modifications during the academic year.

Student learning outcomes usually are abstract statements that cannot be assessed directly. Student performance such as papers, projects, presentations, exams, and performances can be assessed. When the student work is directly related to the student learning outcome, it is called a **student performance indicator**. That is, the quality of student performance on the project or paper is an indicator of how well the learning outcome has been achieved. It is the performance indicator that is actually the focus of the assessment. Each student learning outcome has at least one, but more likely several student performance indicators. In turn, each student performance indicator has at least one **Assessment Method** associated with it. For example, student projects may be evaluated by a faculty committee using a faculty developed rubric. Collectively, all of the student projects evaluated provide assessment data on the performance indicators which helps inform how well the student learning outcome has been achieved.

Such **direct** measures of learning are often called performance assessments. Standardized exams produced by ACT, ETS and some discipline-based professional organizations are examples of instruments available for performance assessment. Often programs will develop performance assessments they believe are more specific and valid for their curriculum. The “gold standard” for determining student competence is known as “authentic assessment.” Their aim is to assess student performance that is as close as possible to what is expected of professionals in their disciplines. Such assessments may involve engaging students in simulation, solving complex problems, completing research projects, writing a thesis, etc.

Another form of assessment involves **indirect** measures. Rather than observing student performance, indirect measures assess reflections on program outcomes from sources such as current students, alumni and employers. Service programs, due to the nature of their
intended outcomes, tend to rely heavily on such reflective assessments, as well as participation rates and other descriptive data from which to make inferences about program effectiveness.

Assessments identified by programs should:

- Be agreed to and supported by program faculty and staff;
- Be closely aligned with stated performance outcomes;
- Focus on overall program-level outcomes;
- Include multiple kinds of measures, both direct and indirect;
- Be sensitive to the effects of curriculum, instruction or other program components;
- Provide useful information for program evaluation and improvement, including longitudinal analysis;
- Be ongoing and practical enough in terms of time, effort and cost to be sustained over time;
- Include mid-program as well as end-of-program measures;
- Not be used to evaluate individual courses or faculty.

Using Assessment Results

**Step Three** – The assessment data collected, sometimes in addition to other available data, are analyzed and presented to faculty and staff for evaluation and consideration of implications.

At the program level, the dominant reason for assessing student performance is to help guide analysis, discussion and decisions regarding improving curriculum and instruction. In developing a program assessment plan, each program has clearly stated its educational mission along with its major student learning outcomes and associated performance indicators and assessment methods. The mission and learning outcomes serve as reference points for evaluating the curriculum, while data gathered in assessing the performance indicators provide evidence of achievement. Data, in turn, are organized and analyzed to produce useful information, then presented to program faculty for review and consideration. The assessment plan is the product of the faculty and the evaluation and use of results should be as well.

In most instances, program faculty will review assessment results once or twice a year at faculty meetings or retreats. Student performance on all outcomes will prompt discussions about what is working well and should be continued or expanded, as well as outcomes where students’ performance is below expectations. Discussions about what, if any, program modifications can and should be made, along with decisions regarding actions to be taken will be made at these meetings. In some cases, a change in the program assessment plan may be indicated, in others a change in some aspect of the curriculum may be deemed appropriate. It is a program-level decision. Programs are not asked to submit assessment data per se, but are asked to complete a report at the end of each academic year and to submit that report to the Office of University Assessment. The report will summarize the extent to which students have achieved each of the program’s student learning outcomes.
The Office of University Assessment will provide results of alumni and employer surveys, Graduate Record Examination scores and results from the National Survey of Student Engagement to each program. University level data will be disaggregated to the program level, as well as at the departmental and college/school levels. While useful to programs even in this form, the intention of the Office of University Assessment is to provide an online database that includes the above data along with considerable data from the University’s student information system database. All of this information, connected by confidential student identifiers, will be available to programs through the online database. Programs will be able to query any and all of these related data and receive a summary report in a few minutes. This process helps transform data into customized information that should be very useful for faculty discussions about program improvement. The database will grow as new data are obtained and updated, thereby permitting analyses of changes over time as well.

**Designing an Implementation Plan**

**Step Four** – *The procedures, responsibilities and schedules for gathering, storing and accessing data are made explicit.*

In addition to identifying assessment processes and instruments, program faculty and staff need to agree on an implementation plan. Developing the plan may result in initial assessment methods to be reconsidered. The implementation plan must fit two criteria. First, it must allow the collection, analysis and use of the kinds of information required. In addition, it must be workable within the context of the program. An implementation plan is very helpful in guiding the assessment process. However, an implementation plan that provides results with little utility or that collapses under its own weight should definitely be avoided. The structure of an implementation plan is essentially that of a project work plan, clearly delineating the who, what, when, where and how of the assessment plan:

- **Who** is responsible for what assessment activities?
- **What** is being assessed?
- **When** are activities occurring?
- **Where** will assessment activities take place?
- **How** will assessment be carried out?

Answering all these questions will add much detail to this bare-bones outline. The faculty and staff should participate in developing the implementation process, just as they did in creating the assessment plan itself.
Appendix A

Core Curriculum

The Core Curriculum at the University of Nevada, Reno is designed to insure that all students become proficient in areas of content and skill deemed highly important by our faculty.

Consequently the Core Curriculum includes six broad learning objectives. As a result of completing the Core Curriculum experience students should be able to:

1) Compose and communicate effectively in a range of media for a variety of rhetorical and creative contexts.

2) Demonstrate an ability to frame and analyze a problem, find and interpret relevant information, develop and evaluate possible solutions, come to well-grounded conclusions, and craft an appropriate argument, report, application, or other expression of such inquiry.

3) Understand and apply the knowledge, perspectives, principles, and modes of reasoning employed in the fine arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics.

4) Understand how the knowledge, perspectives, principles, and modes of reasoning embodied in the fine arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics have contributed to human achievement.

5) Develop habits of mind that foster integrative thinking and ability that allow one to transfer knowledge and skills from one setting to another.

6) Demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of culture and cultural difference, and develop the habits of mind that allow for intercultural understanding and responsible individual and social choices for citizens of the global community.

(Adopted 02/13/06)

- Critical thinking and effective writing skills;
- The foundation of quantitative and logical analysis, mathematics and statistics;
- The basis of scientific methods of experimental practices as well as how to construct, test, and apply theories;
- An appreciation of the language of artistic and creative expression in literature and the fine arts;
- A recognition of the cultural underpinnings of society and history; the diversity of cultural experience, values, institutions, and ideas; and the multiple and conflicting traditions that have shaped us.
Assessment

The Core Curriculum’s Program Review was completed in the spring of 1999. One of its many conclusions was that assessment of the Core, and of its courses and programs, needed to be a priority in the coming years. The Core director wrote, “Assessment of the Core Curriculum must be faculty driven, based on a consensus, and only undertaken for the purpose of improving educational programs.” The Core Curriculum currently places assessment of its overall goals and requirements at the top of its priorities.

Assessment of the Core Writing Program, initiated in 1999-2000, was a first step in the assessment process. Assessment results pointed to several areas where student performance fell below desired outcome levels. As a result, the Core Writing Program reassessed those areas the following year. The results of this ongoing Core Writing Assessment led to actions aimed at improving students’ writing performance and have suggest other areas in which results may be useful.

One positive action was to institute a faculty development program for instructors of the major Core Curriculum courses on writing and composition, courses taken by nearly all University of Nevada, Reno undergraduates. The assessment results enabled us to focus on clearly identified areas of weakness in student writing that could be illustrated with extensive documentation. The assessment rubrics developed for the assessment process also were available for use by instructors. We expect to see benefits from these faculty development efforts as we continue to assess student writing. One of the areas assessed relates to critical thinking demonstrate in composition. Our assessment plan for the Core Curriculum’s critical thinking objective intends to build on the work done in the Core Writing Assessment to apply critical thinking rubrics to writing in other Core areas such as Western Traditions and Capstones. Other implications of the Core Writing Assessment are noted in the October 2000 report.

For example, an educator interested in addressing students’ critical reading abilities might learn a lot simply by focusing on the many pages of reader comments on that particular feature in the student portfolios. A new instructor wishing to know our values for student writing and our criteria for excellence in that writing can find all the necessary information—and more—in this report. An administrator wishing to work for improvement in some areas of student performance might take note of the many comments that will be helpful in designing workshops or other teacher preparation programs. . . . though, it is important to see this material in context: as part of an ongoing program assessment begun in 1999 by Core Writing . . . we have aimed at a descriptive assessment, and that is what we have achieved.

1 The assessment plan for the Core Curriculum has undergone major revisions from the design presented below and currently is being implemented even as the redesign process continues.
The Core Curriculum, with fresh input from a new director and the addition of an assessment coordinator, initiated a focused dialogue with the Cored Board regarding assessment.

Integrating General Education Learning across the Curriculum

Dialogue for the Core Board

1. Should general education provide a common foundation of knowledge for students to share?

2. Should general education expose students to the most important ideas, readings, and events?

3. Should general education seek to provide a common foundation to facilitate the teaching of advanced courses?

Dialogue Focused on Expectations for Student Learning

4. What do members of a college or university and members of specific programs expect their students to be able to demonstrate or represent based on pedagogy, the design of the curriculum, co-curriculum, instruction, other educational opportunities and practices, and the use of educational tools?

5. What should students be able to demonstrate or represent at points along their studies based on these educational practices?

6. What do the curricula and other educational experiences “add up to”?

Dialogue Focused on Verifying Expectations for Student Learning

7. How intentionally do members of an academic community provide opportunities for student to learn what an institution and its programs assert they teach or inculcate.

8. How do faculty, staff, and other contributors to student learning build on each others’ work?

9. Do students have multiple and diverse opportunities to build on previous learning, received feedback, and reflect on their progress toward achieving what an institution and its programs expect?

10. How do academic programs, services, and educational opportunities promote institutional-and program-level understanding, abilities, habits of mind, ways of thinking, and behaving?
11. What educational processes and experiences contribute to and reinforce collective educational expectations?

While this dialogue remains ongoing, what follows is a working draft outline for a new, comprehensive assessment plan for the Core Curriculum.

Assessment Plan Outline (Working Draft)
Hunting the White Elephant: A Roadmap to General Education Assessment

I. Principles of Outcome-based Assessment for General Education
   a. Goal (end toward which efforts are directed) (identify & define x goals to assess)
      i. Tied to mission
         1. Setting (common across campus) (see figure 1)
            a. Develop outcomes/objectives (objectives are created & agreed upon by all constituencies)
            b. Communicate objectives to public
            c. Collect evidence (sampling schema created & implemented as agreed—who decides?)
            d. Review & analyze evidence (appropriate fund allocation to successfully implement process)
            e. Revise outcomes (formative data are used to revise)
   b. Outcomes/Objectives for each Core area (see figure 2 & 3)
      i. Performance indicators/Evidence (what artifacts will be used? Who will decide? Who will read them: within discipline or cross-disciplines or a mixture? Will anonymous student artifacts be available for public display. If so, student permission is required)
         1. Assessment methods/Criteria (rubrics—who creates?)
            a. Direct
               i. Standards (who defines?)
            b. Indirect

II. Glossary of Terms (good assessment plan: Outcomes, Output, Activities)
   a. Outcome: What students can do when finished class
   b. Outputs
   c. Objectives/Activities
   d. Components
   e. Performance indicators: Evidence is a student learning byproduct; student actions or behaviors in demonstrating knowledge & skills
   f. Embedded Assessment: Assessment using the work that student normally produce in their courses: test items, essays, oral presentation, research projects, creative work, etc.
g. Rubric: a rubric is a scoring guide that provides criteria to describe various levels of student performance (see Developing & Using Rubrics: Dawn Rodrigues—Empire State College—handout)

h. Artifacts: An original piece of work produced by a student to fulfill a course requirement

i. Etc….

III. Stakeholders

a. Internal constituencies (Assessment uses UNR standards) (obtaining buy-in)
   i. Faculty
      1. Tenure/Tenure track
      2. LOA/LOB
      3. RA/TA’s
   ii. Students/Parents
   iii. Administration
      1. Academic
      2. Student Services
   iv. Advisory board
      1. Faculty
      2. Students
      3. Staff

b. External constituencies (Accountability uses their standards)
   i. Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (meet learning standards as detail in the accreditation process)
   ii. Government
      1. Federal
      2. State
      3. Local (school district K-16) (seamless transition)
         a. HS guidance & career counselors (match educational goals)
   iii. Community Colleges (articulation agreements) (maintain quality)
   iv. System Office/Board of Regents (goal priority and agreement)
   v. Business Community/workforce (understanding & meeting goals/objectives)
   vi. Donors & Alumni

IV. Core Assessment Areas (What are we going to do with the data? Where is it housed? Who has access to the data? How is it reported, when & to whom? IMPORTANT: loop gets closed—formative info gets used—not just summative.)

a. English/writing
b. Mathematics
c. Natural sciences
d. Social sciences
e. Fine arts
f. Core humanities
g. Capstone courses
h. Diversity
i. Critical Thinking
j. Technology

V. Considerations (what we like to see happen vs. need to happen (minimalist view)

a. Ideal
   i. Course Objectives
      1. Syllabi include objectives (faculty buy-in)
      2. Student exercise—have students write course objectives (student buy-in)
      3. Create a culture where students expect to see objectives and outcomes for every class they take
   ii. Directed teaching to objective curriculum alignment (written, taught, assessed)
   iii. Faculty learning community for each core area—meet once a month. (narrow & define goals)—unique ideas occur when interdisciplinary or cross disciplines. (faculty willing to invest the time)
      1. Identify goals/outcomes (limit number—not everyone is going to be satisfied) (evolve over time—not static)
      2. Take outcomes and breakdown to manageable objectives
      3. Define performance indicators—student work/artifacts that demonstrate achievement of outcomes; opportunity for different ways of demonstrating learning. (How are they chosen? Who picks?)
      4. Have faculty teach Board members or legislators to the importance of assessment
   iv. Student voice (long term)
      1. Include them in the development of course objectives (faculty ownership of curriculum. Feedback through course evaluation—how well did course meet expectations; did course have objectives? Did they meet objectives?
      2. Members of Core Board & learning community committee (is occurring)
   v. Buy-in
      1. Faculty
         a. Link to what faculty value (research, teaching, recognition)
         b. Respect disciplines: understand the value of different methods of research by discipline
         c. Monetary
            i. Pay them to help design & implement the process (goals, assessment, feedback, etc.)
            ii. Reduced course load for process development
            iii. Assessment research grants
            iv. Department assessment directors (already in place)
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v. Special assessment committees (core board sub-committee)
   vi. Feed them and they will come to meetings

d. Retention, promotion, tenure, merit
   i. Scholarship of teaching and learning
   ii. Promote assessment as a scholarly activity
   iii. Public recognitions of contributions
   iv. Assessment is more than service
   v. Assessment is a way to simplify faculty lives

2. Administration
   a. Legitimize the relationship between public assessment and institutional gain

3. Students
   a. Include them in the process (what students should be getting from the educational process)

vi. Review & Analyze Artifacts (Evidence)
   1. Rubrics (close loops)
      a. Create rubrics for core areas
      b. Disseminate & assess
      c. Revise rubrics
      d. Implement in core areas (repeat to refine rubrics)
   2. Collect representative samples (equal number of exemplary, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) for analysis using core rubrics (have faculty identify assignments as item artifacts; create portfolio culture so artifacts are available for review; who places artifacts in portfolio for random selection? Or, do faculty have control over artifact selection?)
   3. Incentives for faculty readers
   4. Analyze data (how, who, when?)
   5. E-portfolio as a data collection venue for artifacts (required for student graduation)

vii. Faculty development
   1. ETP/OUA involvement
      a. Rubric (faculty development in this area)
      b. E-portfolio (faculty buy-in important)
      c. Involve faculty as workshop leaders
      d. Value the scholarship of teaching and learning techniques
      e. Connect student learning results to faculty grant writing
      f. OUA newsletter

   b. Practical
      i. Start small
         1. caring group—ripple effect
      ii. Involved people (reduce course load; part of tenure review, additional pay, administrators job description)
      iii. Rotate goal assessment—every 2 years assess half the goals
iv. Embedded Assessment Process (Basic Process)—focuses upon the student work that gives us the best information,
   1. Begin with learning outcomes/objectives (need course objectives)
   2. Determine what types of work might serve as evidence for which outcomes (link evidence to specific objectives)
   3. Identify courses in program in which the students produce those types of work
   4. Establish criteria & methods for assessing the work
   5. Collect the student work & assess it
v. Link assessment to what faculty value the most on UNR’s campus (research, teaching, recognition)
vii. Make links to assessment results wherever and whenever possible
   1. Include ‘student learning’ pages/links on department website
      a. writing competency examples
      b. pass rates of licensure exams
      c. indirect measures: alumni and employer satisfactions surveys
viii. Look for opportunities to celebrate accomplishments—great & small
ix. Create efficiencies: stage assessment over time; assess what matters most; simplify reporting process
x. Recognize the truth: not all assessments work, not all students succeed.
x. Scholarships linked to achievement of university and department specific learning objectives and goals
xii. Recruitment Student & Faculty
   1. Brochures stating assessment of student learning—what you need to know (Eastern Illinois Univ)
   2. Inform faculty of institutional commitment to teaching and learning

VI. Strategic Plan: So What Concept
   a. Overview (Assessment is part of curriculum development; assessment can inform fiscal & strategic planning)
   b. Mission
   c. Vision
      i. Data Use (What are we going to do with the data)
         1. Formative
         2. Summative
d. Context for Planning
   i. How to analyze the data
   ii. Share results with faculty, administrators, students, parents
   iii. Use results to improve & develop programs
      1. Who it is reported to
      2. Frequency of reporting
3. When disseminated
   iv. Ask departments to relate assessment results to annual reports and requests for resources

e. Goals
   i. What is good writing? (have composition faculty vs. other faculty define)
   ii. What mathematics do all our student need?
   iii. What should a graduate of UNR know, be able to do, or value?
   iv. How can we know?

f. Performance Indicator
   i. Output
      1. Retention figures
      2. Time to degree
      3. Graduation rates
      4. Persistence
   ii. Outcomes
      1. GPA’s
      2. Standardized test scores

g. Assessment Measures (could have assessment day each semester to test rising juniors & graduating senior. First-years would take exams during orientation, but could also be included in assessment day)
   i. Direct
      1. Demonstration of ability level
      2. Value added (NCCU requirements)
         a. Entering student information
         b. First-year artifacts
         c. Pre & post-test opportunities (within courses and possibly between—math post 120 is pre 128—stair step))
         d. Mid-level program (rising junior)
         e. End program (capstone)
      3. Standardized exams (embedded assessment)
         a. ETS (in core areas)
         b. ACT (in core areas)
         c. Licensure exams pass rates (nursing, engineering, teaching)
   ii. Indirect
      1. Reflective
      2. NSSE/FSSE
      3. Alumni survey
      4. Exit interviews
      5. Alumni giving
      6. Employer survey
      7. Graduating student surveys
      8. Staff surveys
iii. Artifacts
   1. e-portfolios materials/artifacts
   2. standardized tests
      a. graduate tests (GRE, MCAT, LSAT)
   3. Entrance into graduate schools

h. Timeline
   i. Phase one: Identify programs, faculty leaders, & start dates for each area
   ii. Phase two: Create objectives for program assessment, identify performance indicators/evidence, criteria and standards to be used to demonstrate outcomes (rubrics)
   iii. Phase three: Communicate outcomes/objectives to internal and external constituencies
   iv. Phase four: Collect evidence/performance indicators
   v. Phase five: Review & analyze evidence
   vi. Phase six: Revise and re-evaluate outcomes/objectives
   vii. Phase seven: Create and implement programs to address the areas noted for improvement from data.

i. Resource Allocations
   i. Make fiscal & planning decisions by taking into account assessment results
   j. Support Needed: Fiscal, Structural, and Reward
      i. Fund activities from outside the department budget (Core dollars)
      ii. When tenure is granted, provide extra funding with expectations from participating in assessment
      iii. Create incentives based on assessment as a priority

VII. Time Frame for assessing student learning outcomes/objectives
   a. English/writing*
   b. Mathematics
   c. Natural sciences
   d. Social sciences
   e. Fine arts
   f. Core humanities*
   g. Capstone courses
   h. Diversity
   i. Critical Thinking
   j. Technology

* have started this process to a degree

Things to remember to include:

   Threat of entropy: anything left unattended will eventually atrophy and die
Academic Freedom: “while academic freedom might be endangered if faculty were required to teach only to certain goals, I don’t believe that asking faculty to make our goals explicit is unreasonable…The problem arises when those not actually involved in teaching or research assume control over the assessment process…” Tom Angel
1. Develop Clear Outcomes/Objectives, Performance indicators (Evidence), Criteria (rubrics), and Standards

2. Make Outcomes, Performance indicators, Assessment methods (Criteria, and Standards) Public and Visible (Syllabi, Programs,

3. Collect Performance indicators (evidence) of Student Achievement

4. Review & Analyze Performance indicators (evidence)

5. Revise Outcomes & Criteria, Improve Pedagogy, Curriculum, and Programs, adjust rubric to reflect necessary change: for improvements

**Mission, Purposes & Educational Objectives**

**Figure 1: Assessment Process**
1. Develop Clear Outcomes/ Objectives, Performance indicators (Evidence), Criteria (rubrics), and Standards
2. Make Outcomes, Performance indicators, Assessment methods (Criteria, and Standards) Public and Visible (Syllabi, Programs, Brochures)
3. Collect Performance indicators (evidence) of Student Achievement
4. Review & Analyze Performance indicators (evidence)
5. Revise Outcomes & Criteria, Improve Pedagogy, Curriculum, and Programs, adjust rubrics to reflect necessary changes for improvements

Mission, Purposes & Educational Objectives

Figure 2: Student Learning Outcomes
Figure 3: Mathematics Core Curriculum Example

Mission
Understand basic Mathematical concepts and apply quantitative reasoning

Outcome 1/Goal
Students regard quantitative reasoning not simply as a set of techniques, but as a way to think, reason, and conceptualize

Performance Indicator/Evidence
Mathematical & statistical projects & papers

Assessment Method (direct)
- Accuracy
- Complexity
- Appropriateness
- Clarity & Coherence

Standards
- Exemplary Achievement
- Satisfactory Achievement
- Unsatisfactory Achievement

Outcome 2/Goal
Students can perform computations and symbolic manipulations

Performance Indicator/Evidence
Mathematical & statistical problems

Assessment Method (direct)
- Accuracy
- Complexity
- Appropriateness

Standards
- Exemplary Achievement
- Satisfactory Achievement
- Unsatisfactory Achievement

Outcome 3/Goal
Students can apply quantitative reasoning to interpret information and solve problems

Performance Indicator/Evidence
Mathematical & statistical projects & papers

Assessment Method (direct)
- Accuracy & Complexity
- Appropriateness
- Clarity & Coherence
- Depth of understanding

Standards
- Exemplary Achievement
- Satisfactory Achievement
- Unsatisfactory Achievement
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College Responses to the 2008 NWCCU Accreditation Report

College of Liberal Arts

The College of Liberal Arts continues to value the importance of outcome assessment as a way to evaluate and improve our degree programs, general (core) education and service offerings, and key individual courses. In 2007, 44 of the college’s 48 degree programs submitted assessment reports. Of the four that did not, two are new programs: Neuroscience began accepting students in Fall 2008, while the Master of Fine Arts program began in 2007. The new chair (Fall 2008) of the Department of Philosophy—the one department which reported no assessment activities other than its program review in 2007—is committed to re-engaging the department in assessment and program improvement, and she has already met with the associate dean and contacted the Office of University Assessment for help with this project.

With this strong record of compliance in planning and reporting through the Office of University Assessment’s template, the college does not agree that “lack of standardization or coordination,” let alone ignorance, is an issue. Nor do we agree that the widespread use of part-time and contingent-upon-funding full-time faculty—whatever its other ramifications may be—is deleterious to “assessment-relevant activities.” These faculty are not given the responsibility of assigning or reviewing assessment activities; permanent, full-time faculty are. However, it is our experience that contingent and part-time faculty have readily complied with departmental directives to provide student scores, portfolios and other artifacts, and any other materials needed for assessment. One example is the Core Writing Program’s portfolio assessment, which had 100% participation by instructors of the first-year writing courses.

This is not to deny that the departments within this college, only a handful of which have had experience with the formal assessment expectations of professional and disciplinary accrediting bodies, have had varying degrees of difficulty with the language and the expectations of student learning outcomes assessment. However, plans and reports are improving as program faculty become more familiar with the demands and advantages of outcomes assessment and more savvy about what can reasonably be accomplished in one year of planning, assessing, reviewing, and loop-closing. For example, the History Department, with its “skills-based” curriculum and clear goals and learning outcomes, began a project in 2006 to evaluate the success of their senior thesis process. Although the relevant materials were gathered and rubrics developed and filled out, the department ultimately found that the assessment project was too multifaceted and demanding. However, they did emerge with two smaller questions about student performance that they wanted to have answered, and these will form the basis for their 2009 plan.

More and more of our programs are recognizing that well-designed assessment activities can help departments pose and answer important questions about their courses, curricula, and student success. One example is Music, which recognized a few years ago, through tests and other measures of student performance, that many majors were not well prepared for the upper-division courses in history and theory. As a result, they not only instituted a continuation exam at the junior level (“to assure competency of all transfer and continuing students in basic musicianship…”) but also provided an explanation of outcomes and expectations to neighboring schools which send many transfer students to the program.
Division of Health Sciences (formerly the College of Health and Human Sciences)

The College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS) was dissolved on June 30, 2008, and a new academic unit, the Division of Health Sciences (DHS) was created as of July 1, 2008. Academic units in CHHS were given the opportunity to request a move to the college/division that was considered to be the best fit. Most of the units in CHHS moved to DHS, including the School of Community Health Sciences (formerly the School of Public Health), the School of Nursing, the School of Social Work, and the School of Medicine. All of the academic programs currently residing in DHS are housed in professional schools that have their own accrediting bodies.

In general, the portion of the NWCCU report that relates to CHHS did not identify any outstanding deficiencies related to the academic units now housed in DHS. All of the professional schools meet standards for the professional degrees and provide systematic assessment of programmatic outcomes. Faculty are fully engaged in course design, sequencing, and implementation of the curriculum, and LOAs the have training and experience they need to make them an asset to the programs.

One concern that the reviewers noted was that scholarly activity is an expectation of faculty, but that the workload in the professional schools is intensive and does not provide a reduction in teaching responsibilities to facilitate scholarship. With the current budget crisis, faculty members are being asked to increase their teaching loads by one class per year (with accommodations made for extenuating circumstances), in order to eliminate the use of LOAs as much as possible and vacated positions are not being filled. This means that faculty members have even less time for scholarship than they did when the accreditation team reviewed the programs, putting untenured faculty at the greatest risk for letters of non-renewal. This is a major concern because the review team also noted that recruitment and retention of faculty in the health professions is difficult because the university cannot compete with salaries offered by the private sector.

With shrinking resources and economic uncertainty limiting the options for increasing scholarship and addressing recruitment and retention issue, DHS decided to initiate a formal division-wide mentoring program for untenured faculty to enhance their scholarship productivity and success in the promotion and tenure process. This effort includes conducting an online needs assessment to identify faculty needs and potential mentors, and writing a proposal for funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (http://www.rwjf.org/humancapital/). The funding would be used to support mentors and encourage them to participate in the program. In the meantime, the DHS Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct regular workshops for untenured faculty, starting with a round table at the DHS assembly in January, 2009. The round table will be hosted by the P & T committee members and will provide an open forum for untenured faculty to discuss their needs and concerns and to brainstorm strategies for success in the context of limited resources.
College of Business Administration

While the College of Business Administration (COBA) assessment effort is relatively new, the honesty and detailed critiques provided in the most recent assessment documents show the determination with which improvement of both courses and the assessment process is being pursued. These analyses, written by faculty teaching the assessed courses, not only present remediation efforts that are being pursued in response to assessment feedback, but they also frequently suggest changes to the learning objective subcategories to give greater precision to the assessment. As a result, the College of Business Administration has developed a “core curriculum” for all undergraduate COBA programs. The full description of the plan, including assessment, is provided in Exhibit 3B; the Executive Summary of that document is reproduced below.

Executive Summary:

Assessment Reports and Closing the Loop Actions by Learning Goal

This section provides the summary of assessment and closing the loop actions for undergraduate and graduate programs of the College of Business at the University of Nevada, Reno. Detailed information on assessment and closing the loop actions is provided in an Appendix.

Undergraduate Programs

While the College of Business assessment effort is relatively new, the honesty and detailed critiques provided in the most recent assessment documents show the determination with which improvement of both courses and the assessment process is being pursued. These analyses, written by faculty teaching the assessed courses, not only present remediation efforts that are being pursued in response to assessment feedback, but they also frequently suggest changes to the learning objective subcategories to give greater precision to the assessment. (For example, see Learning Goal 1, Objective 2).

Learning Goal 1 is concerned with fundamental business knowledge and practices. A common theme in the analyses is that students have difficulty applying abstract knowledge to real-world situations. This is being remedied in many cases with the introduction of semester projects in courses to enable extended, detailed application of knowledge to actual business situations (ex. LG1LO2)

A second recurrent theme is the deterioration of fundamental skills as students progress in their programs of study; math and the ability to read basic financial statements are two examples. Closing the loop efforts have proposed altering course structures across the programs of study in order to supply continuous reinforcement of basic material. This is a longer term process rather than simply altering a single course, since faculty teaching courses that are not currently part of assessment must be brought into that process. However, actions have been taken to insure that assessment and curriculum improvement is truly a college-wide effort.
Learning Goal 1, Objective 3 is concerned with understanding personal motivations in a business context. Overall students do well in this area; however a detailed program has been suggested in closing the loop for this objective to decrease the number of students performing below expectations.

**Learning Goal 2** is concerned with analytical and critical thinking skills, including statistical tools, decision support modeling, and strategic thinking. The majority of students meet expectations. Encouragingly, the percentage of students labeled as needing statistical skill improvement measurably decreased as students progressed from introductory courses as sophomores to capstone courses as seniors.

The most strident concern relative to Learning Goal 2 at this point is the lack of sophistication in critical thinking at the senior year capstone level. To address this concern, the assessment process is promoting increased coordination among the instructors of courses related to Learning Goal 2, so that increased sophistication in critical thinking can be developed through more repetition, more consistent use of underlying skills, and more coordination across course of activities that promote critical thinking.

**Learning Goal 3** concerns the ability to communicate, in writing, orally, and within small groups. A majority of students meet expectations for Learning Goal 3, and there is evidence that the typical student becomes more proficient as progress is made through the curriculum. The development of feedback channels to the primary instructor of MGT 321, the business communication course required of all business majors has been key to developing remediation activities for communication weaknesses in higher level business courses. This coordinated effort is one of the best examples of a continuous process of improvement presently in place in the business school.

The ability to be a “team player” has recently been identified as a concern with respect to Learning Goal 3. To address this concern, peer evaluation of team skill development has been introduced in an MGT 496 capstone course, both mid semester and at the end of the semester. Such peer evaluation has been effective at developing listening skills and the provision of constructive criticism, and the initial indication is that peer evaluation will also facilitate the development of team play.

**Learning Goal 4** is concerned with information technology use and assessment shows our students are quite strong in this area. This is not surprising given the increasing use of technology in general by our students and the increasing stress given information technology use in K-12. Several issues with student non-performance of assessment tasks for Learning Objectives 1A and 1B have led to higher than acceptable number of student performing below expectations. These issues have been addressed by closing the loop actions (see Section 6).

**Learning Goal 5** is primarily concerned with measuring student ability to recognize and resolve ethical issues. Our students need improvement in this area, especially earlier in their course of study. We feel problems in this area reflect broader cultural issues; several recent studies have shown that less than 40% of high school students feel cheating on exams is a serious offence. However, a satisfactory job is being done within the university to increase student ability to resolve business ethics issues. This is demonstrated by the substantial improvement in assessment measures for this goal from 200-level courses to the business capstone course. As detailed in the analyses, significant
actions have been taken to increase ethical awareness and issue resolution capability in lower level classes as well.

Overall conclusions and recommendations:

- For the assessment process to make meaningful changes to the operations of the College, then the culture and spirit of assessment must become a fundamental value of the faculty of the college. At the present time, the assessment process is being driven by a few true believers and from the top down. Significantly more effort is necessary to build a spirit of continuous improvement.

- A systematic feedback process needs to be put into place that ensures continuous improvement becomes a permanent fixture within the college.

College of Education

The College of Education continues to implement its comprehensive assessment plan in order to stay in compliance with the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Assessment data gathered are compiled by the associate dean and distributed to the Dean’s Leadership Team and the College of Education Teacher Education Coordinating Committee. Each department, under the chairs’ leadership, is asked to review the data and make program or operational improvements. Changes have been made within courses, in program requirements, by adding and deleting courses, and by adding more courses to program requirements.

The college has also worked to obtain a greater response rate in its data collection processes. For example, the teacher education program completer follow-up survey, in its first year of use, was administered as a mailed questionnaire. A twenty percent response rate was obtained. During the past two years, the survey was administered through the use of an electronic survey using email as the means of informing subjects to complete the survey. The switch to an electronic survey procedure resulted in doubling the response rate to over 40 percent.

The college has not only used its assessment data to make improvements, but looks for ways to improve its assessment procedures.

Reynolds School of Journalism

While the school has focused much more on assessment, the leadership team agrees that more needs to be done. The school is building assessment measures into new courses as they are created, and has appointed a new Deans’ Council and told members that they specifically will be asked to judge portfolios. In addition, the dean is a long-time member of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications and has been involved in designing its assessment requirements. The school is likely to invite Trevor Brown, former dean of journalism at Indiana University and the expert on assessment in journalism education, to conduct a seminar on the subject for the faculty.
College of Science

All College of Science programs are firmly committed to student assessment with the goal of improving student learning. While the faculty have always been serious about improving student learning, they have not always been thorough in documenting the data they collect and the innovations they undertake. All programs in the college have an assessment plan. All the programs in the college now appreciate the importance of not only implementing their plans, but also of better documenting what they do. All programs are working to close the loop by collecting the data as described in their plan, by assessing what changes might improve student learning outcomes, and by testing the effects of those changes on student learning outcomes.

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources

The College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources takes assessment very seriously. All programs are in the process of revising their assessment plans so that better assessment and improvement of course curricula can occur. Additionally, each department has established an assessment committee which presents its assessment findings to the faculty as a whole for discussion, at the very least, once a year.

Curricular and structural changes in the College are impacting assessment. The Natural Resources and Environmental Science Department, which is the home of the following majors: Ecohydrology, Environmental Science, Wildlife Ecology & Conservation, and Forest and Rangeland Management, has been undergoing some fairly significant curricular changes lately based upon input of their graduated students, the various end employers of their students (state and U.S. environmental agencies, non-governmental environmental agencies), and the various concerned professional agencies. These changes have been instituted through twice yearly Departmental academic retreats. So far this input has resulted in the following changes:

1. The Environmental Science specialization in Watershed Science has been eliminated and a new major Ecohydrology instituted in its’ place as of Fall 2008.
2. Concomitantly as of Fall 2008, the Environmental Science specialization in Environmental Science was eliminated and this specialization became a full major.
3. As of Nov. 3, 2008 a complete revision of the Environmental Science major was passes by the UCCC and the revisions will appear in both the printed and online catalogs for 2009-2010.
4. The revision of the curriculum of the Wildlife Ecology and Conservation major will be the subject of a departmental retreat in Dec. 2008.
5. Discussions are being held between the Department of Animal Biotechnology and NRES regarding the possible merging of Animal Biotech’s Animal Science major’s specialization in Rangeland and Livestock Production and NRES’s Forest and Rangeland Management major specialization in Rangeland Management.

In a similar manner and with similar considerations and input, in 2007, assessment has lead to complete curricular revision of the two undergraduate majors of the Department of Resource Economics: Agricultural and Applied Economics, and Environmental and Resource Economics.
In recent meetings with CABNR assessment coordinators several new assessment ideas were brought forward that we believe will help improve the process for CABNR programs. It was suggested for graduate programs, that after a student’s qualifying and thesis defense, each committee member would be asked to fill out a form assessing the student’s general professional knowledge, research capability and their synthetic ability. Forms would be collected throughout the academic year and then reviewed by the program. Hopefully this would allow program members to more easily and in a more timely fashion spot deficiencies and but also to discern what is working well in the program.

For undergraduate programs, coordinators agreed that it would be a help in assessment if all programs determined which course or courses in their program were pivotal to a student’s success and to incorporate within the final exam questions that not only test a students’ overall factual knowledge but also the student’s ability to synthesize, evaluate and apply this knowledge.

**Interdisciplinary Programs**

To insure that assessment of the interdisciplinary graduate programs is comprehensive and includes student outcome assessment, including consistent data collection, improvements to curriculum, advising and other program efforts:

1. The Graduate Dean, to whom the interdisciplinary graduate programs report, will meet with each of the interdisciplinary graduate programs in Spring 2009 to review current assessment plans. Updates to these will be made as appropriate, assessment data collection methodology will be reviewed and implemented.

2. The Graduate Dean, to whom the interdisciplinary graduate programs report, will review each interdisciplinary graduate program’s report annually and will monitor to assure that the reports are filed annually with the assessment office.
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Assessment Advisory Committee Membership

Kathleen Boardman
   Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

William Cathey
   Vice Provost, Instruction and Undergraduate Education

Carol Condit
   Associate Dean, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources

Vern Luft
   Associate Dean, College of Education

Dean Adams
   Associate Dean, College of Engineering

Katherine McCall
   Associate Dean, College of Science

Rosemary McCarthy
   Chair, Reynolds School of Journalism

Kambiz Raffiee
   Associate Dean, College of Business Administration

Marsha Read
   Interim Dean, Graduate School
Program Assessment Progress Report (Self-Appraisal) and Process Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to work with us to move assessment forward. As you recall, we told you we would be sending you a Program Assessment Self-Appraisal form for each of the bachelor’s degrees in your college. These appraisal forms are attached!

Please disseminate these forms to the respective programs’ chair and assessment coordinator. You may do so in a meeting, by email or however you choose, we offer some guidelines regarding what you might tell them.

1. A major purpose for asking programs to conduct this self-appraisal is to engage more faculty in the conversation about the program’s current Assessment Plan; specifically the learning outcomes and performance measures as well as faculty perceptions regarding the effectiveness of program’s the current assessment processes. Our experience is that faculty engagement is a key feature in programs where assessment is working well.
   a. It is important to stress that each faculty member review the Bachelor’s Assessment Plan.
   b. Also, please stress that a faculty discussion should occur no later than the next scheduled faculty meeting or at a meeting called for this purpose.

2. Following a faculty discussion, the chair, assessment coordinator or another faculty member can complete the self-appraisal then send the completed document to you – the associate dean.
   a. The self-appraisal document can be completed several ways:
      i. Print the form and fill it all out longhand;
      ii. Enter written responses via computer, print the form then circle the appropriate (X) on the various scales; or
      iii. Complete the whole form via computer – underline or bold the appropriate ‘X’.
   b. For all three above options, the self-appraisal document can be returned to you in printed form. In option ‘iii’ the form also can be sent digitally. We suggest you print a copy of each self-appraisal document for your assessment files.
   c. When you have all the appraisal documents, send copies to the assessment office (MS 087).
   d. The deadline to have these appraisal documents into you should be immediately following the faculty meeting (#1); the sooner the better.
3. As the appraisal documents are returned, please review each along with the respective program’s assessment plan and a recent report (you have access to all by logging onto the OUA website – www.unr.edu/assess). If you have difficulty finding anything on the website, please contact the assessment office (4-4837).
   a. A meeting has been scheduled for 3/20/08 (10:30 – 11:30, JCSU 356) to go over the UNR assessment model/process with all associate deans to help you with this review. Additionally, the printed information we gave you at the March 5 meeting should be helpful. Note that all of that information comes directly from our Web site (select “University Assessment Model” on the left side of our home page). There are many links to additional resources embedded in this material.

4. The assessment office will contact you to go over the appraisals, the status of all programs in your college and plan where and how to focus our efforts to make program assessments more useful and more efficient in terms of faculty time and effort.
Program Assessment Self-Appraisal

Program Information

College
Department
Chair
Program
Assessment Coordinator

History:
Assessment Plan
Date: first submitted - last modified -
Reports: Year Submitted (yes)
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007

***************************************************************************
Summary Review by Program Faculty
1. Assessment Plan Design:

How well do the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in the [name of program] assessment plan describe the program faculty’s expectations of what students should be able to demonstrate by the time they graduate?

Very Well x x x x x x x Very Poorly x Don’t Know

If fully implemented, how well can this assessment plan inform program faculty of student achievement of the SLOs overall?

Very Well x x x x x x x Very Poorly x Don’t Know
2. Assessment Plan Implementation:

To what extent is the [name of program] assessment plan being fully implemented?

Fully Implemented x x x x x x x Not Implemented x Don’t Know

If the assessment plan is fully implemented, are/will the data obtained be adequate for program improvement?

Very Adequate x x x x x x x Inadequate x Don’t Know

3. Faculty Involvement and Use of Assessment Results:

To what extent have assessment results been used to help inform program decisions?

Used Extensively x x x x x x x Not Used x Don’t Know

To what extent have the majority of program faculty actively been involved in the review and discussion of assessment data?

Very Involved x x x x x x x Uninvolved x Don’t Know

4. Summary Comments:

Please describe the progress the program has made in the design and implementation of assessment and how assessment results have been used for program improvement/accountability?
What needs to be accomplished to make assessment more useful to the program?

How satisfied are faculty with this program’s progress regarding assessment?

Very Satisfied x x x x x x x Dissatisfied x Don’t Know

Would you like the Assessment Office to work with you to improve the program assessment?

Yes Not at this time

If so, please describe the area(s) in which you would like assistance and what kind of assistance would be most useful.
This appendix contains summary statistics of submitted program assessment plans, and a list of all academic programs with assessment plans, organized by college, department and program including those updated since 1/2008.

### Academic Assessment Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Not Submitted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Last Modified</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2008</td>
<td>Animal Biotechnology - Bachelors</td>
<td>GOMEZ-RAYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2007</td>
<td>Animal Biotechnology, Animal Science - Masters</td>
<td>PORADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2008</td>
<td>Animal Biotechnology, Animal Science - Bachelors</td>
<td>TEGLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/2008</td>
<td>Biochemistry - Bachelors</td>
<td>HOWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
<td>Biochemistry - Doctorate</td>
<td>CUSHMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
<td>Biochemistry - Masters</td>
<td>CUSHMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2007</td>
<td>Biochemistry - Biotechnology - Masters</td>
<td>SHINTANI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2007</td>
<td>NRES: Ecohydrology - Bachelors</td>
<td>SAITO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/2005</td>
<td>NRES: Forest &amp; Rangeland Management - Bachelors</td>
<td>QUALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2009</td>
<td>Natural Resource &amp; Environmental Science - Bachelors</td>
<td>QUALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2009</td>
<td>Natural Resource &amp; Environmental Science - Masters</td>
<td>QUALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/2006</td>
<td>Nutrition - Bachelors</td>
<td>WILSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2008</td>
<td>Nutrition - Masters</td>
<td>BENEDICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/2009</td>
<td>Resource Econ: Agricultural &amp; Applied Economics - Bachelors</td>
<td>KILKENNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2006</td>
<td>Resource Econ: Economics - Doctorate</td>
<td>ROLLINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2008</td>
<td>Resource Econ: Environmental &amp; Resource Economics - Bachelors</td>
<td>KILKENNY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Business Administration (13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Last Modified</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2008</td>
<td>Accountancy - Masters</td>
<td>CARSLAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2008</td>
<td>Accounting - Bachelors</td>
<td>CARSLAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Accounting/Information Systems - Bachelors</td>
<td>CREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2009</td>
<td>Information Systems - Bachelors</td>
<td>CREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/2007</td>
<td>Information Systems - Masters</td>
<td>CREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2007</td>
<td>Business Administration - Masters</td>
<td>RAFFIEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2003</td>
<td>Economics - Masters</td>
<td>STIVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2007</td>
<td>Economics - Bachelors</td>
<td>STIVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/2008</td>
<td>Managerial Science: Finance - Bachelors</td>
<td>STONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2008</td>
<td>Managerial Science: Finance - Masters</td>
<td>BHARGAVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2008</td>
<td>Managerial Science: Management - Bachelors</td>
<td>STEDHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Degree Title</td>
<td>College Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2002</td>
<td>Managerial Science: Marketing - Bachelors</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2005</td>
<td>Managerial Science: Supply Chain Management - Bachelors</td>
<td>AMATO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Education (23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Degree Title</th>
<th>College Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2003</td>
<td>Counseling - Doctorate</td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2007</td>
<td>Counseling - Masters</td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/2007</td>
<td>Educational Psychology - Education Specialist</td>
<td>LIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2003</td>
<td>Educational Psychology - Doctorate</td>
<td>LIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>Educational Psychology: MEd - Masters</td>
<td>LIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2005</td>
<td>Educational Psychology: MS - Masters</td>
<td>LIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning - Masters</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2007</td>
<td>Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning - Bachelors</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/2006</td>
<td>Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning - Doctorate</td>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/2003</td>
<td>Educational Leadership - Education Specialist</td>
<td>HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/2008</td>
<td>Educational Leadership - Doctorate</td>
<td>HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties - Doctorate</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties - Bachelors</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties: Equity &amp; Diversity - Masters</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties: Literacy Studies - Masters</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties: Literacy Studies - Doctorate</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2005</td>
<td>Education Specialties: Sp Ed &amp; Disability Studies - Masters</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>Education Specialties: Sp Ed &amp; Disability Studies - Doctorate</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/2005</td>
<td>Education Specialties: TESOL - Masters</td>
<td>CHENEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/2003</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies - Masters</td>
<td>BURNHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2008</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies - Bachelors</td>
<td>BURNHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/2008</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies: Early Child Ed - Bachelors</td>
<td>BURNHAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Engineering (26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Degree Title</th>
<th>College Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2004</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>FUCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2007</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering - Bachelors</td>
<td>CORONELLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/2005</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>FUCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2006</td>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering - Bachelors</td>
<td>FUERSTENAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2006</td>
<td>Metallurgical Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>FUERSTENAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2006</td>
<td>Metallurgical Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>FUERSTENAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2006</td>
<td>Civil Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2006</td>
<td>Civil Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2008</td>
<td>Civil Engineering - Bachelors</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2006</td>
<td>Civil Engineering: Environmental - Bachelors</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/2006</td>
<td>Civil Engineering: Environmental - Doctorate</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2007</td>
<td>Civil Engineering: Environmental - Masters</td>
<td>DENNETT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2003</td>
<td>Computer Science - Masters</td>
<td>NICOLESCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2006</td>
<td>Computer Science - Bachelors</td>
<td>NICOLESCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2003</td>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>NICOLESCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2006</td>
<td>Computer Science: Computer &amp; Info Engineering - Bachelors</td>
<td>FLOBERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2003</td>
<td>Computer Science: Computer Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>FLOBERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2006</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>PUBLICOVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/2007</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>PUBLICOVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2004</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering - Masters</td>
<td>RAWAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2004</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering - Doctorate</td>
<td>RAWAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2008</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering - Bachelors</td>
<td>HENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/2007</td>
<td>Engineering Physics - Bachelors</td>
<td>TAYAHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/2007</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/2007</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/2007</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Liberal Arts (48)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2007</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>HARDESTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2008</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>HARDESTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/2006</td>
<td>Art: Fine Arts</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>BOGARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2008</td>
<td>Art: Fine Arts</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>K Koh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/2008</td>
<td>Art: Studio &amp; Art History</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>ROSENBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/2008</td>
<td>Tutorial PhD in Basque Studies</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>OTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2009</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>CHAIRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2008</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>GRIFFIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2006</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>HARDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2006</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>HARDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/2009</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>FENIMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2006</td>
<td>English: Teaching English</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>HARDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/2005</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>LOCKHART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/2005</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures: French</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>MELARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/2004</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures: German</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>LANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2002</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures: Spanish</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/2003</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>NEILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2009</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2007</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>DWORKIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2007</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13/2003</td>
<td>History: Teaching History</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2007</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>NISSEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2008</td>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>SCHAAR-BUIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2008</td>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>SCHAAR-BUIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>EHRKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2008</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>EHRKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2003</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>EHRKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/2003</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>ACHTENBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/2003</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>ACHTENBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2003</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2002</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2002</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2003</td>
<td>Political Science: International Affairs</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2002</td>
<td>Political Science: Public Administration and Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2008</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>WEBSTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2007</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>FOLLETTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2008</td>
<td>Psychology: Behavioral Analysis</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2008</td>
<td>Psychology: Behavioral Analysis</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2008</td>
<td>Psychology: Clinical</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>FOLLETTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/2006</td>
<td>Psychology: Cognitive &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>CROGNALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2006</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>KEMMELMEIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2007</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>KEMMELMEIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2006</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>GANDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/2006</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>GANDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2007</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>GANDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/2007</td>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>STEWART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1/2/2009</td>
<td>PRAVOSUDHOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>12/7/2004</td>
<td>PRAVOSUDHOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11/13/2006</td>
<td>LIGHTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2/1/2006</td>
<td>LIGHTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11/13/2006</td>
<td>LIGHTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemical Physics - Doctorate</td>
<td>11/13/2006</td>
<td>CLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Environmental - Bachelors</td>
<td>1/2/2009</td>
<td>LIGHTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Professional - Bachelors</td>
<td>11/13/2006</td>
<td>LIGHTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2/13/2007</td>
<td>HAUSLADEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9/8/2008</td>
<td>STARRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9/17/2007</td>
<td>HAUSLADEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Land Use Planning - Masters</td>
<td>12/8/2006</td>
<td>HAUSLADEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11/5/2003</td>
<td>TEMPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Engineering</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11/26/2003</td>
<td>CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Engineering</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>12/17/2008</td>
<td>CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Engineering</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>11/26/2003</td>
<td>CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2/13/2007</td>
<td>NOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Related Earth Science - Doctorate</td>
<td>2/13/2007</td>
<td>NOBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4/30/2008</td>
<td>OPPLIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9/18/2007</td>
<td>OPPLIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>5/2/2008</td>
<td>OPPLIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9/29/2008</td>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>10/31/2007</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11/2/2007</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Teaching Mathematics - Masters</td>
<td>11/2/2007</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Engineering</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4/25/2003</td>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Engineering</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1/27/2009</td>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1/24/2007</td>
<td>ARNOTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9/20/2002</td>
<td>BAUER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>BAUER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>BAUER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division of Health Sciences (6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>10/8/2003</td>
<td>LAMBERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1/8/2007</td>
<td>AMOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Sciences</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9/14/2007</td>
<td>CONSTANTINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9/14/2007</td>
<td>MINARIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>12/8/2008</td>
<td>ALBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>12/29/2008</td>
<td>ALBERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interdisciplinary Degree Programs (12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1/23/2007</td>
<td>KORACIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1/23/2007</td>
<td>KORACIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1/9/2007</td>
<td>PARI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular &amp; Molecular Pharmacology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2/8/2007</td>
<td>LEBLANC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Conservation Biology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12/14/2005</td>
<td>SEDINGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Health</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12/3/2008</td>
<td>WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Health</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1/30/2008</td>
<td>WALKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4/28/2003</td>
<td>POHLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4/28/2003</td>
<td>POHLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4/28/2003</td>
<td>POHLL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Plans Updated between January 2008 and February 2009

Programs access assessment plan templates online via an interactive web application. This level of access permits program Assessment Coordinators to revise plans at anytime. As outcome assessment is clearly a formative activity, plan revisions often result from implementation as well as faculty review of assessment findings. Not every plan revision is indicated within a program report. Since assessment plans are now included in the University’s General Catalog (http://www.cis.unr.edu/ecatalog/), the OUA tracks plan revisions for updating in the Catalog. For example, between January 2008 and January 2009, 54 programs revised some portion of their Student Learning Outcome, Use of Results or Implementation Plan section of their Assessment Plan.

CABNR (10)
12/19/2008 Animal Biotechnology - Bachelors
12/16/2008 Animal Science - Bachelors
12/5/2008 Biochemistry - Doctorate
8/28/2008 Biochemistry - Bachelors
12/5/2008 Biochemistry - Masters
1/5/2009 Environmental Science - Bachelors
1/8/2009 Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences - Masters
12/29/2008 Nutrition - Masters
1/2/2008 Agricultural & Applied Economics - Bachelors
1/11/2008 Environmental & Resource Economics - Bachelors

COBA (5)
2/1/2008 Accountancy - Masters
10/8/2008 Accounting - Bachelors
3/13/2008 Managerial Science: Finance - Bachelors
3/26/2008 Managerial Science: Finance - Masters
12/19/2008 Managerial Science: Management - Bachelors

COED (10)
9/3/2008 Educational Psychology: MEd - Masters
12/9/2008 Educational Leadership - Doctorate
9/3/2008 Education Specialties - Doctorate
8/25/2008 Education Specialties - Bachelors
12/4/2008 Equity & Diversity - Masters
9/3/2008 Literacy Studies - Masters
9/3/2008 Literacy Studies - Doctorate
9/3/2008 Special Education & Disability Studies - Doctorate
1/14/2008 Early Childhood Education - Bachelors
9/11/2008 Human Development & Family Studies - Bachelors

COEN (2)
12/17/2008 Civil Engineering - Bachelors
2/1/2008 Electrical Engineering - Bachelors

CLA (16)
1/28/2008 Anthropology - Masters
1/11/2008 Art: Fine Arts - Bachelors
1/24/2008 Art: Studio & Art History - Bachelors
1/29/2008 Tutorial PhD in Basque Studies - Doctorate
1/5/2009 Criminal Justice - Bachelors
1/11/2008 Criminal Justice - Masters
1/2/2009 English - Bachelors
9/2/2008 Judicial Studies - Doctorate
9/2/2008 Judicial Studies - Masters
9/3/2008 Justice Management - Masters
12/5/2008 Music - Bachelors
12/5/2008 Music - Masters
12/19/2008 Neuroscience - Bachelors
9/5/2008 Psychology: Behavioral Analysis - Doctorate
9/5/2008 Psychology: Behavioral Analysis - Masters
11/17/2008 Psychology: Clinical - Doctorate

COS (7)
1/2/2009 Biology - Bachelors
1/2/2009 Chemistry: Environmental - Bachelors
9/8/2008 Geography - Bachelors
12/17/2008 Geological Engineering - Masters
5/2/2008 Geophysics - Bachelors
4/30/2008 Geophysics - Masters
1/27/2009 Mining Engineering - Masters

Interdisciplinary (2)
12/3/2008 Environmental Sciences & Health - Doctorate
1/30/2008 Environmental Sciences & Health - Masters

DHS (2)
4/28/2008 Social Work - Bachelors
12/8/2008 Social Work - Masters
Appendix 3F

This appendix contains narrative submitted by academic programs on annual assessment reports.

Program Key Findings: Bachelors Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Animal Biotechnology
Animal Science Program

The Pre-Veterinary Science Program is the main driver of student enrollment. Enrollment remains high again this year. Assessment of graduating seniors indicates satisfactory or better performance for the majority. Alternative career choices need to be developed and emphasized for those students who don't get accepted into a School of Veterinary Medicine. The department has initiated a new major, Animal Biotechnology, which will appeal to this group of students.

The Pre-Veterinary Science Program is the main driver of student enrollment which is up again next year. Assessment of graduating seniors indicates satisfactory or better performance for the majority. Alternative career choices need to be developed and emphasized for those students who don’t get accepted into a School of Medicine.

The Pre-Veterinary Science Program is the main driver of student enrollment. Enrollment in the program increased again this year. Assessment of graduating seniors indicates satisfactory or better performance for the majority. Alternative career choices need to be developed and emphasized for those students who don't get accepted into a School of Veterinary Medicine. The department has initiated a new major, Animal Biotechnology, which will appeal to this group of students.

The Pre-Veterinary Science Program continues to serve as the main driver of student enrollment for the department. Enrollment remains stable with the majority of students finding employment upon graduation. Assessment of graduating seniors indicates satisfactory or better performance for the majority. Alternative career choices need to be developed and emphasized for those students who don't get accepted into a School of Veterinary Medicine. The department has initiated recruitment programs for the other majors we offer in order to appeal to a wider group of students.
The finding that 88% of our students (89% of our BS graduates interviewed) who graduate during the 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 academic years were successfully enrolled in professional or graduate schools, or employed in jobs which used the skills and knowledge learned for their degree, indicates the Biochemistry Department's BS program is highly successful. Please note that the statistics for the years 2000 thru 2003 as compared to the years 2000 thru 2004 are almost identical, indicating a high degree of statistical significance. Comparing these findings with those of previous years, it appears that the BCH BS program is continuing to graduate students who are successfully able to obtain careers in BCH at approximately the same rate as previously.

Overall, our B.S. Biochemistry program looks exceptionally strong.

The finding that 87% of our students (90% of our BS graduates interviewed) who graduate during the 2000, 2001 and 2002 academic years were successfully enrolled in professional or graduate schools, or employed in jobs which used the skills and knowledge learned for their degree indicates the Biochemistry Department's BS is highly successful.

In summary, the focus for the future should not be so much on whether the students can write, but whether or not they can clearly comprehend and explain their project. The instructor believes that writing an introduction early on in the project is an excellent exercise for getting students to think about what they are doing in the laboratory, and why they are doing it. Depending on the priorities of the department (see program modifications) a follow up study can be conducted to determine if senior thesis students have a better grasp of their research project by the end of spring semester. The students have already written two versions of their introductions and most have shown incredible progress so far. I have little doubt they will show increased improvement by the end of the spring semester. In the area of verbal communication skills, students are once again showing significant improvement when given guidance through faculty and peer feedback. Clearly, the fact that the Biochemistry Department allows student the opportunity to practice and improve these skills shows that verbal communication is a high priority within the department. It is reassuring to know that the students are also gaining life-long skills by taking advantage of this opportunity.

The finding that 90% of our students (90% of our BS graduates interviewed) who graduated during the 2000, 2001 and 2002 academic years were successfully enrolled in professional or graduate schools, or employed in jobs which used the skills and knowledge learned for their degree, indicates the Biochemistry Department's BS is highly successful.

SLO 1: Alumni from the Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Bachelor Program are successful in finding positions related to their field or in entering graduate/professional school.
SLO 2: The American Chemical Society exam has helped us to establish benchmarks for coverage of material in our first semester Biochemistry course. Though the faculty who teach these courses have no desire to teach to the test, the ACS exam provides guidelines for curricular emphasis.
This year was the first year that the students could choose Ecohydrology as a major. It was extremely successful, attracting 9 majors in the first year. One of these majors was an entering freshman, which shows promise for future expansion.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences

Ecohydrology Program

Most students completed course requirements, including assignments, exams, lab exercises, and group projects within course expectations. Students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Students are able to produce good quality written and oral reports.

In NRES 295, Principles of Ecohydrology, the great majority of students either fully or substantially met expectations. All students completed course requirements, including assignments, exams, and group projects within course expectations. Students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Students were able to produce good quality written and oral reports, with many producing excellent work.

In Soils, it was found that students did substantially better on homework than on quizzes and tests. In part, this was probably due to collaboration in doing homework. However, the quizzes quickly identified which students were studying and which were not sufficiently applying themselves. Two students withdrew from the course.

In Advanced Environmental Toxicology, term papers on the significance and risks of environmental chemicals generally provided a good opportunity for students to analyze some real world environmental problems and to demonstrate their writing skills. Analysis of the employer surveys and the surveys of previous graduates shows that employers are sometimes not fully satisfied with the oral and written communication skills of the graduates. So, it is important to provide opportunities for oral presentation and a great deal of exercise in writing.

In the courses used for assessment in the 2007 academic year, the great majority of students either fully or substantially met expectations. Most students completed course requirements, including assignments, exams, lab exercises, and group projects within course expectations. Students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Students are able to produce good quality written and oral reports with many producing excellent work.

In the 4 courses used for assessment in the 2006 academic year, the great majority of students either fully or substantially met expectations. Most students completed course requirements, including assignments, exams, lab exercises, and group projects within course expectations. Students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Students are able to produce good quality written and oral reports with many producing excellent work.

Students are able to apply data collection techniques to hydrologic investigations in real world settings. Students are able to apply tools and skills to assess a problem, analyze relevant information, and make decisions about problems. Students are able to produce written and oral reports. Students are able to prepare synthetic papers and companion oral presentations. Students are able to carry out field investigations that involve original data collection. Students in different Options achieved technical competency in the courses required in their respective curricula.
Approximately 95% of our students across those courses considered are substantially or fully meeting our expected Student Learning Outcomes.

- Students are able to apply data collection techniques to hydrologic investigations in real world settings;
- Students are able to apply tools and skills to assess a problem, analyze relevant information, and make decisions about problems;
- Students are able to prepare and produce written reports and oral presentations; and
- Students are able to carry out field investigations and develop interpretive assessments indicating technical competency in required courses.

**Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences**

**Forest & Rangeland Management Program**

Most students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Also most students are able to produce acceptable quality written and oral reports. In particular the combination of field exercises, stand management reports, analyses of technical literature, oral presentations, and written papers, and poster presentations in the three courses appeared to be successful in giving students experience and confidence in all three of the performance indicators. These emphases are consistent with findings from the Assessment Office Employer Survey. Fifty percent agreed that quantitative analysis skills were very important, while the other fifty percent agreed that they were somewhat important. Eighty-three percent of the employers agreed that writing skills are either very important or somewhat important. Eighty four percent agreed that graduates of this program are either very prepared or somewhat prepared for the demands of the jobs.

Students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Most students are able to produce good quality written and oral reports. Students require extensive review sessions. Students were given the basic skill set to identify an unknown plant specimen successfully to Family. Every student regardless of performance evaluation should be able to collect specimens in the field for later identification, unless said specimen was an invasive weed, in which case 80% could identify that plant immediately.

Students were given the basic skill set to identify unknown plant specimens successfully to Family. They were also learned to identify 85 noxious, invasive and or poisonous plants encountered in the Great Basin on sight. I am confident that every student regardless of grade would be able to collect specimens in the field for later identification, unless said specimen was an invasive weed, in which case 80% of them could identify that plant immediately.

Most students were able to apply data collection techniques to field investigations in real world settings. Most students are able to produce acceptable quality written and oral reports.

**Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences**

**Wildlife Ecology & Conservation Program**

Students require extensive review sessions. Undergraduate students made substantial progress toward using analysis of raw data to generate estimates of demographic parameters construct population models and suggest management options based on the model. These students also developed substantially in manuscript preparation, and gained experience in the peer review process. Three students indicated that the projects were the best experience they had during their undergraduate career.
Students require extensive review sessions. Undergraduate students made substantial progress toward using analysis of raw data to generate demographic parameter estimates, construct population models and suggest management options based on the model. These students also developed substantially in manuscript preparation, and gained experience in the peer review process. Students expressed strong support for feedback they received on draft manuscripts.

Most undergraduate students made substantial progress toward using analysis of raw data to generate demographic parameter estimates, construct population models and suggest management options based on the model. These students also developed substantially in oral and poster presentations. These students also developed substantially in manuscript preparation, and gained experience in the peer review process.

Students require extensive review sessions. Undergraduate students made substantial progress toward using analysis of raw data to generate estimates of demographic parameters construct population models and suggest management options based on the model. These students also developed substantially in manuscript preparation, and gained experience in the peer review process. Three students indicated that the projects were the best experience they had during their undergraduate career.

**Department of Nutrition**

**Nutrition Program**

Student attitudes correlate to some extent to the option in the major they have chosen. Advising remains a concern. Students are reporting concern about the lack of rigor in some classes. Grade inflation remains a concern. The two options have different career targets and the department will discuss the question of having two distinct majors in nutrition rather than two options. This is of course a resource issue as well as an educational one.

Advisement has improved slightly as indicated by student comments. Comments suggest that students would like more career advisement, although this has not traditionally been a department function.

Elimination of the Career Development will require that colleges and departments fill in.

Class size for 400 level classes has increased 40-50%. This significantly affects the instructor's ability to provide the same level of instruction as in smaller classes.

NTS students continue to feel somewhat neglected in the curriculum. Several positive comments were received about the addition of NUTR 460, Nutrients and Gene Expression, but resources do not permit the addition of other classes more focused on current developments in the science of nutrition.

Some classes require very little of students and need to be more rigorous.

In general, the Nutrition Department is very effective in providing the knowledge and undergraduate training that students need to continue on to graduate school, professional schools or a dietetic internship.

Student attitudes still depend to some extent on the track the student is in. Students in the dietetic track generally do less well in the "hard" science of nutrition. Nutritional science students occasionally feel less challenged than they would like.

Writing and reading skills remain as before. They need of remedial attention.

Advising needs improvement.

Grade inflation needs to be addressed, especially in two classes.

The Department is convinced that course content is generally appropriate for majors in the two tracks. We would like to add additional courses specific to the nutritional sciences track, resources permitting.

1. Expectations were met at about the same level as during the previous year.
2. It is useful to have data such as that from the survey done in Spring.
3. Writing and reading skills may impair achievement of expectations.
4. Some objectives appear much harder to achieve than others.
5. The department is generally well perceived.
6. We need to provide more classes, especially for the nutritional sciences option.

Different attitudes depending on track:
Writing and reading skills, as well as math skills need remedial attention.
Prerequisites: students are often unaware of these. It would be useful for the University to block registration for students who do not have prerequisites for a class.

Grade inflation persists.
Advising changes to be implemented; this would appear to be the main area of concern for students, but responses are again contradictory and suggest some unwillingness to accept responsibility for their progress toward their degree.
In general, the Nutrition Department is convinced that it provides students in both tracks with information and insights consistent with requirements of the accrediting agencies and, nor important, with the growing demands of the field of nutrition. This information is current and accessible to students who devote the effort to acquiring the knowledge that is constantly being developed in a fairly complicated and expanding field.

We found that generally student performance is consistent with that defined by the UNR survey of graduates. It is, by definition, above average. The Nutrition Department is discussing this to determine whether grades are excessively high (or low) in specific classes. Student attitudes generally are satisfactory, but clearly indicate an interest in grades rather than information. It is clear that we need to offer additional courses to meet the changing distribution of students in the two undergraduate tracks and in some cases to meet the requirements of the job market.

Department of Resource Economics
Agricultural & Applied Economics Program

(1) It is felt that the weakness with statistical and econometric theory is a function of weakness with math skills. Some students delay taking APST470 until their last semester, which is too long after having taken the prerequisites. Other students delay taking the prerequisite math courses and then when they do take them, with weak performances, have too little time left to take additional coursework that might strengthen their understanding. It is necessary to increase the percentage of students who are performing well in the statistics and econometrics courses.
(2) Some key findings are issues that have come about due to low faculty numbers and subsequent shuffling of undergraduate course offerings. The two main examples of this are repercussions from not offering a 100-level introductory course and inconsistent offerings of courses that are required for students to complete the major. The department's only 100-level introductory course has not been offered in many years due to limitations in teaching resources. So in effect, the first course available to students is APEC202, which does not presume a background in formal economics. However, as a required core course, APEC202 does need to introduce jargon, basic theory and methods, in order to prepare students for the more advanced work. Upon review of our undergraduate program, which includes two majors, it has become clear that some first year students are unclear as to the overall motivation for the majors: they see the individual techniques, methods, and can memorize definitions of concepts important to theory, but they appear to miss the big picture - the "why is this important and what does it all mean". This lack of firm grounding in concepts can carry through to affect performance in later courses. Economics and statistics are fields in which students can easily become engulfed in the
details and applications - while missing the important concepts.
(3) The alternate year offerings of core courses for the major has not yet cost any student additional
semesters at UNR, that we are aware of, but it has caused a degree of frustration as students must work
to carefully plan around and for all contingencies. In some cases, we have had to substitute courses, and
in others, change the order of courses from what would be most desirable. This has probably not
affected student performance in attaining the learning objectives overall, as much as it causes
frustration and limits students' flexibility with their programs.
(4) Another key finding is that there may be some holes in the program where agricultural business and
marketing are concerned. Again, this has come about in part due to some departmental transitions and
recent losses in faculty numbers - teaching loads were shifted to cover off what were considered core
areas. This should be alleviated in part due to new faculty hires and the department's decision that the
priority in courses covered by new faculty will include these areas.

According to Alumni surveys of 2002-2008 academic year RE graduates, 41% rated the "overall
quality" of their degree program as "Excellent." The proportion rating the RE program "excellent" is
higher than the UNR average of 37%. 29% rated it "Good" and 24% rated it "Fair." 24% rated the RE
degree programs as "excellent preparation for the career path they have chosen" while 47% rated it
"Good." Two thirds rated the AAE degree program "difficult or somewhat difficult" which is a bit more
difficult than the average UNR degree. 89% of the alumni are working or studying in fields related or
closely related to their APEC and APST coursework and training. These proportions are NO
DIFFERENT than the proportions in last year's report because there have been no new survey
respondents since last year.

According to the Alumni Employment Survey since 2002, 50% of RE graduates had their subsequent
occupation locked in before graduating, and 100% were employed or enrolled in graduate within six
months of graduation. 15% got their first position in the public sector.

According to Employer (or graduate faculty) surveys concerning 2002-2008 academic year RE
graduates, 62% are "Very satisfied" and the other 38% are "Somewhat satisfied" with RE graduates.
This indicates somewhat fewer satisfied employers of RE graduates compared to UNR-wide averages,
because 83% of employers reported being "Very Satisfied" with graduates UNR-wide. However, 74%
reported that RE graduates are equally or better prepared compared to graduates from other institutions,
which is comparable to the 77% reporting the same, UNR-wide.

We are encouraged that these ratings of our RE program by alumni and employers have been rising
relative to the ratings' in prior years. We are also pleased by the relatively high rate of continued
engagement in the field. 89% of our alumni are working or studying in fields related or closely related
to their course work and training. The graduate and professional school successes of our graduates are
also noteworthy.

According to the Alumni Employment Survey, 40% attended Law School. Economics (including
Resource Economics) has long been known to be excellent preparation for Law School. We look
forward to continuing that tradition.

According to Alumni surveys of 2002-2007 academic year RE graduates, 41% rated the "overall
quality" of their degree program as "Excellent." The proportion rating the RE program "excellent" is
higher than the UNR average of 37%. 29% rated it "Good" and 24% rated it "Fair." 24% rated the RE
degree programs as "excellent preparation for the career path they have chosen" while 47% rated it
"Good." Two thirds rated the AAE degree program "difficult or somewhat difficult" which is a bit more
difficult than the average UNR degree. 89% of the alumni are working or studying in fields related or
closely related to their APEC and APST coursework and training.

According to the Alumni Employment Survey since 2002, 50% of RE graduates had their subsequent
occupation locked in before graduating, and 100% were employed or enrolled in graduate within six
months of graduation. 15% got their first position in the public sector.

According to Employer (or graduate faculty) surveys concerning 2002-2007 academic year RE
graduates, 62% are "Very satisfied" and the other 38% are "Somewhat satisfied" with RE graduates. This indicates somewhat fewer satisfied employers of RE graduates compared to UNR-wide averages, because 83% of employers reported being "Very Satisfied" with graduates UNR-wide. However, 74% reported that RE graduates are equally or better prepared compared to graduates from other institutions, which is comparable to the 77% reporting the same, UNR-wide. We are encouraged that these ratings of our RE program by alumni and employers have been rising relative to the ratings' in prior years. We are also pleased by the relatively high rate of continued engagement in the field. 89% of our alumni are working or studying in fields related or closely related to their APEC and APST course work and training. The graduate and professional school successes of our graduates are also noteworthy. According to the Alumni Employment Survey, 40% attended Law School. Economics (including Resource Economics) has long been known to be excellent preparation for Law School. We look forward to continuing that tradition. But we are not satisfied that employer satisfaction with RE graduates does not exceed UNR average rates. See "Program Modifications" for brief descriptions of how we have used OA information to improve our curricula.

Other OA activities that we have conducted this past year have uncovered a number of other 'key findings.' Our curriculum mapping activity has indicated serious gaps in the lower-division curricula of both majors, and overloading at the 400-level courses. It also indicated that the Math Methods course (APEC 350) could be better if taught at the 200 level. Our surveys of graduating seniors indicated that a name change for the BS-EPA major would be welcome and useful (more informative to potential employers), among other things.

Department of Resource Economics
Environmental & Resource Economics Program

We are very pleased with the relatively high rating of our AAE program by alumni and employers. According to Alumni surveys of 2001-2005 academic year AAE graduates, 40% rated the "overall quality" of their degree program as "Excellent." 33% rated it "Good" and 20% rated it "Fair." 27% rated the AAE degree program as "excellent preparation for the career path they have chosen" while 47% rated it "Good." Two thirds rated the AAE degree program "somewhat difficult" which indicated it is more difficult than the average UNR degree. It is apparent that our program has successfully emphasized the acquisition of quantitative skills. This is noteworthy. We are also very pleased by the relatively high rate of continued engagement in the field. 89% of the alumni are working or studying in fields related or closely related to their APEC and APST course work and training. The graduate and professional school successes of our graduates are also noteworthy. According to the Alumni Employment Survey of 2001-2005 academic year AAE graduates, 40% attended Law School. Economics (including Resource Economics) has long been known to be excellent preparation for Law School. We are pleased to further that tradition. 50% had their subsequent occupation locked in before graduating, and all but one were employed or enrolled in graduate within six months of graduation. 23% were employed in the public sector. The workplace success of our graduates requires careful interpretation. According to Employer (or graduate faculty) surveys concerning 2000-2005 academic year AAE graduates, 50% are "Very satisfied" and the other 50% are "Somewhat satisfied" with AAE graduates. This indicates somewhat fewer satisfied employers of AAE graduates than with the average UNR graduates, about whom 83% of employers reported being "Very Satisfied." Also, only 67% reported that AAE graduates are equally or better prepared compared to graduates from other from other institutions, which is somewhat lower than the 77% UNR-wide. We caution that because AAE graduates clearly pursue relatively demanding graduate work or professions, it may be inappropriate to compare them with the average UNR grad who takes a job in retail after completing their bachelor's degree.
According to Alumni surveys of 2002-2008 academic year RE graduates, 41% rated the "overall quality" of their degree program as "Excellent." The proportion rating the RE program "excellent" is higher than the UNR average of 37%. 29% rated it "Good" and 24% rated it "Fair." 24% rated the RE degree programs as "excellent preparation for the career path they have chosen" while 47% rated it "Good." Two thirds rated our degree program "difficult or somewhat difficult" which is a bit more difficult than the average UNR degree. 89% of the alumni are working or studying in fields related or closely related to their APEC and APST coursework and training. These proportions are NO DIFFERENT than the proportions in last year's report because there have been no new survey respondents since last year.

According to the Alumni Employment Survey since 2002, 50% of RE graduates had their subsequent occupation locked in before graduating, and 100% were employed or enrolled in graduate within six months of graduation. 15% got their first position in the public sector.

According to Employer (or graduate faculty) surveys concerning 2002-2008 academic year RE graduates, 62% are "Very satisfied" and the other 38% are "Somewhat satisfied" with RE graduates. This indicates somewhat fewer satisfied employers of RE graduates compared to UNR-wide averages, because 83% of employers reported being "Very Satisfied" with graduates UNR-wide. However, 74% reported that RE graduates are equally or better prepared compared to graduates from other institutions, which is comparable to the 77% reporting the same, UNR-wide.

We are encouraged that these ratings of our RE program by alumni and employers have been rising relative to the ratings' in prior years. We are also pleased by the relatively high rate of continued engagement in the field. 89% of our alumni are working or studying in fields related or closely related to their course work and training. The graduate and professional school successes of our graduates are also noteworthy. According to the Alumni Employment Survey, 40% attended Law School. Economics (including Resource Economics) has long been known to be excellent preparation for Law School. We look forward to continuing that tradition.

But we are not satisfied that employer satisfaction with RE graduates does not exceed UNR average rates. See "Program Modifications" for brief descriptions of how we have used OA information to improve our curricula.

(1) It is felt that the weakness with statistical and econometric theory is a function of weakness with math skills. Some students delay taking APST470 until their last semester, which is too long after having taken the prerequisites. Other students delay taking the prerequisite math courses and then when they do take them, with weak performances, have too little time left to take additional coursework that might strengthen their understanding. It is necessary to increase the percentage of students who are performing well in the statistics and econometrics courses.

(2) Some key findings are issues that have come about due to low faculty numbers and subsequent shuffling of undergraduate course offerings. The two main examples of this are repercussions from not offering a 100-level introductory course and inconsistent offerings of courses that are required for students to complete the major. The department's only 100-level introductory course has not been offered in many years due to limitations in teaching resources. So in effect, the first course available to students is APEC202, which does not presume a background in formal economics. However, as a required core course, APEC202 does need to introduce jargon, basic theory and methods, in order to prepare students for the more advanced work. Upon review of our undergraduate program, which includes two majors, it has become clear that some first year students are unclear as to the overall motivation for the majors: they see the individual techniques, methods, and can memorize definitions of concepts important to theory, but they appear to miss the big picture - the "why is this important and what does it all mean". This lack of firm grounding in concepts can carry through to affect performance in later courses. Economics and statistics are fields in which students can easily become engulfed in the details and applications - while missing the important concepts.

(3) The alternate year offerings of core courses for the major has not yet cost any student additional
semesters at UNR, that we are aware of, but it has caused a degree of frustration as students must work to carefully plan around and for all contingencies. In some cases, we have had to substitute courses, and in others, change the order of courses from what would be most desirable. This has probably not affected student performance in attaining the learning objectives overall, as much as it causes frustration and limits students' flexibility with their programs.

College of Business Administration  
Department of Accounting  
Accounting Program

The students appear to be performing well on all metrics. Areas of weakness still seem to be research skills and preparation of financial statements where a significant number did not meet expectations. Writing and presentation skills could be more generally applied in the curriculum. Technical skills appear to be well covered.

After the first round of the assessment process, we note some weaknesses in our assessment measures and our data collection processes. Certain measures that were initially adopted are not considered to be assessment measures and are more in the nature of program success measures. These will be dropped from our measures in our next learning assessment review. We are also using a broad range of measures for each goal these could be reduced in number.

We also note that our data collection processes need to be made more formal and, in certain areas, we need to strengthen the assessment process to ensure that specified key courses do include mandatory elements which are needed for the assessment processes. In certain areas, the assessment tools needed for measure are voluntary for students. In other cases the data is not available on a timely basis. From the results obtained our general conclusion is that students are meeting learning expectations in most areas our program. We note some continuing weakness in the preparedness of students entering into the major particularly with respect to their record keeping ability. This appears to be a matter to be addressed in future curriculum deliberations to ensure that students are prepared when they enter the major. One issue here has been the requirement for finance majors to complete the first two Intermediate Accounting courses. These students have not been as committed as accounting students and have as a group not performed as well as the accounting majors.

The key findings for each objective are described above. We see lower than desired achievement levels in the area of research skills and record keeping skills. These findings will be addressed in the forthcoming year.

We have also identified that we need more refined measures in the area of record, keeping, financial report preparation and financial statement analysis. Each of these dimensions needs to be examined as significant skills that should be obtained by our majors.

In the taxation area, the VITA program has enhanced student's ability to prepare taxation returns. We note a significant problem in obtaining metrics for the overall assessment of our program success.

Our findings indicate a group of students (approx 15%) who are performing poorly in many areas. Informal discussions between faculty indicate the existence of this "problem" group. This may be rectified by a proposed earlier screening process in the degree through the introduction of a new bridge course. The research skills area again seems to be an area of poorer than average performance. We intend to
address this through use of more research cases throughout the financial accounting stream. We will also seek alternative metrics in other courses to determine if this is a fundamental problem. Our student employment record remains very strong and exceeds the university average. Our degree satisfaction ratings also remain very strong and exceed the university average. We do note some problems with the metrics here due to the small number of graduates reached each year in the university survey.

Department of Accounting

Accounting & Information Systems Program

We found the following during this assessment cycle:
1) Classes within our curriculum could be more fully integrated to make better use of prerequisite knowledge. Integration is especially problematic for cross-disciplinary major since courses for different domains tend to be evaluated by different groups;
2) Our students work effectively in groups to complete projects;
3) Our students have strong technical skills, but could enhance their knowledge and skills about solving abstract problems; and
4) Some of the learning outcomes do not lend themselves to direct measurement. We need to amend our assessment plan to enable better measurement methods.

As part of our assessment program we have begun meeting on a regular basis with our IS Industry Advisory Group and maintain close relationships with local accounting firms who hire many of our students. The consensus of these groups confirms the high level of mastery of the learning objectives in our plan.

SLO's continue to work well for this program.

Department of Accounting

Information Systems Program

As part of our assessment program we have begun meeting on a regular basis with our IS Industry Advisory Group. The consensus of this group confirms the high level of mastery of the learning objectives in our plan. However the group also suggested several key curriculum changes to better meet the changing business environment; we will be implementing these curriculum changes and introducing revised learning objectives for the next assessment year.

The key findings for each student learning objective are discussed in the commentary following each above. For learning objectives 1, 3, 4, and 5 performance was satisfactory, with less than 15% of students not meeting expectations.
For learning objective 2, a midterm project plan review for a semester project is expected to improve student performance by giving students earlier, corrective feedback and guidance.
For learning objective 6, a new course in business processes was designed and added to the curriculum to help students better understand business processes so they can understand and solve organizational problems.
In addition, faculty continued to assess student performance in their individual courses and made revisions to address any issues observed.

We found the following during this assessment cycle:
1) Classes within our curriculum could be more fully integrated to make better use of prerequisite
knowledge. For example, while measuring learning outcome #1, we discovered that two classes
essentially teach the same material about systems documentation without providing additional depth;
2) Our students work effectively in groups to complete projects;
3) Our students have strong technical skills, but could enhance their knowledge and skills about solving
abstract problems; and
4) Some of the learning outcomes do not lend themselves to direct measurement. We need to amend our
assessment plan to enable better measurement methods.

Our original SLO's remain valid. As we shift to a greater emphasis on business processes we will need
to revisit these.

**Department of Economics**

**Economics Program**

Undergraduate Programs: The department formed three study groups for microeconomics,
macroeconomics and quantitative courses, respectively. The purpose of the groups is to improve
integration across different sections of the same course and between lower and upper division courses
as well as between economics department and other department in the college. The study groups
defined core content for principles courses and developed action plans for improving curriculum.
The department assessment committee conducted standardized testing in the economics principles
classes. The test was obtained from the National Council on Economic Education and will be used to
assess student's basic understanding of core economics principles.
The UNR Alumni Survey suggests good quality economic education offered by the department. The
2006 Senior Survey conducted by the COBA dean's office shows scores of 4.6 on the "Quality of
instruction in the Economics major" and 4.4 on "Level of satisfaction with the Economics major, based
on a 1 to 5 scale with 1 rated as poor and 5 rated as excellent.

Graduate Program: The department began requiring GRE/GMAT scores as admissions requirements,
continued to enhance the internship program by working with Washoe Medical Center and other organization, and
created a research seminar and working paper series during 2006.

**Department of Managerial Sciences**

**Managerial Science: Marketing Program**

Student expectations about the nature of marketing are not consistent with the goals of the major.
Students do not believe they need more mathematics, calculus, statistics, accounting and economics
than majors in general management. Too many students sign up as Marketing majors because MKT
210 was fun and the principles of accounting and calculus were too hard.

**College of Education**

**Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning**

**Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program**

Students in the elementary education program in CTL have shown consistency in their assessment
outcomes in fall 2006 and spring 2007 in the final assessment benchmarks for their program.
Assessment outcomes are measured by their score on Portfolio II and on their student learning sample earned during their internship semester. The total number of students (n=58) maintained a set of mean scores in the 5.89 range to a 6.67 range overall in the five criteria for their student learning sample results. The same group of students maintained an set of mean scores in the 6.14 to 6.52 for their portfolio II scores. The secondary students showed more variability in their SLS scores during fall 2006 - a range of 4.50 to 4.92 (fall) as compared to spring 5.22 to 5.70. This discrepancy was based on one of the assessor's lack of training in understanding how to score the student learning sample document. The situation has been resolved by closer monitoring of the training. The scores for Portfolio II for secondary interns showed higher consistency in fall 2006 (6.02 to 6.37) and spring (6.12 to 6.40).

The unit continued to use the same assessments as in prior years. Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions at the initial level continue to be assessed through the use of portfolios, Praxis exams, final internship results, Student Learning Samples, exit surveys, and dispositions assessments. A follow-up survey of the previous year's program completers and their supervisors was added to the college's assessment plan this past year. The State of Nevada requires all of its teachers to pass Praxis I and II exams. The latest Praxis exam results (2004-05) revealed that the institutional pass rate for basic skills exams was 98%, 91% for professional knowledge exams, and 91% for academic content area exams. The overall pass rate for our candidates for 2004-05 was 88%. Candidates are required to submit Portfolio I prior to entrance into the semester long internship. Assessment results indicated that candidates' overall mean score for Domain IV - Knowledge and Use of Assessment was again consistently lowest in every program area with overall mean scores in the mid to high developing range. Domains receiving the highest overall mean score varied by semester and program. Mean scores for all programs were in the mid to high developing range based upon the assessment rubric. At the end of their internship, candidates are assessed on their performance in the classroom as well as written work in preparation of their teaching and other duties. Assessment results indicate that the 2005-06 interns across all program areas were assessed highest in Domain V - Professionalism with mean scores in the high proficient to distinguished range. Candidates in most programs were assessed lowest in Domain IV - Knowledge and Use of Assessment. However, mean scores were still in the high proficient to distinguished category. Mean assessment scores across all domains in each program were in the high proficient to distinguished range. Candidates are required to do a Student Learning Sample (SLS) during their internship as a means of demonstrating a positive effect on the achievement of their students. The SLS is also evidence that candidates can use assessment results to reflect upon their efforts to improve instruction. It can be reported that mean scores for each section were in the proficient to distinguished range, indicating that our candidates did have a positive effect on student achievement. A review of mean scores over the last two years reveals that the scores have increased.

Overall, the two checkpoints for assessment in CTL - Portfolio One and Portfolio Two - are providing a vehicle for program change. To date, the department has noted that there is a need for students to become more aware of the meaning of school context, student diversity, and appropriate assessment strategies. These insights have helped the department rethink where these topics are being addressed in their courses and ways to make these topics more explicit in their course content. Also, students have expressed a desire to have debriefing as part of the assessment process. As such, the department is considering using an exit interview at both checkpoints to provide feedback to the students about their self-assessment and faculty assessment on the five domains.

Department of Education Specialties
Education Specialties Program

During the 2005-2006, all 67 students who completed the EDS program in Early Childhood, Special Education, and Dual (Elementary and Special Education) met the minimum requirement of proficient.
This partially due to the fact that student who are having difficulty are identified and mentored by faculty. However, during 2005-06, there were two students who did not complete their internship. Since these students were withdrawn from their internship, they did not complete the portfolio.

We are pleased with our students' progress on our SLO areas. The Early Childhood Education students have slightly lower scores than other majors, although they take only 5 courses in our department. We will be working with colleagues in HDFS to determine if there are any systemic concerns.

### Department of Human Development & Family Studies

#### Early Childhood Education Program

Overall, both current students and graduates of the Early Childhood Education program have an excellent record in meeting and surpassing expectations. Overall grade point average is one measure of this. Majors must maintain at least a 2.75 GPA. The GPA of the 29 current students is 3.3 (range 2.8 to 3.95). Of the 21 students who have completed the program, the average GPA was 3.6 (range 2.8 to 4.0); four of these students graduated with High Distinction and another four with Distinction. In all the courses included in these analyses, ECE students' average grades were above the means all students enrolled in these classes. Success after graduation in finding a position relevant to the students’ training is another measure. The Alumni Survey showed that 80% of graduates were employed full time and another 20% part time. Eighty percent of respondents indicated that they are employed in an area closely related to their degree and indicated that their position is the kind they expected to obtain while attending UNR. Informal contact with graduates provides somewhat more comprehensive information. About half of the graduates work in a related field, four are pursuing a graduate degree, three are looking for a job in the field, and the remainder has not kept in touch.

One informal finding, both from students and employers, is that students need more intensive preparation in understanding and being able to teach literacy to young children. Another need is that students have to be better prepared to carry out a Student Learning Sample during their student teaching experience.

Overall, assessment results reveal that ECE students entering internship in the spring of 2008 were "developing" in most domains upon completion of coursework. Portfolio II scores indicated that all had achieved proficiency in each domain by the end of their internship experience. Scores from the student learning samples were generally in the "proficient" to "distinguished" categories. These results are consistent with those from previous years, although Portfolio I scores were better in 2008 than the scores of students entering internship in 2007. This improvement may be due to programmatic changes that were implemented during these students' tenure at UNR (the addition of a required course on children with disabilities and the addition of a second literacy course).

In addition to the above findings, alumni survey data indicate that our graduates are generally pleased with the quality of education they received in the ECE program. Ninety-four percent of graduates completing the alumni survey rated the overall quality of the program as "good" or "excellent," and 67% indicated that the degree prepared them well for their current career. Further, 78% rated the advising they received during the program as" good" or "excellent," and 89% rated the level of student to faculty interactions as "good" or "excellent".

The ECE program is growing and our assessment plan needs to be revised to better reflect student performance. The program currently has 27 majors and 50 pre-majors. Nine new pre-majors were welcomed to the program during the fall term of 2006. Our graduation rate is high, and most students are employed full-time in relevant positions once they have graduated (according to the alumni data). Students' portfolio grades have consistently improved since the first graduates finished the program in 2003.
ECE students are consistently holding high GPAs, and consistently receive the highest grades in department courses.

Overall, the assessment revealed that the students entering internship this year were generally considered "developing" in most domains upon entry into internship. Their portfolio scores improved greatly so that by the time of second assessment, most had moved from "developing" to "proficient" in each domain. Scores from the Student Learning Samples were generally in the "proficient" to "distinguished" categories.

These results are consistent with those of previous years. Changes that were made to the program most recently (for example, the addition of two courses) are not yet reflected in students finishing the program this year. We expect to see substantial improvement starting with next year's graduating seniors.

**Department of Human Development & Family Studies**  
**Human Development & Family Studies Program**

Overall, students who graduate from the HDFS undergraduate program continue to be pleased with the program's preparation for their careers, most of the core teaching faculty, and the program as a whole. Employers appear to be satisfied with our graduates. In addition, students indicated that they were very pleased with the quality of advisement in the program and noted that it has improved immensely over time. They noted that core teaching faculty were knowledgeable regarding subject matter and were approachable and friendly. They appreciate the clear sequencing and structure of the program. The program appears to be doing a very good job at preparing students for their future careers and providing the knowledge and advisement for students to graduate in a timely fashion. Areas for improvement have been identified as well. For example, students continue to express an interest in having varied practicum placements that better fit with their area of concentration emphasis. Findings also indicate that there continues to be a problem with the amount of overlap in lower division courses. Several initiatives are currently being pursued that address these concerns.

Overall, students who graduate from the HDFS program appear to be happy with the program and core faculty, and they feel well-prepared for a career in their field of expertise. Employers give high ratings to our alumni, most students are employed and have jobs related to their degree, scores on the senior exam suggest that they retain most of what they have learned in their core courses, and students express satisfaction with the knowledge and skills that they have gained in the program. On the other hand, students persistently complain about career uncertainty and the need for the program to promote itself better. Students say that they are better prepared for graduate school than the job market, and that they need more career guidance earlier in the program. They also are concerned that HDFS degree is not known or valued by employers. They believe that the CFLE adds credibility to the major and a resume builder, but most students are not aware of the option early enough in the program to take advantage of it. Several students suggested collaborating with other programs to offer dual majors to increase employability.

Concerns that students express about the program point include frustrations with the heavy emphasis on early childhood and ECE at the expense of material on middle childhood, adolescence, and the family; problems with the research methods course and practicum, repetition of introductory level material across courses; and the failure of some faculty to complete references, return exams, phone calls, and emails promptly or to follow the syllabus. Students perceived that certain faculty members seem to be overwhelmed and that this hurts the program. On a positive note, persistent complaints about the quality of advising and internship course noted in previous assessments have disappeared in response to program modifications (e.g., having a core faculty member teach the internship course; hiring an excellent student records staff member; increasing faculty advising).
Students recommend that faculty offer the internship for a letter grade; make 371 a sophomore level course; provide more consistent advising about the CFLE; offer more variety of courses and offer courses more frequently; offer fewer courses in 3-hour blocks; allow students to do their practicum in their area of concentration; place less emphasis on attendance; and monitor the qualifications of LOAs and TAs more carefully. We have taken steps to improve our program by implementing most of the students' recommendations, as indicated below.

The incorporation of CFLE competencies and our efforts to realign the curriculum are having a positive effect. Students are retaining critical information and they seem to be better prepared for the workforce and graduate study than in the past. The greatest gains in terms of assessment tools were with the internship program and the mosaic focus group. Data from both methods of assessment will guide our current effort to map and revise the HDFS undergraduate curriculum. We learned that students want a graded internship, assessment of advisement, revision of the practicum to focus more on their area of concentration, more professional development experiences and training, and special topics courses. These requests are aligned with internship supervisor feedback.

The alumni data will also be helpful. For example, alumni as well as current students feedback suggests that our advisement process needs to be assessed in the future. The employer data from the alumni survey highlights the need to reinforce students' quantitative skills, especially in the area of research methods.

Students participating in the mosaic focus group continue to be positive about the value of the program, and we received enthusiastic feedback on the value of the CFLE program certification for students. Most of the students with a family emphasis are applying for the CFLE.

How assessment has reinforced current practices:
Faculty mapped the curriculum and started the revision process. Several alternative scenarios were explored, but ultimately faculty chose to retain the basic structure of the current program and focus on specific courses and practices that need revision. Feedback from students and internship site supervisors helped support this decision.

How assessment has helped us to identify problem areas:
The assessment process helped faculty identify several issues with courses and procedures, including lack of enforcement of prerequisites, students taking introductory required courses at the end of their program, and problems with using LOAs to teach two key courses in the program: HDFS 202 (Introduction to Families) and HDFS 470 (Internship).

Overall, students who graduate from the HDFS program appear to be well-prepared for a career in their field of expertise. Employers give high ratings to our alumni, most students are employed and have jobs related to their degree, scores on the senior exam suggest that they retain what they have learned in their core courses, and students express satisfaction with the knowledge and skills that they have gained in the program.

Concerns that students express about the program point to isolated issues such as the need to offer certain courses more frequently, the limited offering of courses during the summer and online, difficulties with the way one particular course is being taught, the need for better career advising, and the practicum being limited to experiences with young children.

Students recommend that we offer the internship for a letter grade; get a more engaged instructor for the internship; provide more consistent advising about the CFLE; offer more variety of courses and offer courses more frequently; allow students to do their practicum in their area of concentration; evaluate advising and emphasize its importance; and listen to students when they complain about a particular course or instructor. We have made substantial efforts to improve our program by implementing most of the students' recommendations, as listed below.

Our initial findings from the senior online exam indicate that even our most intellectually challenged students (e.g., one was learning disabled) were able to retain about two-thirds of the knowledge gained
across a five-year period. Students seemed to do somewhat better on family and theoretical material than on the developmental questions. This may reflect that there are many developmental courses and students only take one of these courses in depth. For example, one of the highest scoring students noted that he did not take the infancy course, so he was somewhat unsure about the answers to those questions (his concentration was aging). But overall, we believe that the exam is a fairly good indicator of the type of knowledge that we want them to have when they leave the program. Students leaving the program believe that the program has adequately prepared them for graduate school and careers, although they would like more information about career options.

Scores on the online exam were higher than the previous assessment period, which probably reflects a larger number of students who took the exam in the second round or that students performed better. Students emphasizing the adolescent stage of the lifespan had lower scores on the senior online exam than those who took the exams focusing on childhood or adulthood. Since this was the first time that the adolescent area of concentration was tested, and only 11 students took that portion of the exam, the difference may be an artifact of the methodology rather than students’ knowledge. More data is needed to assess this issue.

We have made major adjustments in the internship program and supervisor ratings reflect an increase in the quality of this experience for students. We have sorted out weak placement sites and developed and nurtured new sites better suited to our program. Students are pleased with their experiences and supervisors are overwhelmingly positive about the contributions of students to their organizations.

Students participating in the mosaic focus group continue to be positive about the value of the program, but were still hearing complaints that one of our courses is overwhelming in the amount of work required, and students want more career guidance.

Therefore, the alumni data suggest that students are prepared for work and graduate school when they leave.

**College of Engineering**

**Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering**

**Chemical Engineering Program**

Extensive (see ABET report)!
1. Students appreciate the education they receive.
2. Students are prepared, upon graduation, to function effectively as engineers.
3. Greater emphasis must be placed in discussing sustainability vis-a-vis the impact of engineering projects.

**Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering**

**Materials Science & Engineering Program**

1. Students are, generally, happy with the education they received.
2. Students are prepared well enough to function successfully as engineers.
3. The program must continue to emphasize the importance of oral and written communications.
4. Greater emphasis should be placed on sustainability vis-à-vis the impact of engineering projects.
1. Students appreciate the education they receive.
   2. Students are prepared, upon graduation, to work as engineers.
   3. Greater emphasis must be placed on discussing sustainability vis-à-vis the impact of engineering projects.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Civil Engineering Program

1. More emphasis should be placed on fundamental science and engineering principles with direct applications of mathematics and physics. Instructors (especially those of freshman, sophomore, and junior year courses) should incorporate brief review sessions and/or assignments that emphasize the importance of sound knowledge of fundamental science and mathematics.
2. More emphasis should be placed on AutoCAD throughout the curriculum where appropriate.
3. The CEE Space Committee plan for renovating and upgrading the teaching laboratory facilities should be pursued.
4. Opportunities for students to improve their communication skills should be emphasized earlier in the curriculum. Core courses should require submission of written project reports in addition to oral presentations to the class. These presentations should be routinely graded by the instructor and other invited members of the faculty and industry representatives. In selected courses, one or two lectures should be devoted to emphasize effective written and oral presentation skills. The senior capstone design courses must include strong communication components.
5. More emphasis on ethics should be incorporated into the BSCE curriculum.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Civil Engineering: Environmental Program

1. More emphasis should be placed on fundamental science and engineering principles with direct applications of mathematics and physics. Instructors (especially those of freshman and junior year courses) should incorporate brief review sessions and/or assignments that emphasize the importance of sound knowledge of fundamental science and mathematics.
2. Opportunities for students to improve their communication skills should be emphasized early in the curriculum. Core courses should require submission of written project reports in addition to oral presentations to the class.
3. In selected courses, one or two lectures should be devoted to teach the students effective written and presentation skills. A textbook on writing skills should be included with other course materials. Reading assignments should be given throughout the semester.
4. The senior design capstone courses must include strong communication components.
5. Oral presentations should be routinely graded by the instructor and other invited members of the faculty and industry representatives.
6. More emphasis on ethics should be incorporated into the BSEE curriculum.
Department of Computer Science  
Computer Information & Engineering Program

See pdf report.

Department of Computer Science  
Computer Science Program

Overall, the committee thinks that both faculty and students are making good efforts to improve the teaching experience. On one hand, students have raised their concerns about a number of important issues in various courses and provided constructive comments to improve teaching while on the other hand, faculty have tried to address students’ concerns and improve their teaching.

Overall, the committee thinks that the majority of the students have made constructive comments and that the instructors have addressed them quite satisfactorily although there is room for further improvement. Most student evaluations were mixed between favorable comments and not so favorable comments. There seems to be a wide range of theme and variation. In general, students appear to enjoy and consider valuable a hands-on applied approach to learning material. This is reflected in favorable comments regarding project work and less favorable comments from students in lecture oriented classes.

Overall the advisory board demonstrates that they feel our graduates are well prepared. However, the evaluations point out a few areas where we might improve. First, our evaluation of students’ technical capabilities finds they are slightly lower than the committee's perceived importance. This leads the committee to recommend that the current emphasis on Computer Science basics be maintained and perhaps enhanced slightly. Second, our graduates' ability to learn independently should be encouraged – perhaps through more open ended homework and project assignments.

A major gap seems to exist between advisory board members' desire for holistic thinking in their employees and the existence of this trait in our graduates. The committee recommends that the faculty discuss possible ways to increase this characteristic in our students. Exactly how this might be accomplished is not immediately clear to the committee.

See .pdf Report!

Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering  
Electrical Engineering Program

Our evaluation of program outcomes was based on student scores on each outcome averaged over key classes. For 2005-2006 all averages are above 90%. However, the score of 92% for outcome (f) may indicate that there is a problem with the first year students in EE 191 understanding professional and ethical responsibility. This may be an indication that the University Core Curriculum may need to be reviewed to see if engineering students are receiving enough emphasis in the topics of professional and ethical responsibility. These subjects will be covered in more depth in EE191. However, this will be reviewed in more detail if the next year data also indicates that a problem may exist.

Although all results are within the satisfactory range, we will closely monitor outcomes (e), (g), and (i).
Students will demonstrate an ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems (ABET e) 85%.

Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively (ABET g) 80%.

Students will acquire a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning (ABET i) 85%.

At this stage, there is no urgent need to take remedial action. However, we feel that effective communication (g) is a critical issue for engineers and that a higher performance level is required. We would also like to improve students' ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems (e).

Discussions in EE Department meetings revealed that students were avoiding courses they perceive to be difficult which adversely affected the breadth of their education. The department decided to require all students to take at least one senior elective in each of the following areas: Control, Communications, Electromagnetics, Electronics, and Power.

So far it is too early to reach significant conclusions from our assessment efforts. However, we now have in place the mechanisms that will allow us to reach such findings in the next assessment cycle.

We have identified some significant weaknesses and strengths through monitoring the performance of our students on specific tasks.

It appears that some students still are not comfortable with some basic mathematical skills including complex numbers and linear algebra. We have revised the content of EE 231 to address these topics and the revised course will be taught starting in Fall 2005.

We have noticed that some students are not able to write formal reports that properly document a project they have completed. We have noticed a significant improvement in these skills as students complete the capstone/lab course EE 490.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**

**Mechanical Engineering Program**

Our students' ability to learn and use math, science and engineering fundamentals is probably acceptable relative to nationwide norms; based on current and past admissions history of our graduates into professional (graduate) programs, the FE exam results and faculty survey. This is likewise true of our communications outcome; albeit with some reservations about lab reports. That shortcoming seems more tied to the overall weakness of the experimental aspect of our undergraduate program; a weakness recognized by students although different aspects of survey was mixed. But it looks like combined ranking by students and faculty has improved.

Survey results indicate that our students' ability to design has also improved. This improvement may be linked to increased familiarity with applications-oriented software, a task that was identified and implemented by faculty.

Our students' ability to learn and use the fundamentals of math, science and engineering is probably acceptable relative to national norms. Likewise, communications, albeit with strong reservations about lab reports continues.

Our students' ability to design an experiment is generally weak. Certainly this is the least successful of the ME program objectives.

Our student's ability to design (generally) is also weak, and needs improvement (see Program Modifications).
Appendix 3F

Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Exam Performance:

The FE exam is the only objective measure available for comparing UNR student performance against other institutions performance. The validity of the comparison is a subject of disagreement among the faculty because there is disagreement about the quality of the FE exam. Nevertheless, using an improved Tukey Quick Test to compare UNR performance against the national averages, it is seen that:

- Our students, measured in terms of pass rate, do better than the national average;
- Our students perform better than the national average in automatic controls;
- Our students perform worse than the national average in:
  - Chemistry;
  - Computers;
  - Materials Science & Structural Materials;
  - Eng Econ (big time);
  - Fluid Mechanics;
  - Stress Analysis.

Key faculty observations are:

- Students have a difficulty ‘connecting the dots’ from course to course. There seems to be difficulty in weaving the threads of individual course skills and knowledge into a coherent body of engineering knowledge;
- The ability to make and explain critical assumptions and first principles to the definition and solutions of engineering problems is not as strong as desired. Students have difficulty in preparing succinct and comprehensive laboratory reports;
- They do well at preparing and delivery oral presentations;
- Based on the recent 2002-2005 cohort assessment data for the program educational objectives:
  - OBJ 1-Entry Level Design & Analysis Proficiency The program is doing well, with 76%-83% positive responses in design and 68% positive responses in modern tools. There is room for improvement in the design area and use of modern engineering tools and techniques;
  - OBJ 2-Experimental Design The program is doing just ok, with 70% positive responses and 24% negative responses and 68% positive responses in modern tools. There is room for improvement in experimental design and use of modern engineering tools and techniques;
  - OBJ 3-Ability to communicate The program is just doing ok, with 79% positive responses and 20% negative responses. There is room for improvement in verbal, presentation, and writing skills, particularly in technical report writing;
  - OBJ 4-Success in graduate school< The program is doing well, 1 graduate, but 40% enrolled in graduate school and 32% planning to enroll.

- Based on the S2005 and F2005 student course evaluations, there is room for improvement in:
  - Increasing knowledge of professional and ethical responsibilities and how engineering solutions relate to contemporary issues are opportunities for improvement;
  - Increasing familiarity with statistics and linear algebra is an opportunity for improvement;
  - Increasing the ability to design both mechanical and thermal systems, including the ability to incorporate realistic constraints, including economic constraints, as identified above is an opportunity for improvement.

- Based on the FE Exam performance, the program is doing well in;
  - Average FE Exam pass rate, and
  - Automatic controls.
• There are opportunities to improve in:
  o Chemistry;
  o Computers;
  o Materials Science & Structural Materials;
  o Eng Econ; and
  o Fluid Mechanics Stress Analysis.

Assessment of upper-division students over the past year has determined that student performance on learning outcomes 1, 3, and 4 is within the expectations of the faculty. Course instruction and communication skills appear to be program strengths. Aspects of independent study (outcome 2) need a more rigorous assessment review in the future.

Our students' ability to learn and use math, science and engineering fundamentals is probably acceptable relative to nationwide norms; based on current and past admissions history of our graduates into professional (graduate) programs, the FE exam results and faculty survey. This is likewise true of our communications outcome; albeit with strong reservations about lab reports. That shortcoming seems more tied to the overall weakness of the experimental aspect of our undergraduate program; a weakness recognized by both students and faculty in our reported surveys. Our students' ability to design something is also rather weak -- at least as viewed by the ME faculty! his weakness is linked to an unfamiliarity with applications-oriented software, a problem we are beginning to address.

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Anthropology
Anthropology Program

Student Learning Outcome 1: The assessment results for the 2005-2006 academic year indicate that undergraduate students are, by and large, quite satisfied with the quality of the anthropology curriculum and how it prepares them for a career. From the sample of those who have graduated with a BA in anthropology in the last five years, about 70 percent are employed in the public or private sectors and 40 percent have been admitted to graduate programs at UNR or elsewhere.

Student Learning Outcome 2: This outcome suggests that the undergraduate program is successful in instilling knowledge and comprehension of basic anthropological principles, concepts, and methods. The assessment results indicate that most graduating students are as highly satisfied as they can be with the program and have graduated feeling well prepared for their future.

The assessment results for the academic year 2007-2008 indicate that most undergraduate students are satisfied with the quality of the anthropology curriculum and how it prepares them for a career. Assessment data suggest that the BA program is successful in instilling basic understanding of human cultural, physical, and linguistic diversity as well as knowledge and comprehension of basic anthropological principles, concepts, and methods in the four subfields of anthropology and their relevance to the discipline as a whole. The data also show that students are able to participate in anthropological research and scholarship.

Student Learning Outcome #1: The assessment results for the 2006-2007 academic year indicate that undergraduate students are, by and large, quite satisfied with the quality of the anthropology curriculum and how it prepares them for a career. Alumni surveys give some information about the employment or
continuing education status of anthropology graduates. Of those who responded to the survey, all are employed full-time in the education or business fields in the local region but none in areas related to anthropology.

Student Learning Outcome #2: This outcome suggests that the undergraduate program is successful in instilling understanding of human cultural, physical, and linguistic diversity.

Student Learning Outcome #3: This outcome suggests that students in the undergraduate program are able to participate in and evaluate anthropological research and scholarship.

Student Learning Outcome #4: This outcome suggests that the undergraduate program is successful in instilling knowledge and comprehension of basic anthropological principles, concepts, and methods in the four subfields of anthropology and their relevance to the discipline as a whole.

Student Learning Outcome: Fifteen (15) students graduated from the anthropology bachelor's degree program during the 2003-2004 academic year. Exit questionnaires given to these graduates provided data on the perceived quality of the program. When asked to rate the overall quality of anthropology's BA program, 37 percent responded excellent and 47 percent good. Ninety percent of the graduates believed that our BA curriculum provided either excellent or good preparation for a hoped for career, and 68 percent found it to be very difficult or moderately difficult. Most (90 percent) considered the quality of academic advisement in the department to be either excellent or good. Finally, 63 percent rated the level of faculty interactions with undergraduate students to be excellent and another 21 percent very good.

Student Learning Outcome: Twenty-one (21) students graduated from the anthropology bachelor's degree program during the academic year 2004-2005. Seven of these graduates provided data on the perceived quality of the program by completing exit questionnaires. When asked to rate the overall quality of anthropology’s BA program, 71 percent responded excellent and 29 percent good. All of the graduates believed that our BA curriculum provided either excellent or good preparation for a hoped for career, and 86 percent found it to be very difficult or moderately difficult. One hundred percent considered the quality of academic advisement in the department to be either excellent or good. Finally, 43 percent rated the level of faculty interactions with undergraduate students to be excellent and another 57 percent very good.

**Department of Art**

**Art: Fine Arts Program**

The BFA program will next year be eleven years running. It is our sense that we have largely honed the BFA into a highly functional program that is producing students of the highest caliber. We continue to seek ways to improve this program; including exploring the possibility of hiring additional art history LOA’s and the anticipated new hire to replace retiring Professor Joanna Frueh. This position will continue to be crucial for the successful continuation of this program.

The BFA program has been more than ten years in art department. It is our sense that we have largely honed the BFA into a highly functional program that is producing highly qualified students. We continue to seek ways
Overall, the Department of Art continues to provide highly challenging and competitive BA Studio Art and Art History programs. Our top students compare well, and at times exceed, those from peer institutions. Our students are generally well prepared in the techniques and concepts endemic to and developed within the Department's Concentration Areas. Students have found employment in art-related fields following graduation and a large percentage find their way to graduate school and to careers 'making' art, many remaining in the Reno area becoming vital participants in the growing community of art and artists. Challenges continue to exist in several key areas and are being addressed on an on-going basis as funding, instructional space and other resources become available, particularly in the following areas described in the Program Modifications Section of this 2008 Assessment Report.

Overall the Department of Art continues to provide a highly challenging and competitive BA studio and art history program. Our best students compare well, and at times, exceed those from other institutions of similar size. Our students are generally well-prepared in the techniques and concepts covered in our various discipline areas. Students have found gainful employment in art related fields after graduating from our program - many remain in the Reno area and become vital participants in a growing artistic community. Several have gone on to continue their education in graduate and professional programs. Challenges exist in several key areas: Art History, Foundations, Independent Study, scholarships, internships and professional preparation.

Overall, the Department of Art continues to provide highly challenging and competitive BA Studio Art and Art History Programs. Our top students compare well, and at times exceed, those from peer institutions. Our students are generally well prepared in the techniques and concepts endemic to and developed within the Department's Concentration Areas. Students have found employment in art-related fields following graduation from the Department's Program and a large percentage find their ways to graduate school and to careers "making" art, many remaining in the Reno area becoming vital participants in the growing community of Art and Artists. Challenges continue to exist in several key areas and are being addressed on an on-going basis as funding, instructional space and other resources become available particularly in the following areas:

* Visual Foundations: The Department, as a whole, is addressing a variety of issues concerning both the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes. There is discussion about the possibility of making the Visual Foundations class a two [rather than the presently one] semester class divided into two and three dimensional considerations based on the classic Composition style classes taught in Architectural Science oriented programming. There is discussion regarding the possible return to a Visual Foundations program which would incorporate beginning drawing, painting, sculpture and Digital Media into the instructional format taught by a four-member Faculty-team. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with Fall 2007.

* Art History: The Department is considering a number of possible options depending upon the recruitment of that person who will replace our retiring Art Historian in the Fall of 2007. We have begun recruitment for a 20th Century Art Specialist who will develop and teach larger and more comprehensive survey-type coursing along with smaller, more movement-focused courses. The securing of this Art Historian will dictate the next Art Historian recruiting which will occur as the Department is awarded its next new position. The Department is also actively seeking to recruit qualified part-time Art History instructors to teach much-needed courses. 5 * Independent Study: The Department of Art Undergraduate Advisor is undertaking the coordination of Independent Study classes to insure that prerequisites are completed and that consistent contact between student and
faculty oversight is met thereby effecting the greatest degree of success possible.

*Scholarships: Scholarship guidelines, requirements and application forms are posted on the Department's website. We continue our efforts to get information to all art students, recognizing that the responsibility for application, etc. is the student's.

*Internships: The Department of Art Undergraduate Advisor is undertaking the coordination of Internship possibilities and placement for our students. We are encouraging all Faculty to be attentive to Internship possibilities and to be mindful of the student qualifications for and instructional advantages of such internships.

Department of Criminal Justice

Criminal Justice Program

As we mature in our assessment abilities we use the data in a variety of ways. For example, it is recognized the data is not dependable. Simply put, the Pre-Law program is preparing students for a specific professional doctoral program while the General Program prepares for practice and graduate school. Pre-Law students take an additional course in Legal Research and generally have different applied research and writing expectations. The SLO needs to be better framed to specific groups because, based on direct Pre-Law faculty evaluation of the subset, Pre-Law students would have a lower rating than General degree students in the percentage substantially meeting expectations and also have a higher percentage of failing. The questions and evaluation will be adjusted to reflect different expectations. This of course, makes for a more complex report. Another issue we have is that the general and pre-law programs are competitive. No more than 40% in lower division and 60% in upper division, grades of B or A may be awarded without special circumstances put in writing by the instructor and approved by the department. This tends to skew our evaluations assessment. Further, a student must maintain a 2.5 GPA to remain in the program. By the senior year, those students who do not display an overall competence are mostly gone. As such, those students who may be reflected as failing in a particular are not failing in all.

Overall we feel that the department is doing a very good job of meeting is goals in undergraduate education. Our high academic standards, bolstered by; the 2.5 minimum grade point average students must maintain, demanding curriculum, and grading policy designed to fight grade inflation all seem to work to produce high quality education. By and large our students are very successful getting jobs and going on to graduate school and law school. We are indeed, very proud of our students and their accomplishments.

Department of English

English Program

Our key finding was the desirability of defining and strengthening the goals for each foundation course for our majors and minors.

English 298: As planned, a set of final essays from two sections of this course offered in Spring 2007 were collected, and a random sample of 30 of them (approximately half) were read by a subcommittee of three faculty, who each rated them in light of two of the main SLOs for the course.
Ratings were then normed and collated, as follows:
1. SLO #1: "To employ literary terminology appropriate to the study of various genres"
   20% met fully or exceeded
   47% met
   33% failed

2. SLO #2: "To write literary analyses and critical arguments based on close reading, using academic citation forms when appropriate"
   31% met fully or exceeded
   64% met
   5% failed

English 303: The same procedure, with a separate three-member faculty committee, was followed with regard to this course, for which English 298 is the prerequisite, and which is the prerequisite for all 400-level courses in English:
1. SLO #1: "To improve skills in critical thinking and writing about literature"
   25% met fully or exceeded
   53% met
   22% failed

SLO #2: "To practice applying contemporary theory and criticism to texts"
   21% met fully or exceeded
   38% met
   41% failed

From this analysis we can see that we should be most concerned with student achievement of ENG 298's SLO #1 and ENG 303's SLO #2.

Through our exit interviews given this year, we can report successful outcomes in four key areas: 1) When asked to rate the overall quality of instruction they received in their English courses, 65% responded "very good," while 31% said "excellent." 2) When asked how well the foundation courses prepared them for 400-level work, their responses were lower. 46% reported "very well," and only 12% said "excellent"; 12% said "somewhat" and 27% "well enough." 3) To the question which asked if they felt they had gained a solid foundation in their field, 85% said "yes," and 11% "somewhat." 4) When asked if the department advisement system met their needs, 81% responded "yes," 8% "somewhat," and 4% "no"—although these negative responses were often based on time conflicts with schedules.

Note: Not all numbers on the questionnaire add up to 100% because some students did not answer all questions. Also May 2005 graduates' exit interviews are not included because of a transition with an interim director.

1. Students seem generally satisfied with the preparation provided by our foundation courses for upper-division work in English. The high level of satisfaction with the third course in the sequence, ENG 303, may indicate that the SLOs are cumulatively addressed and reinforced by the entire sequence 282-298-303.
2. We have come to realize that, except for foundation courses and enforced prerequisites, our majors do not take the sequence of courses leading to the BA in English in any predictable or consistent way. This presents problems for assessment of upper-division work and exit assessment. We have worked this year with our college to develop reports and data collection methods to identify which late-program seniors are enrolled in which courses, in preparation for an effort next year to "cherry-pick" these seniors' work for program-level assessment. The same reports will allow us to chart the most common
sequences of courses taken by our majors and modify, if necessary, certain prerequisites and advisement strategies.

3. As a result of our 2006 assessment activities, one of our foundation courses, ENG 282, has come under increasing scrutiny by several of the department's curriculum committees. It overlaps to some extent with the sequence of courses leading to the Language and Linguistics specialization, and unlike the other foundation courses (ENG 281, 298 and 303) it is taught by such a wide range of instructors that its syllabus has strayed from the original intention as implemented in the mid-1990s. One student perception and potential problem is best summarized by quoting from an exit interview: "where were we supposed to learn about grammar?" This situation points to a lack of consistency across the syllabi for this course as taught by several instructors.

4. The syllabus and goals for ENG 298 will also be reviewed in 2006-2007, with a program-level assessment plan described elsewhere in this report to be implemented beginning in Spring 2006. In particular we will assess the lowest-scoring SLOs for this group, related to literary research and documentation of citations.

Based on the foundation course assessment administered in fall 2003 and spring 2004 to over 100 students completing the last foundation course (fall 2004 has not yet been tabulated), we have met many of our goals in English 282 and 303. Based on our survey, 80% or higher of the students "agree" or "strongly agree" that class goals had been met. In 297, the percentage of students who "agree" or "strongly agree" drops to an average of about 75% In the exit interview, over 80% of the students reported the quality of instruction "very good" or "excellent." All but one student reported that they felt they had a "solid foundation in their field, and noting the skills students had developed in English classes, they listed close reading, critical thinking, writing for a variety of audiences, editing and proof reading, and library research. The one area that did not receive high ratings was the question involving how well the foundation courses prepared students for the 400-level courses. Only 60% responded "very well" or "excellently" with several negative comments about 297--and the fact that students had not taken the courses in sequence or completed them before taking the 400-level courses.

As the raw data collected in 2008 has yet to be processed and analyzed, no quantitative findings are available at this time. Anecdotal evidence from conferences with faculty teaching ENG 298 finds students are more precise and confident use of literary terminology among students in their courses as a result of the modifications.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures

Foreign Languages & Literatures: French Program

Findings show that most students completing the French major have the skills to tackle difficult literary and cultural texts and can express themselves in writing at a fairly sophisticated level. Reaching this level of competency has no doubt been facilitated by the addition of two new courses in the past 1.5 years: Business French and French in Translation. The former allows students to read challenging and contemporary culturally based texts and the latter gives students the opportunity to focus on vocabulary and sentence structure in French in order to see how it relates to English. Both courses are giving students the opportunity to focus on a kind of reading and writing not necessarily found in other courses. Although most students are reaching the Intermediate Mid range in speaking, we would like to see students going as far as Intermediate High in a more consistent manner. Findings clearly show that students who spend time in a study abroad program greatly increase their level of spoken French.

French majors at the 300 level are speaking, reading and writing at the appropriate level which indicates that they arrive at the 300 level with a good foundation in the language. Most exiting French majors fully met (and two even exceeded) our expectations for speaking. For the most part, exiting French
majors demonstrated an impressive ability to read and comprehend difficult works of French literature and literary criticism. Most wrote well-argued and grammatically sound research papers. But since writing (especially research and abstract writing) is the most difficult skill to master, some of our students need extra help and perhaps extra training in this area.

Findings show that most students completing the French major have the skills to read and discuss difficult literary and cultural texts and can express themselves in writing at a fairly sophisticated level with a minimum of errors. Students seem to be reaching the Intermediate High and even Advanced Low ranges of speaking. All of the students in question either spent time in a study abroad program or in a French-speaking country. It is still too early to gauge the impact of changing our French Conversation course from two credits to three because these students had already taken the course when the change went into effect.

Majors just beginning their upper division work perform within the expected levels in regards to reading, writing and speaking. This would indicate that the beginning language courses (French 111, 112, 211, 212) are preparing them well for more advanced work in the major. Exiting majors demonstrated excellent reading and reading comprehension abilities. They are often, however, at different mastery levels of writing and speaking. All of our upper division courses (with the exception of French Conversation) have a heavy writing component. A newly added course, French 316 (French for Business), taught for the first time in Fall 2004, is a combination conversation/composition class with a strong emphasis on improving writing in a practical context. We are confident that this course will further help students to develop their writing and speaking skills.

2008 data shows that French majors continue to be have excellent skills in reading and comprehending difficult texts. A great percentage (85%) of the graduating majors are able to speak at either the Intermediate Mid to Intermediate High range. These strong percentages, sustained over the past few years, show that the combination studying abroad and spending more hours in French Conversation (revised from 2 credits to 3 credits) has given students the immersion necessary to master oral proficiency in French. 30% of the students did not meet the expected outcome in writing. Although their papers showed a good understanding of the subject matter they lacked intellectual sophistication as well as linguistic/syntactical sophistication. One of the questions we have to ask ourselves here is whether these students are not meeting expectations simply because they are not particularly taken with the "literary" side of language learning. That is, English majors must necessarily accept that they will take many literature courses (and must excel in them) if they are indeed to be majors. French majors, however much they may be committed to the language and its mastery, may not be experts in literature and may in fact have little background in literature.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures

Foreign Languages & Literatures: German Program

This year we graduated four rather good to excellent students. Since three students were a sheer pleasure to work with throughout their UNR career, and the other student quite obviously with less talent achieved a pretty satisfactory level of accomplishment, we do not currently see a need to rethink the design of our program.

How our program is successful in improving reading skills can be seen by comparing our graduating seniors to students taking the same test upon declaration of their major. Students who did not yet take third-year classes had substantially lower scores.

The program should look for ways of improving students’ oral skills, presumably by restructuring the syllabus in GER 309 and/or offering a new, three-credit oral skills class. The program has always put
great emphasis in training proper writing, and the finding has confirmed our belief that in this respect we are doing outstanding work.

We cannot draw too many conclusions from the critical thinking part of the assessment because the two students who fully met our expectations were by anybody’s standards outstanding and would have written really good papers even if our training would have been defective. The third student, who performed less well, had done her upper level course work on an exchange program in Germany. The assessment, as it has been set up, seems to work and yield objective and useful results.

Two of the three graduating students did not fully meet our expectations. This stands in contrast to our findings in previous years, when generally the majority of students did. Since this is not a statistically relevant sample, we will have to wait to see whether this is a trend or a blip. However, two students could not show real mastery of the thesis essay in a foreign language, although one of the students must count as academically gifted. This raises the question whether the program is giving enough emphasis on this important aspect of a student's skill. We will pay special attention to this issue in our next assessment and, if need be, discuss and implement program changes.

SLO1: We could define better how the comprehension question should be phrased and graded so as to give us even more accurate information about the students’ reading skills. How our program is successful in improving reading skills can be seen by comparing our graduating seniors to students taking the same test upon declaration of their major. Students who did not yet take third-year classes had an average score of 56%, those students who had taken some third-year classes had an average score of 69%.

SLO2: The requirement to videotape the interview might be too cumbersome, since this time a camera could not be located in time. Given the fact that one student never spent a considerable amount of time in a German-speaking country, we can be happy about our training in oral communication.

SLO3: The program has always put great emphasis in training proper writing, and the finding has confirmed our belief that in this respect we are doing outstanding work.

SLO4: It was interesting to notice that both students scored worst on the ability to structure their paper successfully on a thesis paper format. This is something we in the program have informally talked about before. We will wait for further assessment results and, if necessary, think about ways of improving this important skill with our students. Key findings for overall program assessment activities: This was our first run of doing it, and some kinks in the process could be eliminated and some improvements in the process could be made.

This year we had one of our strongest and one of our weakest students graduate. Because of the small sample size (2) and disparity, it is difficult to make any significant conclusions about our program. We were pleased to see that even a weaker student had developed strong analytical skills and some oral proficiency (if not accuracy). Her grammar, however, was quite poor. This particular student did a number of her credits in the USAC study abroad program, which has advantages, but also means that we were not able to work with her in our regular composition class, because she took the same course number abroad. The results based on one student are far from conclusive, but this issue of different standards and curricula in the same courses provided.

In general, we can be happy with the outcomes, since two thirds of our graduates performed on a very high level in all categories. The one performance goal not met, however, is critical, since it corresponds to a similar failure last year. In both cases, the non-performing paper was written for the same teacher and appears to have gotten a good grade.
Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures
Foreign Languages & Literatures: Spanish Program

The evaluation of student written work at the advanced (400-level) stage yielded very positive results. There is, however, room for improvement. A few Spanish majors are still grappling with issues of basic grammar, writing style, and critical content. The Spanish undergraduate advisors are encouraging Spanish majors and minors to study abroad with USAC to improve their cultural interaction with Hispanic people as well as their Spanish skills.

More students (51%) met or exceeded expectations in the Student Learning Outcomes assessment but many (49%) substantially failed expectations. Students underperformed in the mechanics of writing in Spanish (language usage) and citation/bibliographic method. Thus, the chief areas that need to be addressed in the curriculum include grammar (62% unsatisfactory); vocabulary, spelling, accentuation, and punctuation (57% unsatisfactory); and citation/bibliographic method (60% unsatisfactory). Graduates from the Spanish program were satisfied (63%) with the preparation they received. Most reported that they were fully satisfied (gave a rating of "excellent") or substantially satisfied (gave a rating of "good" or "fair") in four key areas: quality of program, preparation for current career path, advisement, and faculty interaction. Some students (37%) reported that the Spanish program failed their expectations in some way (gave a rating of "poor" or "very poor" in quality of the program, preparation for current career path, advisement, and faculty interaction). Of these four categories, academic advisement received the worst assessment (50% of respondents reported it was "very poor").

The evaluation of student written work yielded positive results. There is, however, room for improvement. Some Spanish majors are still grappling with issues of basic grammar, style, and critical content.

The majority of our students (80%) met or exceeded expectations in all areas of the Student Learning Outcomes assessment. Students did not have difficulties comprehending literary texts or citing them appropriately. However, many students underperformed in the mechanics of writing in Spanish (language usage) and some failed to demonstrate adequate critical/analytical thinking in their papers. Thus, the chief areas that need to be addressed in the curriculum include grammar (36% unsatisfactory), spelling/accentuation/punctuation (27% unsatisfactory), and critical thinking/approaches to a literary text (23% unsatisfactory). Graduates from the Spanish program were overwhelmingly satisfied (80%) with the preparation they received. Most reported that they were fully satisfied (gave a rating of excellent) or substantially satisfied (gave a rating of good or fair) in four key areas: quality of program, preparation for current career path, advisement, and faculty interaction. No students reported that the Spanish program failed their expectations in terms of the quality of the program, but one student gave a failing grade in the areas of preparation for current career path, advisement, and faculty interaction.

The evaluation of student written work at the advanced (400-level) stage yielded positive results. There is, however, room for improvement. Some Spanish majors are still grappling with issues of basic grammar, writing style, and critical content.

Current requirements for the major might be contributing to low enrollments on upper division literature courses. To earn a B.A in Spanish, less than third of required credits (9 of 30) must be in literature, namely, an introduction and two survey courses.
Department of General Studies
General Studies Program

The students and program performance appear to be close to University norms.

The program administration was adjusted substantially two years ago. Policies have been formalized and applied consistently. The program is growing in numbers and students are graduating with well-defined clusters. The advising for the program has been provided by faculty in the Academic Advising Center. The quality of advising has been excellent. The Alumni data suggests that our students assessment of the program is average for the campus. The assessment plan should be revised to remove SLOs or performance indicators that cannot be assessed.

It is difficult to draw comparative conclusions with the last report. The data sets used are quite similar. The BGS program review will be completed in the spring of 2007. The SLOs and PIs will be reviewed.

Department of History
History Program

Students are generally meeting program objectives. Our assessment plan has been only partially implemented this far; the pre-evaluation component (History 300) is slated to begin in Fall 2003.

Students met standards in giving oral presentations.

1. The portfolio project showed that our history majors are learning and exhibiting the desired set of skills but the project was deemed to be inefficient and not to be repeated.
2. The assessment project put in place last academic year (2005-06) based on two required courses--History 300 and History 499—has demonstrated potential in its first year of operation. Over time, the department believes that it can be modified and improved in an efficient manner.
3. The department's assessment program is providing data that our student majors are making progress towards their degrees and are learning the skills that we have deemed to be important.

During the 2005-06 academic year, 11 students completed both History 300 and History 499. In History 300, each student paper was read and evaluated by the professor in charge of the course and a second faculty member. Each reader completed an assessment form. The results for History 300 were that 8 of the 11 students met the minimum expectations of "the pre-selected skills set."
Likewise in History 499, each student paper was read and evaluated by the thesis advisor and a second faculty member. Each reader completed an assessment form. The results for History 499 were that 8 of the 11 students met the minimum expectations identified as "the pre-selected skills set."

Two qualifications should be mentioned. First, we are not tracking the grades that students receive in either of these courses and have no intention of doing so. In each case, the grades reflect a number of confounding factors other than the "pre-selected skills set." Our assessment efforts are focused on the skills set. Second, we are beginning to collect data that over time will allow us to make judgments about how much academic preparation the students have had in their thesis subjects and when the students take the two courses. For instance, does it make a difference how far apart the students take the courses?

1. The portfolio project completed in 2006 showed that our history majors are learning and exhibiting the desired set of skills, but the portfolio project was administratively impractical and abandoned at the end of 2006.
2. The assessment project to replace the portfolio project evolved over the course of several years and is based on two required courses--History 300 and History 499. It is beginning to show that our students are learning the research, creative, and presentations skills that the faculty considers as important. Further, the new program can be sustained over time.

3. The department's assessment program is providing data that our student majors are making progress towards their degrees and are learning important skills.

**Department of Interior Design**

**Interior Design Program**

Each of the Student Learning Outcomes needs reiteration throughout the curriculum. The development of numerous evaluation rubrics has aided student understanding of expectations and standards and greater emphasis on modification, revision and refinement of work has increased skill levels.

Increased critique, feedback (via rubrics) and revision of student work throughout the curriculum has improved quality, raised standards and built student confidence.

Student Learning Outcomes need to be continually reiterated.

The faculty has identified key areas on which to focus continued efforts for improvement (listed under each SLO).

Again, the use of critique, feedback (via rubrics), opportunities for revision, and competition problems has improved work quality, raised overall performance standards, and contributed to greater student confidence.

Student Learning Outcomes need to be reiterated frequently to both students and faculty. Continued efforts for improvement and refinement have been identified under each SLO.

With the majority of faculty teaching only part time, and some periodic attrition of faculty, maintaining sequential momentum throughout the curriculum and ongoing communication between both courses and instructors requires continual emphasis. Student Learning Outcomes must be reiterated frequently to both faculty and students. However, the regular inclusion of critique and feedback, revision and re-submittal of student work, competition problems, national exam practice problems, and a checklist of program accreditation/Nevada registration standards have resulted in improved student communication skills, more professional-quality work, and higher performance standards which, in turn, have developed stronger self confidence in students and graduates.

**Department of Music & Dance**

**Music Program**

The department of music administers barrier examinations, end-of-the semester performance juries, piano proficiency examinations, continuation examinations and pre-recital auditions for all music majors pursuing a degree plan. These various "assessment" examinations allow for continued monitoring of our students' progress and performance.
The department of music administers barrier exams, end-of-the semester performance juries, piano proficiency exams, for all music majors pursuing a degree plan at the university. These various "assessment" exams allow for continued monitoring of our students' progress and performance.

The department of music administers barrier exams, end-of-the semester performance juries, piano proficiency exams and pre-recital auditions for all music majors pursuing a degree plan at the university. These various "assessment" exams allow for continued monitoring of our students' progress and performance.

Semester-by-semester evaluation is the norm for music majors.

**Department of Music & Dance**  
**Music Education Program**

New coursework, revisions to existing courses and implementation of barrier exam and piano proficiency exams have made positive changes to the progress and performance of all music education majors, instrumental, choral, and/or general music education.

With curriculum and course changes now being implemented, the music education major has become a much stronger course of study with better results in terms of professional music teacher preparation.

New coursework, revisions to existing courses and implementation of the continuation examination have made positive changes to the progress and performance of all music education majors, instrumental, choral, and/or general music education.

New coursework, revisions to existing courses and implementation of barrier exam and piano proficiency exams have made positive changes to the progress and performance of all music education majors, instrumental, choral, and/or general music education.

**Department of Philosophy**  
**Philosophy Program**

None of the information below has led us to revise our previous assessment plan. It seems to be working well so far.

1. Our advising is better than most departments on campus. All our advising of majors and minors is done by senior faculty members (associate professors or professors).
2. We have implemented our plan to evaluate each of our majors individually each year, in a full department meeting. This not only assists student advising, but helps us know our students better, a fact that only enhances our reputation among students of being a friendly, accessible department.
3. Our increased course choices at all levels (including new courses and courses that can be taken for diversity credit) have helped increase our enrollment as well as the number of majors. Our data shows all-time department records for enrollments each semester, with a 20% increase in the number of majors over last year. Hiring a new faculty member (our first lecturer) has made a big difference.
4. Our recently acquired ability to fund advanced undergraduates and graduate students to attend conferences and to present their work has been a major success in terms of student interest and productivity. This year student obtained an undergraduate research award and has already had his papers accepted by two conferences.
5. Because Philosophy is a small department, our students will benefit greatly from the university-wide plan to announce tentative course offerings two years in advance.
1. Good to excellent students make good progress in their class work over time with the guidance of their instructors. Students who start out poor are less likely to make progress and have a high degree of inconsistency of application missed classes, personal crises, inconsistency in effort, etc.; In addition, there is a fairly high degree of inconsistency of application among our students.

2. Exit interviews conducted by the current department chair and the two previous chairs indicate a high level of satisfaction with our programs: with their content, with the range of offerings, with the accessibility and flexibility of the programs, with the friendliness and availability of the faculty, with the responsiveness of faculty to student needs, with the availability of faculty for advice. The findings result from descriptive comments and, for three years, student ranking of our program on a scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high). In the latter, rankings were: ranking of 10: 33%; ranking of 9: 33%; ranking of 8: 33% (no rankings below 8).

The high level of satisfaction is consistent with results we found during a previous academic program review in interviews with a random sample of alumni from different graduation years. The responses of the alumni randomly sampled at that time were uniformly highly positive.

3. Student comments to chairs in exit interviews, and in other forums, give some evidence of some amount of lack of consistency in advisement, with some graduate students indicating lack of advisement on basic requirements in the program and some need for help in rectifying deficiencies in earlier education (for students lacking an undergraduate philosophy degree). Some undergraduate and graduate students have indicated that we may be losing students from or not attracting students to our program due to insufficient diversity of course content in lower-level offerings (viz., course content with greater global perspective, greater gender content, and a wider representation of different races and issues concerning race) (see below for curricular and staffing efforts to broaden diversity offerings).

4. Value tracks: After reviewing a number of undergraduate and graduate program, we discovered that specialized tracks in value theory, i.e. in areas such as ethics, political philosophy, philosophy of law, social philosophy and aesthetics, are now common in departments of philosophy both at peer institutions and at higher level institutions (see below regarding value track efforts we have taken).

5. Review of peer and higher level departments indicated some gaps in our program (see general curricular improvements below for examples of those gaps and of how we have filled them).

**Department of Political Science**
**Political Science Program**

The PSC program is successfully accomplishing its goals and we are excited about the future of our program as we continue to develop our junior faculty cohort--the future of our department and program.

Overall, students perform well in our classes because they are connected with creative and interesting reading as well as visual materials and because they are involved in applying materials to their everyday experiences.

The PSC program is successfully accomplishing its goals and we are excited about the future of our program as we continue to develop our junior faculty cohort--the future of our department and program. The junior faculty have done a wonderful job engaging students in research as well as building important research bridges with the faculty in the sciences and engineering.

The key findings indicate that political science is doing a good job of meeting our goals in a variety of ways. We are making students more aware of issues and helping them to develop greater levels of civic consciousness Student responses are generally similar to those university-wide.

The department is doing a solid job in educating student is basic PSC knowledge, skills, and abilities.
Generally, the department is doing a good to excellent job in the PSC-BA program. Areas for future improvement may relate to continued work on advisement and the building of quantitative analysis skills.

**Department of Political Science**  
**Political Science: International Affairs Program**

Alumni from the undergraduate program indicate that the University core curriculum does not offer enough in the way of diversity-related education. New personnel (i.e., a new program director) will be hired this year and will focus attention on the curriculum.

New Director has improved the program substantially.

The program appears to be functioning effectively.

The IA program continues to provide excellent educational opportunities for our students.

**Department of Psychology**  
**Psychology Program**

Preparation in the major: Examining the data from alumni surveys for 2008, and comparing this data to that from graduates in earlier years shows that psychology alumni continue to express overall high levels of satisfaction with their prepared for employment and/or continuing education in psychology. In 2007, 84% of psychology alumni rated the overall quality of the psychology program as good or better (compared to 81% over the last six years for the Department). We are maintaining this trend in 2008 with 83% of current and recent alumni (surveyed in Spring 2008) indicating that they are very or completely satisfied with the quality of their degree program. The 2008 graduates of the Psychology program are generating ratings of the quality of their program that average higher than for the previous five years.

When comparing mean ratings of 2008 Psychology Major Graduates with mean ratings of previous alumni in the 2002 through 2007 cohorts, we see that the most recent Psychology graduates are even more satisfied than in the past with every aspect of their degree program. Psychology 2008 graduates are 18.8% more satisfied with the overall quality of their program than the previous alumni sample. In addition, they are 15% more satisfied with program preparation for their career path, 23.4% more convinced of the rigor of the curriculum, 18.3% more satisfied with their advisement, and 26.7% more satisfied with their student/faculty interactions.

Overall this may indicate that students in the Psychology major are becoming consistently more satisfied with their program than in the past. Given that these ratings are on 9-point scales, we consider even the worst (2.73 mean rating of faculty interactions from '02- '07) to be a great rating. That said, A 1.56 mean "overall quality" rating on a 9 point scale of our most recent graduating cohort of Psychology Majors reflects our commitment to improvement, excellence, and service to our students.

Employer Satisfaction: Employer satisfaction data is not yet available to us for 2008. Examining the data for the last six years, however, shows that employers said they were somewhat or very satisfied with Psychology graduates 95% of the time (as compared to 96% of the time for the University overall). Employers said that UNR Psychology graduates were less well prepared than those from other
Universities only 2% of the time (as compared to 5% of the time for the University overall). Similarly high levels of approval were shown for ethical sensitivity (94% positive vs. 95% positive for the University as a whole), and the quality of a UNR degree (100% positive vs. 95% positive for the University as a whole).

Employment: According to the university alumni survey data, only 5% of the 2008 cohort is unemployed, an improvement from 9% of the 2007 cohort and Â½ of the 2007 University rate of 10% (university-wide 2008 numbers not available). 100% of those employed found their position within 6 months of graduation, with 76% of them finding work within 3 months. Perhaps because Psychology majors are mainly trained to continue in graduate level education for future employment in their field, more than half of them (53%) found work outside of their area. However, 47% of employed Psychology Bachelors found work in the field, and 62% found their first position related to the Psychology degree program.

Advising Performance: We assessed our advising using questionnaires after each student's advising throughout 2008 visit. Students in the department are made aware of the advisor as a resource for many of their needs, and students are able to be deliberate in using advising for help essential to their goals. Students tend to plan their advising visit, aware of its usefulness with 95.7% of students in the Spring 2008 semester, scheduling appointments in advance and only 4.3% dropping in. Students in the Fall continued to prefer making scheduled visits, and 100% of students answering this item scheduled appointments. Of those students coming in for advising, 21.9% in Spring and 52% in Fall, obtained DARS signature or discussed their review. Another 21.9% in Spring, and 71% in Fall, discussed college requirements, 20.5% in Spring and 71% in Fall, were helped with educational planning or timeline, 15.1% in Spring, and 65% in Fall discussed course scheduling, 8.2% in Spring, and credit evaluations, and the rest planned transfers or met other needs with their visit.

In addition, our advisors have been instrumental in helping students with a breadth of needs by directing students to other useful resources on campus. According to our data from Spring 2008, 26.3% of advised students received referrals to faculty members, 26.3% were referred to Admissions and Records. 10.5% of advisees were referred to multicultural student services, while 10.5% received referrals to the Disability Resource Center, and 5.3% to tutoring services.

According to data collected in Spring, 2008, students who used the department advisors favorably evaluated their experiences. An overwhelming majority of students (between 80% and 90%) strongly agreed with statements that reflected the ease of scheduling appointments, feeling welcome by a friendly advisor, competence of the advisor for answering or directing students to the answers of questions, promptness with which they were seen, and general satisfaction with their advising experience. In Fall this trend continued and improved. The following table presents mean and modal scores on a 7-point scale of ratings by advisees of different aspects of their advising experiences. In every case, the modal response was a 7, and the mean scores (between 6 and 7) indicate to us that our advising is helpful.

Preparation in the major Psychology alumni express overall high levels of satisfaction regarding how well they feel they were prepared for employment and/or continuing education in psychology. Fifty-nine percent of psychology alumni rate their degree program as good or better in terms of career path preparation (compared to 60% in the university). Similarly 82% of psychology alumni rate the overall quality of the psychology program as good or better (compared to 87% of Univ. alumni). Of the students that took Introductory Psychology at UNR 81% of them rated the course as average or harder.

The quality of psychology advisement is rated nearly the same as university advisement overall (76% PSY vs. 80% Univ. believe it is fair or better) indicating the quality of advisement in major is
increasing. Student faculty interaction was similarly rated as fair or better (90 vs. 93) for both psychology and the university.

Students did indicate dissatisfaction with technological preparedness suggesting that greater computer access, perhaps via a dedicated computer lab for experimental design and statistical analysis would be useful. We have also implemented new assessment procedures to continue improving our advising. Continuing Education The percentage of psychology alumni currently pursuing continuing education is greater than the university alumni as a whole (44% PSY vs. 29% Univ. full time). Of those pursuing Continuing Ed, 73% of psychology students attend full time (compared to 64% of Univ. alumni).

Of the psychology alumni enrolled, 57% are pursuing master’s degrees and 19% are pursuing doctoral degrees. Of those not currently enrolled in degree programs, a higher percentage of psychology alumni are planning to enroll in the next 12 months (54% PSY vs. 33% Univ.). Data also indicate that, as a result of the core classes typically taken as part of a psychology education, psychology students believe they are more prepared creative and critical thinkers, as well as researchers and scientists, when compared to university students. Interestingly, despite such high levels of feelings of preparation, interviews with some students indicated there was sense that the technological preparations and resources were insufficient. These data indicate psychology alumni are well prepared for advanced study in psychology and related fields. Employment Satisfaction Overall employment satisfaction of Psychology alumni is quite comparable to that of all alumni.

Employment success of psychology alumni, including full-time, part-time and self-employment status, is nearly identical to that of the University Alumni as a whole (90% PSY vs. 90% Univ.). These numbers to include a higher percentage of part time employment for psychology graduates compared to university graduates overall (19% vs. 10% respectively), which is likely related to the greater percentage of psychology students being enrolled fulltime in higher education. Despite psychology and university alumni having obtained their first degree-related job without equal success (40 vs. 82% for each) psychology indicates a higher degree of job satisfaction (21% PSY vs. 11% Univ.).

Psychology also graduates typically start with a higher average pay rate than other university graduates. These data indicate psychology alumni are well prepared and poised for success as they enter the job market following graduation. Overall Satisfaction Psychology alumni express overall satisfaction with their experience of obtaining a psychology degree. The fact that 80% would recommend the UNR psychology department to others, 90% have had a positive experience working with faculty members, and 79% of the students believe they are satisfactorily prepared for continuing education within their field clearly indicates the overall value of the program to the students and vice versa.

Preparation in the major Psychology alumni express overall high levels of satisfaction regarding how well they feel they were prepared for employment and/or continuing education in psychology. Sixty percent of psychology alumni, as well as 60% of university alumni, rate their degree program as good or better in terms of career path preparation. Similarly 80% of psychology alumni rate the overall quality of the psychology program as good or better (compared to 84% of univ alumni). The curriculum is rated as slightly less difficult compared to other similarly numbered courses on campus (47% vs. 64%). Interestingly, of the students that took Introductory Psychology at UNR 81% of them rated the course as average or harder. Curriculum revision is underway to address issues of difficulty by strengthening our graduate school preparation tract. The quality of psychology advisement is rated slightly less positively than university advisement overall (51% PSY vs. 62% Univ.). Psychology advising has improved since the last alumni survey, and has recently received special recognition from the college advisor. We have also implemented new assessment procedures to continue improving our advising.
Continuing education:
The percentage of psychology alumni currently pursuing continuing education is greater than the university alumni as a whole (45% PSY vs. 29% Univ.). Of those pursuing additional education, 71% of psychology students attend full time (compared to 64% of univ alumni). Of the psychology alumni enrolled, 20% of them are pursuing doctorate degrees (compared to 13% of univ alumni). Of those not currently enrolled in degree programs, a higher percentage of psychology alumni are planning to enroll in the next 12 months (54% PSY vs. 33% Univ.). Overall, these data indicate psychology alumni are well prepared for advanced study in psychology and related fields.

Employment Satisfaction
Overall employment satisfaction of Psychology alumni is quite comparable to that of all UNR alumni. Overall employment success of psychology alumni, including full-time, part-time and self-employment status, is nearly identical to that of the University Alumni as a whole (77% psychology vs. 81% university). The slight under employment percentage can be partially explained by the fact that a higher percentage of psychology alumni are unemployed by choice while attending graduate school (47% PSY vs. 43% Univ.).

Despite indicating lower success with having obtained their expected job (41% PSY vs. 63% Univ.) the alumni of psychology and university alumni have obtained their first degree-related job with equally successfully (72% for each). Further, psychology alumni have a slightly higher feeling of satisfaction with their salary as compared to the university alumni as a whole (21% PSY vs. 11% Univ.). Overall, these data indicate psychology alumni are well prepared and poised for success as they enter the job market following graduation.

Overall Satisfaction:
Psychology alumni express overall satisfaction with their experience obtaining a degree within the psychology department. Some notable findings are the fact that 81% would recommend the UNR psychology department to others, 90% had a positive experience working with faculty members, and nearly 70% believed the department was satisfactorily prepared in their major area of interest.

Preparation in the major: Examining the data from alumni surveys for 2007 graduates and for graduates from 2002 shows that psychology alumni express overall high levels of satisfaction with their prepared for employment and/or continuing education in psychology.

Last year 84% of psychology alumni rated the overall quality of the psychology program as good or better (compared to 81% over the last six years for the Department). In terms of career path preparation, 65% 2007 graduates rated their degree program as good or better, which compares to 59% overall the last six years. The major was rated as somewhat or very demanding by 53% of the 2007 graduates as compared to 47% of the graduates since 2002. The quality of psychology advisement is rated as good or better by 32% of 2007 graduates, as compared to 47% over the last six years, indicating an area that needs improvement. This is a lagging indicator, however, and we hope that changes in the advising program such as the new assessment procedures that have been implemented with will be reflected in improved future scores.

Furthermore, the average rating for 2007 graduates was only .4 of a standard deviation lower than that for the University as a whole, indicating that the difference between the Department and the University in this area is small (as was the case through except where noted). Student faculty interaction was rated as good or better by 68% of the 2007 graduates as compared to 66% for the last six years. Thus overall, it appears that preparation in the major yielded rising scores this year in all areas except advising, with scores similar to the University overall in all areas.
Employer Satisfaction: Overall employer satisfaction of Psychology alumni is comparable to that of all alumni in all areas. All differences were small and insignificant statistically. Ratings by employers are too few in 2007 for analytic purposes, but examining the data for the last six years shows that employers said they were somewhat or very satisfied with Psychology graduates 95% of the time (as compared to 96% of the time for the University overall).

Employers said that UNR Psychology graduates were less well prepared than those from other Universities only 2% of the time (as compared to 5% of the time for the University overall). Similarly high levels of approval were shown for ethical sensitivity (94% positive vs. 95% positive for the University as a whole), and the quality of a UNR degree (100% positive vs. 95% positive for the University as a whole).

Employment: Only 9% of the 2007 cohort is unemployed, similar to the University rate of 10%. 76% were employed within 3 months, which is within a point of the University rate. More Psychology majors are employed outside of their area, however, which is the flip side of the emphasis on further education seen in earlier sections of the report since Psychology is not a strong specific area of employment at the Bachelor's level. In 2007, 38% of the Psychology graduates found employment closely related to psychology. This compares to 36% in previous years within the major and 63% within the University as a whole.

Overall, psychology graduates are slightly or moderately less positive than average about their major, particularly in their preparation for their career and in faculty-student interactions. Overall, employers of psychology graduates are slightly or moderately more positive than the average employer of a UNR graduate, particularly in the areas of written expression, critical thinking skills, ability to use computers and technology, and the ability to learn continuously. More is expected in the preparation to work ethically.

Department of Sociology

Sociology Program

This review revealed that after refining and revising our 2006 SLOs, they were able to reflect the sociology faculty's goal for their students.

This review revealed a need to refine and revise our previous SLOs as they did not exactly reflect the Sociology faculty's goal for their students.

Our assessment demonstrates that roughly two thirds of our students fully meet program expectations, with the majority of the remaining students substantially meeting expectations. There is a relatively small group of students, though, that does not live up to the expectations. We suspect, though, that the present findings may underestimate the success of our sociology students, simply because for most of the data sources used here it is unclear whether responses pertained to sociology majors or minors (our target groups) or students without any formal commitment to sociology beyond the courses they were taking at the time (e.g., because they took the sociology course to fulfill a core curriculum requirement). This is issue is particularly pressing because the majority of students in SOC 101 classes is non-sociology majors or minors, and because 65% of all responses to the semester student evaluations come from non-sociology students.
Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
Speech Communication Program

1. We continue to see a "performance gap" between presentational skills and interpersonal communication skills. Speech skills are demonstrated in low-enrollment sections (usually 25) with several speech projects, often recorded and always evaluated. The "laboratory" environment is clear. Interpersonal skills must be demonstrated in large sections (35-40 students) with major cognitive content and textbook material. The course syllabi state primarily cognitive learning objectives. These "interpersonal" courses also have high numbers of non-majors; we have no quality control.

Other explanations for low achievement in interpersonal skills include instructor background. Our part-time faculty never experienced laboratory learning when they were students and may not have the teaching methodology to achieve this SLO. Further, the academic focus of interpersonal communication faculty tends to be on studying communication phenomena more than teaching discrete communication skills.

But the most significant problem in achieving this SLO; may be that we do not have the laboratory setting that other skills-based courses have. For example, students in theatre do not learn how to act in a high enrollment course like "Introduction to Theatre"; they learn the skill in small lab courses. CEP majors do not learn counseling skills in large classrooms; they have clinical practica. The same is true in science labs and art studio courses. None of these programs expect cognitively-based courses to teach personal behavioral skills; they separate their curricula to include both types of competency--cognitive and behavioral. Perhaps Speech Communication will never demonstrate broad student competence in personal communication skills until we can (1) reduce class size as in public speaking and acting, (2) create true laboratory courses, (3) restrict enrollment to majors with appropriate background and (4) rethink course objectives and syllabi in interpersonal communication.

2. Non-majors in our 200-400 level courses dilute our assessment process and our achievement of SLO's. Our 2007-08 Self-Study data confirmed that we are teaching primarily non-majors; our courses serve the larger university population. We cannot focus on screened (2.5 gpa) and committed COM majors when they are typically less than 25% of the total class section.

3. Outcomes in critical thinking and theoretical analysis remain marginal. Perhaps some of this disappointing outcome can be explained by a decline in entering student competencies or a lack of classroom time in discussions and written assignments. But whatever the reason or cause, if we expect these outcomes for COM majors we must devise new strategies.

1. We continue to see a "performance gap" between presentational skills and interpersonal communication skills. The intensity of learning activities in public speaking courses is possible because of lower enrollment and major class time devoted to the activity. In contrast, "interpersonal, small group and organizational" communication courses are almost exclusively cognitive in format, even if the learning objectives within the course claim "skills improvement." But these courses have high enrollments. Structured simulation activities in which all students can get practice and receive evaluations are simply too expensive. We do not have the luxury of small performance courses and labs that can build this skill.

2. Competence in fluent extemporaneous delivery is a strong outcome. This skill is an clear expectation of every communication graduate.

3. We have clearly failed to improve student achievement in critical thinking and theoretical analysis. We don't know whether this outcome is partly due to a reduction in emphasis across university curricula, a decline in entering student competencies or a lack of classroom time and assignments. But it is clear that the gap between the high achieving and low achieving students is widest in this area.
1. We need improvement in the percentage of students who can demonstrate, by their senior year, professional-level speech delivery. This skill must include extemporaneous fluency.
2. Our learning activities in COM 113 are intruding on the learning outcomes we seek in COM 213 and 329. Our assessment feedback indicated that the overemphasis on stand-up speaking assignments in 113 takes class time away from one-to-one and small group communications exercises. Our service course clients expect a broad set of cognitive and behavioral outcomes for varied student careers, and COM 13 was too narrow in its methods to achieve SLOs #7 and #8.
3. We are doing a better job with developing student competence in communication principles than with their competence in communication theory.
4. We are doing a better job building student skills to analyze problems and develop strategies than we are at building their behavioral skills to participate in these settings. We have methods to assess cognitive learning but limited classroom methodology to assess behavioral skills in interpersonal settings.
5. We are achieving good results in presentational speaking skills. Senior performance activities show that our graduates can prepare and deliver an effective speech and oral report, requirements in most professional careers. Further, the popular view of a speech major or speech department would view this SLO as our primary mission. Speech communication means giving speeches to audiences. Unfortunately, we define speech communication much more broadly and our mission is to develop a broad communication repertoire in our majors. To develop such skills takes classroom time and creative teaching methodologies, and we have not used either. We have not achieved the interpersonal skills outcome. In #4, these behavioral skills have a lower priority than cognitive competence. In #5, these interpersonal skills have a lower priority than audience speaking.

1. Train new TA's in the revised course plan for COM 113. Last year's assessment led to restructuring the basic course. We reduced emphasis on public speaking and increased activities in interpersonal/small group settings. In other words, we discovered that this basic course is not instrumental in achieving several of our SLO's, and we are letting dedicated 200-300 level public speaking courses achieve them instead.
Informal observation of TA instruction and new COM 113 syllabuses showed that transition by experienced TA's to the revised learning objectives was do-able, but difficult. The methodology of "interpersonal communication" content and activities is much more challenging than public speaking activities. Accordingly, we will ask new TA's to sit in on a summer course in COM 113 and get mentoring from an experienced instructor. The new TA's can then prepare their course outlines and set up learning activities before the fall semester begins.
2. Add a new course in listening and interpersonal skills. The need in last year's assessment report to "create a new course . . . for skills practice in interpersonal communication events" was further confirmed in 2005 data. Our students demonstrate cognitive but not behavioral competence in interpersonal communication strategies. We have now created and gotten approval for a new course COM 311: Listening and Interpersonal Skills. It will be offered in Spring, Summer and Fall 06. While not required, we believe it will be taken by virtually all COM majors and most minors. In 2006, we will attempt to assess whether our students improve in interpersonal competence.
3. Revive an inactive course, COM 212 Communication Research. Previously a requirement for COM majors, this course was deactivated due to insufficient faculty numbers and increasing demand for other courses. But two consecutive assessment years have shown that our students are not achieving in the "theory and research" area of the communication discipline. When we recovered a faculty position last year, we hired someone who specialized in communication research methods. In response to our disturbing student performance noted in SLO #7, the new faculty member re-instituted COM 212, created new course activities appropriate to lower-division majors and taught the class in Fall 05. We now are returning that course to "required" status for COM majors.
1. Ignoring assessment data from COM 113 provides a more accurate performance measure of the B.A. in Speech Communication. None of the 8 SLO's or the percentage of students meeting expectations included COM 113 data. Hence, we are obtaining more accurate assessment of our majors 'and minors' performance.

2. We continue to experience a performance gap between public speaking skills and interpersonal communication skills. Performance on SLO #7 is limited by instructor methodology (choosing cognitive over behavior all earning objectives) and by the sheer size of our "interpersonal communication" courses. We limit presentational speaking courses to 25-28 students, and we spend most of the class time doing speeches. Accordingly, we see observable outcomes. To provide behavioral opportunities to meet SLO #7, we would have to reduce class size to a non-acceptable level. We have learned from this assessment process that whatever outcomes we observe, they result from a student's ability to transfer cognitive competence to behavioral performance.

The Courses and Curriculum Committee of the CLA is another barrier to our efforts to elicit observable behaviors in interpersonal communication courses. They believe that upper-division courses should not include skills, but rather cognitive competencies (principles, theories, research, & literature of the field). The C sends back proposals at the 300-400 level if they include skill-building activities - "such courses belong at the 100-200 level." It appears that while other programs in the fine arts and professional schools are permitted to build skills in 300-400 level courses, speech communication and other social science and humanities departments are not.

Two recent submissions to C&C were designed to address the skill-building outcome- COM 311 (Listening) and COM 313 (Voice). Both courses were sent back and then approved only after we significantly increased cognitive content and reduced the behavioral.

3. Assessment shows that theoretical competence is not being achieved. SLO #5 is being met when we observe students' understanding of communication terms and phenomena, and application of those concepts in problem-solving. When asked to explain and compare theories of communication, most students cannot perform satisfactorily.

**Department of Speech Communication & Theatre**

**Theatre Program**

SLO #1 and 2: More opportunities need to be provided to students for developing resume creation skills and doing presentations/auditions that will be required of them in the professional arena. As per our department mission, we will continue to offer the course work and experiential opportunities (technical assignments and performing roles) needed to help each student become competent in their area(s) of study and have substantial background in theatre Arts.

The Theatre BA program appears to be succeeding in the assessed areas. The means of assessment were modified to a simpler format (questionnaires completed by each graduating senior and by faculty assessing each graduating senior) in an attempt to implement some form of assessment. Data is still being collected.

SLO #1: Some students enter our program knowing their focus will be on technical and/or design aspects of theatre. Most do very well and leave our program with a strong foundation of skills and knowledge in theatrical design and technology. Some are given the opportunity to design or serve in leadership roles (such as Chief Electrician) for main stage productions. This gives them an even more "professional" foundation for their work beyond undergraduate training--whether graduate school or professional theatre or even in K - 12 educational settings. A few students, due to the requirements of the major, even awaken previously undiscovered talents in design/technology areas.

SLO #2: Our curriculum, though somewhat constrained by the size of our faculty, helps to give acting
students a solid foundation in modern acting skills, theories and techniques. We cannot specialize, again due to the small number of instructors dedicated to this area, as much as we would like. But we do offer many opportunities in classroom and on stage for the student to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for the actor. One obstacle to actor training is the difficulty in convincing students that training is needed. It is commonly believed that acting "comes naturally" to individuals. This obstacle is overcome by the approach taking by our acting instructors who create curricula that allows performance students to let go of this false belief and explore the techniques that can lead to strong acting skills.

SLO #3: We continue to struggle with students attempting to "take a day off" or having conflicts with the performance or rehearsal schedule. This usually is caused by newer theatre students not realizing the commitment of time required when working on a production. Also we find the need to reiterate the lines of authority for changes to the assignments and permission to alter assignments or "work around" an absence to each stage manager and assistant stage manager.

The curriculum as it currently stands allows flexibility to a fault. Students are currently allowed to pick and chose courses, which allows for great freedom, but which also allows them to skirt some essential topics.

We lack a set of student learning outcomes for theatre history and literature. We need to develop an assessment tool that tracks number of plays read (genre, period, and style) and essential books from the canon. Many of our courses require important readings; how many of those courses students actually take is not clear (i.e. Students can potentially avoid Theatre History I and II by taking other courses).

Repeatable courses often facilitate a student's ability to avoid unpopular or difficult classes and prevent them from getting essential experiences (i.e. students enroll in 350 and then again in 351 and regularly repeat the same class by enrolling again as 454 and then 455 and in some cases yet again as 654/655 and in extreme cases yet again by enrolling in Independent Study 495/695; while the core content of that course is essentially the same).

The opportunities available to theatre students effectively develop general skills such as teamwork and creative expression as well as effectively provide the future theatre practitioner with skill sets specific to careers in the performing arts.

Department of Women's Studies
Women's Studies Program

Although assessment based on essay exams will provide the Program with information allowing us to assess the outcome that "students will recognize and understand the centrality of gender in everyday life," that alone will not be a completely adequate method. We will develop a key question that students will answer during the exit interview that will assess their understanding of the complex interplay of race, gender and class as they affect the individual's life. Because we also want students to understand feminist theory, we will incorporate a question that allows us to assess theoretical understanding in the thesis defense for those students who choose the thesis option and in the exit interview for those who do not. The above is not based on the student survey given that only one student responded. Rather, it is based on discussion between faculty in the Program.

1. Resistance to acknowledge the centrality of race.
2. Difficulty in understanding the intersection of race/class/gender.
3. Enhanced understanding of the impact of gender in life experiences.
4. Changes to plan are necessary to reflect our increasing understanding of student needs.
Overall, students perform well in our classes because they are connected with creative and interesting reading as well as visual materials and because they are involved in applying materials to their everyday experiences.

It is clear from a review of the material covered on the final exams and presentations in the Women's Studies Capstone courses that the program is shifting to a heavier emphasis on the intersections of race, class and culture and to feminist methods, perspectives, and theories. We need to develop a rubric more sensitive to these areas to be used during our evaluation of indicators. We also need to develop a way to conveniently Overall, while there is some variability in the success with which the program met the goals of having students understand gender as a cultural and structural concept, understand the concept of intersectionality, and effectively integrate feminist theory and method, these expectations were met by the majority of students. Because the concepts are sophisticated and because the expectations are high, we are relatively satisfied with the ability of the program to provide students with the learning outcomes we expect. We are very pleased with our success in gaining students' understandings of gender as structural and cultural rather than as an individual characteristic. We are least satisfied with the degree to which students were able to integrate feminist theory and method.

Our initial data are too small to make for significant findings.

College of Science
Department of Biology
Biology Program

In general, our program is preparing competent graduates who gain sufficient skills and knowledge in the field of Biology as they progress through our curriculum. However, ongoing curricular coordination needs to be conducted in the major course sequence. Pre-tests and surveys in lower and upper division Biology courses have indicated the content that needs to be introduced and/or reemphasized in existing courses. Additionally, it has become clear that our students need to have more laboratory experience to be more competitive in their postgraduate studies and in the workplace.

The Findings are too extensive as to provide specifics. See Updater, which reports on employment, post grad school plans, undergraduate research, technical skill acquisition, suggestions to faculty for improving student library skills, honors & awards, student writing, and 2006 assessment goals.

Assessment in Content Knowledge: The ETS scores for Biology undergraduates were subdivided into two major categories, (1) Cell Biology and (2) Ecology and Population Biology. Comparisons of the mean percentile scores for our students vs. 319 institutions nationwide indicated that our students met, and at times exceeded, the nationwide average in most areas of biological science. Results for Cell Biology students and Ecology students can be found in Figures 1 and 2 (http://unr.edu/homepage/cjhoward/OUA/fig1_2.xls), respectively. Assessment in Technical Skills: Results from a lab practical given in General Biology Lab in Fall 2002 are provided in Table 1 (http://unr.edu/homepage/cjhoward/OUA/table1.doc). Assessment in the Areas of Locating, Evaluating, and Communicating Information: In the area of library research, data from the Biology Department Curricular Map of Undergraduate Course Content (2001-2002) shows that nine out of 17 Biology courses teach students the skills necessary to locate primary literature (ten courses provided no data at the time the map was made). Additionally, students are asked to demonstrate their library skills in 11 Biology courses that require the referencing of
primary literature as part of class assignments. In the area of communication skills, 15 out of 17 courses require writing assignments and 3 out of 17 required student presentations. Six courses, including five required courses, make scientific writing a major theme throughout the semester. A grading rubric for writing was designed by one of our instructors and variations are now being used in three biology course in this department. In the area of evaluation (critical thinking) skills, instructors from 17 courses spend time teaching critical thinking in their courses. Five instructors have made it a major emphasis for their course (all 5 are required courses).

Assessment in the Area of Applied Knowledge: Keeping track of trends in student internship experiences is one way for the department to monitor changes in student involvement in experiential learning. Our records show that students seeking undergraduate research have remained constant over the last four years, averaging 21 students per semester (Figure 3: http://unr.edu/homepage/cjhoward/OUA/fig3.xls). In addition, there are students who have left Biology and moved to our new Biotechnology Program. The Biotechnology Program began in Fall 2001 and is designed to allow student to gain a combined Bachelor and Masters Degree in five years. Ten of the 22 students who have participated in this program have come from the Biology Department. We expect to see this program continue to grow as part of a joint effort by the administration and faculty members in Biology, Biochemistry and Animal Science.

Undergraduate experiential learning also includes teaching. Our Science Partners program pairs undergraduates with elementary school teachers. Undergraduates teach science to students at the grade level in which they are assigned. The Science Partners course has had 66 students participate in biology-related teaching since the inception of this program four years ago. Another teaching-related experience our undergraduates involve themselves in is the "dissection team". Students on the dissection team prepare specimens for the anatomy and physiology courses. They also facilitate in the running of the lab sections. Approximately seven students a semester are on the dissection team. Numbers are expected to grow due to the increasing demand for more sections of this course.

**Department of Chemistry**

**Chemistry Program**

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle two) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for assessment cycle two evaluations; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 2 years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.

Conclusions on program assessment await the evaluation of student performance on our assessment tools to be performed early in the fall semester, according to the implementation schedule of our Assessment Plan.

Several key findings became apparent by the end of the first 4 years of assessment following at the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the second 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2008 we complete the planned first 4-year cycle of evaluations. A comprehensive review of the four 4-cycles of
assessment comprises our 2008 report, and serves as the first "baseline" data set as we proceed into a 2nd 4-year cycle of assessment. In 2009, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially in view of the curriculum changes mandated by the American Chemical Society for certification.

Several key findings have become apparent at this mid stage of implementation (cycle three) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle three of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2007 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations and in 2008 we start a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time, alterations in the plan may be expected.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle one) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle one evaluations; with only small numbers in the data pool, the % values can be perturbed easily; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this mid stage of implementation (cycle four) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
1. graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
2. achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
3. with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2007 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations. A comprehensive review of the four 4-cycles of assessment will be made in 2008 before we start a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially in view of the curriculum changes proposed by the American Chemical Society.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Environmental Program

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle one) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle one evaluations; with only small numbers in the data pool, the % values can be perturbed easily; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically meaningful data can be obtained following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations. This is especially true of this particular B.S. degree, where the data pool (1-2 students) is so small over the short evaluation period that only meaningful numbers could be obtained by combining the small number of BS-CHEM-Environmental option students with the other BS-CHEM students for courses taken in common.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle two) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for assessment cycle two evaluations; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 4 years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2007 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations, and in 2008 we start a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time alterations in the assessment plan may be discussed and anticipated

Several key findings became apparent by the end of the first 4 years of assessment following at the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the second 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2008 we complete the planned first 4-year cycle of evaluations. A comprehensive review of the four 4-cycles of assessment comprises our 2008 report, and serves as the first "base line" data set as we proceed into a 2nd 4-year cycle of assessment. In 2009, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially in view of the curriculum changes mandated by the American Chemical Society for certification.

Several key findings have become apparent at this stage of implementation (cycle four) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
1. graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
2. achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
3. with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.
In 2008 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2008 a comprehensive review of the first 4-year cycle will be undertaken before we start a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time alterations in the assessment plan will be discussed especially in view of the curriculum changes proposed by the American Chemical Society.

Conclusions on program assessment await the evaluation of student performance on our assessment tools to be performed early in the Fall semester, according to the implementation schedule of our Assessment Plan.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Professional Program

Several key findings have become apparent at this mid stage of implementation (cycle four) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
1. graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
2. achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
3. with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.
In 2008 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations and in 2008 a comprehensive review of the first 4-year cycle will be undertaken before starting a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially view of curriculum changes being proposed by the American Chemical Society.

Conclusions on program assessment await the evaluation of student performance on our assessment tools to be performed early in the Fall semester, according to the implementation schedule of our Assessment Plan.
Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle one) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle one evaluations; with only small numbers in the data pool, the % values can be perturbed easily; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings became apparent by the end of the first 4 years of assessment following at the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the second 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2008 we complete the planned first 4-year cycle of evaluations. A comprehensive review of the four 4-cycles of assessment comprises our 2008 report, and serves as the first "base line" data set as we proceed into a 2nd 4-year cycle of assessment.; In 2009, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially in view of the curriculum changes mandated by the American Chemical Society for certification.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle two) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle two of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this mid stage of implementation (cycle three) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well;
(2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle three of our annual evaluation process; and
(3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2007 we complete the planned 4-year cycle of evaluations and in 2008 we start a 2nd 4-year cycle. At that time, alterations in the plan may be expected.

Department of Geography
Geography Program

At the end of the 2006-2007 academic year there were 80 geography majors. The geography majors are split between an older curriculum which leads to a Bachelor of Science in Geography and two degree programs that began this year, which lead to Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees.
The following courses are required as "Geography Core Courses" for under both the new curriculums:
GEOG 103 - Introduction to Physical Geography
GEOG 106 - Introduction to Cultural Geography
GEOG 200 - World Regional Geography
GEOG 210 - Mapping Planet Earth OR GEOG 205 - Appl. of Geographic Information Systems
GEOG 312 - Cartography OR GEOG 311 - Maps and Image Interpretation
GEOG 314 - Field Methods
GEOG 325 - Research Methods
GEOG 418 - Geographic Thought
In the fall 2006 semester the department taught two sections of GEOG 103, two sections of GEOG 106, one section of GEOG 200, one section of GEOG 210, one section of GEOG 312, one section of GEOG 314 and one section of GEOG 325. In the spring 2007 semester the department taught two sections of GEOG 103, one section of GEOG 106, one section of GEOG 210 and one section of GEOG 418. Thus of the fourteen required courses offered during the academic year, the fall 2006 semester offered nine courses as compared to five courses in the spring 2007 semester. Each of the Geography core courses were offered at least once except GEOG 205 and GEOG 311, which are irregular offerings. These required courses for geography majors under the new BA and BS curriculum are the focus of this analysis for the first three student learning outcomes. In these learning outcomes, 75% was used as a threshold to identify whether a course extensively developed a skill or not. The fourth student learning outcome is assessed from data compiled in a College of Science exit survey of graduating seniors with geography majors.

Assessment of upper division students over the past year has determined that student performance on learning outcomes 1 and 4 is within the expectations of the faculty. In-class, field-based, and laboratory instruction appear to be program strengths. Students' oral communication skills were adequate, and their ability to present information convincingly using maps and posters is acceptable. PowerPoint skills vary to an unreliable degree. With the changes planned in the major (broadening it to two tracks, one a bachelor of arts, with a foreign language requirement, the other a bachelor of science degree, with a stronger emphasis on in-geography coursework and a larger number of techniques courses required), we expect student performance in all outcomes to improve, somewhat. But we also note that there is variability from year to year, and as the first year with formal evaluation of students using this rubric, we have no basis for comparison besides anecdote. We are making significant curriculum changes to the geography program and therefore this report for next year will include some different responses to perceived problems, in light of those modifications.

Our key finding is that, based on skills assessments and regular work with student-majors, student skills are picking up appropriately. In many of the skill areas that are most strongly emphasized within the program, student numbers are up, in some cases dramatically, from 2006-2007, the first year of data accumulation. In Outcome #1, writing and verbal skill work could be improved — but it needs to be recognized that the numbers are down (slightly) in large measure because they are down in the lower division courses taught to non-majors. Since we have been told repeatedly that the prime concern in Assessment relates to MAJORS, we take that instruction at face value. However, since GEOG 103, GEOG 106, and GEOG 200 are each core courses for some program or another (Natural Sciences "B," Core Curriculum, or College of Education Second Education majors), we will want to make further efforts to refine that material, so students are encouraged to develop all the skills that we associate with a successful student of geography, major or not.

At the end of the start of the 2007-2008 academic year there were 80 geography majors; in September 2008, with the start of the new academic year, the department UG census (all undergraduate degrees) is at 82 students. The geography majors are split between an older curriculum that leads to a Bachelor of Science in Geography and two degree programs that began in 2006-2007, which lead to either a Bachelor of Science or a Bachelor of Arts Degrees. We would like to boost those numbers, but we also recognize that we have a large number of junior and senior-level students who need to be brought toward graduation. This is an advising push, within the department Â¿ not necessarily part of the core Assessment process, but certainly, moving some credit-heavy students to graduation is an important metric within the department.

The following courses are required as "Geography Core Courses" for under both new curricula:
GEOG 103 - Introduction to Physical Geography
GEOG 106 - Introduction to Cultural Geography
GEOG 200 - World Regional Geography
In the fall 2007 semester the department taught two sections of GEOG 103, one section of GEOG 106, one section of GEOG 200, one section of GEOG 210, one section of GEOG 312, one section of GEOG 314 and one section of GEOG 325. In the spring 2008 semester the department taught two sections of GEOG 103, one section of GEOG 106, one section of GEOG 210, one section of GEOG 312, one section of GEOG 314, and one section of GEOG 418. Thus of the fourteen required courses offered during the academic year, the fall 2007 semester offered eight courses as compared to six courses in the spring 2008 semester. Each of the Geography core courses was offered at least once except GEOG 205, which is an irregular offering; GEOG 311 was taught in Spring 2008. These required courses for geography majors under the relatively new BA and BS curriculum are the focus of this analysis for the first three student learning outcomes. In these learning outcomes, 75% was used as a threshold to identify whether a course extensively developed a skill or not. The fourth student-learning outcome is assessed from data compiled in a College of Science exit survey of graduating seniors with geography majors.

While the results are limited by a reasonably small number of classes and only a few student self-assessments, the results indicate that analytical skills, such as memorizing, analyzing and judgment, are widely integrated by instructors across geography core courses and from the students' perspective, the same skills were reported high consistently. Skill development in library and archival research, field work, qualitative analysis and applications was moderately widespread, as reported in courses by both instructors and students. Instructors and student alike reported few or no courses that developed skills in computing and quantitative analysis. Curiously, skills in synthesizing and accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy showed a marked discrepancy between instructors, who did not identify developing these skills, and students, who largely felt these skills were developed. More seniors identified they had developed strong skills in library and archival research; computing; quantitative analysis; qualitative analysis; accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy; analyzing, and synthesizing than those who felt these skills were relatively weak. By contrast, there were more reports by seniors with weaker skill development in the areas of field work and applications. While the results are limited by a reasonably small number of classes and only a few student self-assessments, the results indicate that skills in perception and geography, regional understanding, physical geographic analysis, and human-environment interactions are more widely integrated by instructors across geography core courses than spatial analysis skills. From the students' perspective, these same trends were apparent. By contrast, twice as many seniors (10) felt that they had developed strong spatial analysis skills than those who felt these skills were relatively weak (5). From the standpoint of seniors' self-assessment, six students felt they had developed strong skills in cultural interpretation of place and landscape and five students would have liked to develop these skills more extensively. Human-environment interactions also stands out for being an area of senior's strength (with 4 students reporting) and one student reporting this as weakness in their program. While the results are limited by a reasonably small number of classes and only a few student self-assessments, the results indicate that writing skills are more widely integrated by instructors across the Geography core courses than oral presentations and visual communications. From the students' perspective, writing was also developed in more courses, followed by oral presentations and then visual communications. While an equal number of students felt that they were strong writers compared to those who believed they were relatively weak writers, more students felt they were not proficient in oral presentations than those who identified this as one of their strengths. More students felt that visual communication was one of their major strengths than those who considered this skill to be underdeveloped.
Overall, very high levels of satisfaction for each these factors - in all but one case the program rates far above university averages -- underscore how geographic knowledge is effectively being put into daily practice through the program curriculum, advising and interactions with faculty members.

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Geological Engineering Program**

Some GE students are a concern with respect to ethics and ethical behavior. Most GE students, however, are performing at an excellent and very high level.

1. FE exam may indicate a problem with students' ability to apply knowledge;
2. In contrast, UNR GE students perform well in upper-level GE design classes; and
3. Student attitudes toward UNR Core Curriculum may be a problem that requires attention.

Student quality has improved markedly; at least 5 honors students are declared geological engineering majors.
Faculty in the geological engineering program must set the example for proper ethical and professional behavior.

1. FE exam results may not be accurate for assessment purposes;
2. Employers may be dissatisfied with BSGE students’ ability to communicate in writing and orally; and
3. Employers are concerned about problem solving skills and ethical judgment.

1. Whether BSGE students have a good sense of ethics is poorly understood;
2. Students are not able to effectively design a process to grid a set of spatial data;
3. BSGE students may have some weakness with respect to critical thinking skills;
4. BSGE students are performing well on the FE exam;
5. BSGE students work well with others and are respectful of others;
6. Improved assessment metrics are needed to better understand students' ability to visualize in 3D and to measure their understanding of the societal context of engineering; and
7. All BSGE faculty must become engaged in assessment; this is not happening at the moment

There are presently more than 70 undergraduate majors in geological engineering at UNR. The quality of these students is very high. Students are motivated, mature, and more than one are members of the UNR Honors Program. Classroom performance, with the exception of mathematics, is good to excellent. All graduates have earned jobs in their fields or have been admitted into graduate programs.

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Geology Program**

The coordinator job was recently handed over to me. Therefore, we have no data to report at this time. Beginning now, we will start collecting the data specified in the plan.

Our new plan was submitted in January 2007. We are in the process of implementation, and do not yet have any data.
Department of Geological Sciences
Geophysics Program

A strong indicator of our program's success is that in the extended tracking period (beginning in 2000) all of our graduates have gone on to graduate or professional schools or taken professional positions in industries utilizing their training. Specifically during the 2003-2004 academic year, two remarkable undergraduates completed B.S. Geophysics degrees under the guidance of Geophysics Associate Professor John Louie. Dr. Louie employed each of them on his research projects which enhanced their undergraduate experiences with real-world problems and learning opportunities that many graduate assistants would envy.

Dr. Louie reports:
Student A graduated in May 2004 with a 3.9/4.0 GPA, having completed a Senior Thesis applying geophysical methods to investigate the engineering stability of the Mt. St. Helens volcanic edifice. Mr. A held a UNR Undergraduate Research Award for this project. I employed him for more than two years; his productivity in my research program was so comprehensive that he is first author of two papers submitted to refereed journals and appears as a co-author of two more. In addition, he presented five papers at national scientific conferences, and appears as a co-author of nine more presentations. Mr. A is pursuing a Ph.D. degree in Geophysics at the University of Washington under Prof. S. Malone.
Student B graduated in May 2004. I employed her for more than two years; her productivity in my research program was unusual for an undergraduate. She presented two papers at national scientific conferences, and appears as a co-author of six more presentations. Ms. Rasmussen is now a practicing geological engineer employed by a consultancy in southern California.

For graduates of the BS geophysics degree program, 3 UNR Student Survey and 2 Employer Survey responses were available for the 2002 through 2007 survey cohorts. As highlights, all three program Alumni rate the overall quality of the program and preparation in major as excellent. The two Employers responding to the survey rated our BS program graduates as better prepared than graduates from other institutions. Employer responses rated students as very prepared (50%) to somewhat prepared (50%) for all expected working skills.

An analysis of student attrition and major changes into and out of the program suggests the process is beneficial to students and the program. Curricula of the various geoscience degree programs do not become significantly differentiated until the 3rd or 4th years, with the geophysics program placing more emphasis on math and physics courses at that time. This may help explain why about 50% of students experimenting with a geo-physics major may switch to another UNR program within their first year. As students develop and take measure of their strengths and preferences in the sciences, they refine their degree program choices. However, most departing students stay within UNR's geoscience or engineering related programs and are not delayed in time to graduation. Similarly, the BS geophysics program attracts a number of upper division and transfer students that have made a carefully studied change of major. This university wide exploration of degree and career choices is useful and necessary and yields a qualified, self-selected group of upper division geophysics majors. The contributing program faculty derive pride from the trend that most of these geophysics upper division students will graduate from the program and all of those that graduate will build careers using their degrees.

A strong indicator of our program’s success is the finding that during the assessment period one hundred percent of our graduates have gone on to graduate or professional schools or taken professional positions in industries utilizing their training.

A need to improve student advisement and assessment documentation at the department level was identified. This will simplify the assessment information collection process.

The potential of the assessment process to assist with student advisement was recognized. Early recognition of weak progress toward the learning outcomes will allow corrective student advisement, including the use of electives to strengthen deficiencies.
The assessment process has identified the need for program change in:
1. the advising structure;
2. math and physics emphasis; and
3. annual course offerings.

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Hydrogeology Program**

Enrollment in the Hydrogeology undergraduate degree has grown to the largest it has been in recent years, with an increase from 7 students in 2006 to 10 students enrolled in 2007. This is consistent in overall enrollment increases in the Earth Sciences.

During the 2006/2007 academic year, there were no graduating seniors from the program.

As the Assessment Plans for several other majors in the Geological Sciences and Engineering Department have undergone revision in late 2007, the Assessment Plan for the Hydrogeology Degree is also undergoing revision to be consistent with these new and more appropriate vehicles. As a result of these changes and the fact that significant numbers of students are in the pipeline, further assessment data were not collected and the Assessment Plan is being revised.

**Department of Mathematics & Statistics**

**Mathematics & Statistics Program**

1. Student performance in modeling and problem solving indicates a high level of success.
2. Students' ability to write clear coherent arguments is a SLO that needs improvement.
3. Students in the BS program are acquiring the desired computer skills.

**Department of Mining Engineering**

**Mining Engineering Program**

Students in the mining engineering program are meeting the program learning objectives. Continuous incremental changes to the program will be implemented such as course curriculum changes.

**Department of Physics**

**Physics Program**

The indication is that the Physics program significantly meets its objectives.

100% of Physics BS graduates interviewed by UNR who graduated from 2002-2008 were employed, 50% as graduate assistants. Institutions where UNR graduates are pursuing advanced degrees include Cambridge University (England), the University of Texas at Austin, Carnegie Mellon University, and UNR. 50% secured their first employment position before graduation, and an additional 25% secured a position within 6 months of graduation. Most employers surveyed found UNR Physics BS graduates to be Somewhat or Very prepared to perform their work.

36% of Physics BS graduates interviewed rated the overall quality of the Physics program Excellent,
and an additional 36% rated it Good. 21% rated their preparation for their career Excellent, and 29% rated it Good. 86% rated the academic advisement they received Excellent (29%) or Good (57%). 71% rated their interactions with Physics faculty Excellent, while 14% rated them Good.

The students' success indicates they are getting good preparation for jobs and graduate school. Students' basic understanding of fundamental physical laws and skills in reporting results have benefited from the 2007-2008 improvements in undergraduate laboratory courses. These improvements included developing new experiments, implementing a new computer network, updating the lab manuals, developing rubrics for more rigorous grading, and improving the synchronization of labs with lectures.

In summary, the Physics BS program is very successful. We will continue to recruit students, to ensure a critical mass of students in the program.

Relying on "self-reporting" by the students regarding portfolios etc was an error in implementation this year. Next year faculty and teaching assistants will be proactive in data collection.

100% of Physics BS graduates interviewed by UNR who graduated from 2002-2005 were employed, most as graduate assistants. 100% rated the overall quality of the Physics program Excellent or Good, 86% rated their preparation for their career Excellent or Good, and 100% rated their interactions with Physics faculty Excellent or Good. Student satisfaction was corroborated in the exit interviews. This indicates the Physics BS program is very successful.

**Division of Health Sciences**

**Department of Health Ecology**

**Health Ecology Program**

We are doing well in most areas of our student learning outcomes. The biggest area for improvement is in increasing our students' written communication skills.

We are doing well in most areas of our student learning outcomes. The biggest area for improvement is in increasing our students' written communication skills.

**Department of Nursing**

**Nursing Program**

Students continue to have difficulty with test taking, utilizing critical thinking, and integrating theory into practice.

Only about 70% of students are adequately prepared to pass the NCLEX-RN. Program review and revision will be started.

**Department of Social Work**

**Social Work Program**

On use of the Curriculum Mapping Instrument it is noted that improvement of scores occurred from Fall Semester to Spring Semester indicating higher levels of intellectual processing. Additionally, these
findings were supported by Field Instructor Evaluation of social work students. This also supports the cognitive processing and increased scores on those courses that build from previous courses as outlined by Bloom's taxonomy.

Social Work undergraduate students continue to be rated quite favorably by the School of Social Work Instructor's Evaluation of Field Practicum program outcomes. The majority of students fully meet expectations of identified outcomes over 80% of the time. The only outcome needing further assessment by school faculty is in the area of students being able to evaluate research studies and applying the findings to practice.

Social Work undergraduate students continue to be rated quite favorably by the School of Social Work Instructor's Evaluation of Field Practicum program outcomes. The majority of students fully meet expectations of identified outcomes over 70% of the time. The only outcome needing further assessment by school faculty is in the area of students demonstrating a beginning knowledge of research as a social work practice tool.

1. We continue to excel in teaching the values and ethics of the profession to our students. Student ratings rose even further, surpassing our 2001 ratings and the national average of BSW student ratings in this area.
2. Student response to doubling the amount of theory instruction has been positive with the student ratings increasing almost a full point.
3. The methods course related to instruction about intervention with communities was also related to a rise in ratings of a full point.
4. Student ratings increased for every Student Learning Outcome, suggesting that the changes that have been implemented have positively affected the overall program.

Social Work undergraduate students continue to be rated quite favorably by the School of Social Work Instructors' Evaluations of Field Practicum program outcomes. As noted on the outcome results, the majority of students fully meet expectations for school outcomes over 80% of the time. The only outcome that continues needing further assessment by school faculty is in the area of students being able to evaluate research studies and applying the findings to practice.
1. Areas for further curriculum development relate to student use of theoretical frameworks and ways to influence social policies.
2. Areas where we are doing well and would like to continue to excel relate to values and ethics. This is an important area for the profession because values and ethics define who we are as social workers.

Reynolds School of Journalism
Department of Journalism
Journalism Program

The feedback from all of those devices led us to a curriculum revision of the entry core (the first four journalism classes) that goes into effect in the fall. It requires an accelerated introduction to the technologies used in journalism as we prepare students to deal with converged media. In other words, students won't learn just print journalism; they'll learn how to deliver the news in a variety of ways, from the Internet to video to print. In fall 08, we also introduced a change in the advertising/PR sequence: We combined two intro classes into one so that advertising students learn public relations and vice-versa.
The program is successful at achieving SLOs. Students are achieving program goals and graduate students met goals with high degree of success. All graduate students passed the national board examination in 2008. The mean test score for our graduate students was well above the national average.

Although the majority of students have been successful, we have evaluated weakness and decided that a new course was needed to address a gap in the curriculum. A new course has been designed and is under review by the Course and Curriculum Committee.

The assessment method is a valid indicator of achievement.

The SLOs for the UG program progress from basic levels to more advanced levels. Examination of the percentages associated with each SLO shows that as students progress through the program success rates improve. This probably reflects attrition of weak students and maturation of retained students.
Program Key Findings: Masters Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Animal Biotechnology
Animal Science Program

Both students who graduated from the program during the period fully met all expectations. At this point, it appears that our students are receiving adequate training to allow them to excel in the various areas we have selected to assess.

Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biochemistry Program

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry M.S. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.
Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last three years particularly in the area of plant molecular biology and protein structural analysis research.
Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of UNR campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry M.S. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.
Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last three years particularly in the area of plant molecular biology and protein structural analysis research.
Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of UNR campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars.
The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry M.S. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last three years particularly in the area of plant research.

Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry M.S. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the intimate research environment it affords. The students liked the accessibility of the faculty and the excellent quality of research mentors. Students noted better communication about the structural requirements of graduate committees. Students have experienced less confusion about program requirements due to better communication by the graduate program director.

Weaknesses: One weakness of the program is that it lacks rigorous advisement and a well-structured core curriculum during the first year. Students would like to have a core curriculum during the first year while they are conducting their research rotations. A continuing major weakness of the program is that students feel that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, students thought that a graduate level course in cancer biology and plant molecular biology should be offered. Students thought that they should also be advised more aggressively to hold more committee meetings in order to gather input and research advice from graduate committee members. Students would like to see more team taught courses offered. Shorter rotations would be desirable so that the students do not waste time in lab in which they do not intend to stay.

Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

Biotechnology (Dual Degree) Program

SLO1: From the cumulative data obtained from the 2007 and 2008 Biotechnology graduating classes, it appears that our students have been judged to highly qualified to pursue research and professional careers by a diverse set of stakeholders including academic and industrial laboratory employers and advanced degree admissions committees.

SLO2: From the seminar reports we have been able to obtain a good sense of the breadth and depth of each student's knowledge base and how it changes over their time in the program. A general trend that we found was that the seminar reports were better written and more sophisticated as students progressed through the program. Such progress was also observed in fourth year students as they submitted more reports.

SLO3: The student presenters of the best talk and poster are each provided with a cash award and a certificate. Informal discussion with the judges provided Biotech faculty with an over assessment of the overall student No results have yet been returned to us regarding the alumni and employer surveys.
Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
Natural Resource & Environmental Science Program

All of the four students who graduated from the degree program during the period substantially met expectations.

Overall seven students successfully completed their MS degrees during the 2007-2008 academic year, which is in line with the average of previous years. All students except one fully met expectations in most categories, and one student substantially met expectations in all categories. One or two theses will very likely result in publications with the student as first author. Of the few performances that were rated less than fully meeting expectations, oral presentations and demonstration of technical expertise were the causes. The two students completing B track theses tended to rate lower on the categories of development of experimental ideas, experimental design and instrumental methods. This may be due to the criteria being designed to reflect the research thesis track.

The range of thesis topics was impressive: from wildlife population dynamics, to landscape ecology, to watershed science. This is in keeping with the original concept of the degree as an interdisciplinary degree designed to take advantage of the wide range of expertise and high level of available research funding available in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences. All of the students were admitted on the basis of the availability of research assistantships, funded mainly by external research grants. This is a great advantage for the MS students that have funding (based on satisfactory progress), a general topic, and one that is applied. Thus, these students can claim applied science, understanding of theory, and in at least one case, admission to a Ph.D. Program.

Key deficiencies: First, the lack of halftime teaching assistantships, particularly those that can be assigned during the recruitment period are, and have been a severe handicap in recruiting the best first year students. We can contrast this with the situation in other Colleges who can accept students without necessarily having the research funding in place so far ahead of time. We should seek any way of having reliable TAs's ships that can be promised in March before the students all accept somewhere else. Another comment that has been made in faculty meetings concerns the small number of 700 level courses available, especially in the Fall semesters. We should make sure that there is no decrease in the frequency of 700 level courses, particularly those with lab/field course sections.

Ensuring the quality of incoming students is largely due to a screening by the grad school and the needs of faculty for a student to cover a recently received grant. We should make sure that our acceptance is based just on the need to fill a position.

Department of Nutrition  
Nutrition Program

The Nutrition Department MS Program remains very small. Three students were enrolled during this period. Two have successfully completed their MS programs and are employed locally, one as an MS-RD, the other as a research associate with the local branch of Charles River.

Based on the learning outcomes identified here, the Nutrition Graduate Program is providing students with the knowledge and skills required for careers in nutrition or advanced degree programs. It is important to note however, that there were only four students enrolled in the program during the 2007-08 academic year.
When the PhD program was developed and launched the department changed its focus from a MS to a PhD oriented graduate program. No new PhD courses were developed, instead the MS courses were upgraded to meet PhD standards. The intention was that any new students would be admitted to the PhD program but if they failed to pass the qualifying exams after the first year of core theory and quantitative coursework they would be transferred to the MS program and the PhD coursework they had taken up to that point would be the basis for continuation toward the MS degree. The most important key finding from assessment is that we need to find an alternative that allows students to enroll in an MS degree program without requiring them to take the same PhD theory sequence of courses that the PhD students must take. These courses are too difficult for many MS students to handle coming directly from an undergraduate degree, unless they have also taken a highly mathematical set of courses as undergraduates. Students find themselves having to make the choice of taking additional math courses to prepare for the PhD level coursework, or take the chance of doing poorly grade-wise in these courses as they compete with PhD students. While it may be argued that their level of mastery of economic theory and methods is far in advance of many MS programs, in many cases the needs of employers who hire economists with MS degrees is not for them to have had a highly theoretical background, but rather to have had training in practical applications.

First, M.S. students may benefit more from a less mathematical treatment of microeconomic theory. Second, M.S. students may be better prepared for their careers with more applied econometric training and with knowledge of canned statistical software.

Overall, the Department's assessment activities revealed that students continue to acquire high proficiency in statistical and econometric methods, as well as programming and general computation skills throughout the Program. However, with the modification of APST 750, our Masters program has become even more quantitative and technically challenging. Future recruitment and assistantship considerations will need to be more sensitive to the level of mathematical preparation of applying candidates than they have been in the past. These efforts should identify the need for remedial coursework in this area, with new student advisement adjusted accordingly.

Our key findings are that better training in economic theory and more experience in problem solving activities are viewed by students and faculty as areas requiring some program modifications.

Overall, the Department's assessment activities revealed that students acquire high proficiency in statistical and econometric methods, as well as programming and general computation skills throughout the Program. Alumni feedback indicates that these skills are generally crucial in securing employment or admission to reputable PhD programs, and translate directly into a competitive edge over Master level students from other programs. At the same time, however, student assessment and alumni feedback revealed that the Program's course sequence in micro-theory could benefit from a revision along two axes: 1) inclusion of modern theoretical topics such as game theory, contract theory, and models of asymmetric information, and 2) the provision of or requirement of remedial courses for new students to assure homogeneity in preparatory background upon commencement of theoretical coursework. Furthermore, tight supervision of theses / professional papers and substantial course projects will be needed to ascertain students' ability to better capitalize on quantitative proficiency by better and more effectively communicating results and findings to both peers and a non-technical audience.

Firstly, the coordination and the content of the microeconomic theory sequence APEC 710 and APEC 720 were apparently found to be confusing to students and these courses were not entirely successful at
developing important recurrent concepts over the two semesters. Secondly, graduate students benefit from additional projects which require the application and interpretation of statistical or econometric methods. Thirdly, the ability of students to develop analytical and problem solving abilities has appeared to have plateaued.

College of Business Administration
Department of Accounting
Accountancy Program

The assessment process for the Masters of Accountancy degree has been a developmental learning process this year. It has pointed out the deficiencies in our annual plan and the information gathering process. The following problems have been identified.

For the first and second objectives measures are available. However we have faced the problem that we have had instructors who have left the University and instructors who are temporary lecturers. In both cases, we did not capture data from their classes for use as assessment measures. We have also experienced situations where grades have not been retained or suitably fine enough detail of grades has not been recorded to provide adequate measures. In addition we may be trying to collect too many assessment measures related to one learning Goal.

The graduate faculty will refine the goals and assessment measures for the current year to make them more measurable.

Notwithstanding the process that has been used this year, the conclusion is that our graduate students are overwhelmingly meeting expectations from the MACC program.

Due to the small number of students, the measures remain slightly weak. We have had no non-performing graduate students in the MACC and all students have successfully proceeded through the program.

Based on very limited data from the alumni survey and faculty personal knowledge, all of our graduates have jobs in their chosen field. The university survey indicates that salaries earned by our graduates are significantly higher than the university graduate average.

No serious weaknesses are identified in the program or our students.

The assessment process has contributed little to our program evaluation again this year. A number of factors contribute to this. Firstly, the sample data are very small and provide very little information that is not already known. Secondly, the program does not have mandatory courses that all students must take. This means that we are unable to measure core knowledge of all students. Thirdly, we have a problem of having a significant number of courses taught by temporary faculty and we do not capture good data from these courses.

The principal findings are, firstly, that we have generally one or two non-performing students in each area. We have considered whether admission standards should have barred these students from entry into the program. Our conclusion is that this is not a problem since these students generally fail to complete the program. Secondly, we have an issue over close supervision of temporary faculty other than through student evaluations. This matter may need to be addressed by the MACC director to ensure that courses cover required topics and are rigorously assessed. Thirdly, the fact that we do not have a required core of courses is an issue that will be considered in the revisions to the master’s curriculum currently taking place.

Because of the size of the program, the extent of meaningful assessment data obtained is questionable. However, the measures appear to indicate a high level of achievement by students. In addition
employment date and satisfaction ratings from alumni appear to indicate that the program is operating successfully. All six graduates are employed in fields relating to the degree and their median salary is approximately $25,000 higher than graduates from other degree programs. All rate the quality of the degree program as excellent or good.

Department of Accounting
Information Systems Program

SLO's in this new master’s degree seem reasonable for 788 and 670.

Department of Business Administration
Business Administration Program

I'm pleased to report the results of the 2007 EBI exit survey for the UNR MBA program, based on surveys completed by students in the capstone course, BADM 781 in December 2006 and May 2007. The survey results are compiled by EBI and compared with aspirational and peer schools (6 in each category) that were selected based on consultation with the MBA Policy Committee. There were 86 participant schools for the 2007 EBI exit survey of part-time MBA programs, and 18 of these had the Carnegie Class designation.

Highlights of the 2007 EBI Survey of MBA Program:
1) Compared against the 6 aspirational schools, UNR MBA was ranked in the top 4 in 8 out of 15 factors. The results are: learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 2nd), overall program effectiveness (ranked 3rd), curriculum: addresses ethics and social issues (ranked 3rd), curriculum: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 3rd), advising (3rd), learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 4th), critical thinking and problem solving (ranked 4th), and program office services (ranked 3rd); and
2) Compared against the 22 participating Carnegie Class schools in the EBI part-time MBA surveys, UNR MBA was ranked in the top 10 in 8 out of 15 factors. The results are: learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 5th), overall program effectiveness (ranked 6th), curriculum: addresses ethics and social issues (ranked 6th), curriculum: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 6th), learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 7th), critical thinking and problem solving (ranked 7th), program office services (ranked 9th), and facilities and computing resources (ranked 9th).

The results of the 2004 AACSB/EBI exit studies for the COBA MBA program, are based on surveys completed by students in the capstone course, BADM 781, in December 2003 and May 2004. The survey results are compiled by EBI and compared with 6 aspirational schools. There were 91 participant schools in 2004 for the AACSB/EBI exit study for part-time MBA programs, and 22 of these had the Carnegie Class designation. Our survey results were compared with all schools and with the Carnegie subset. The aspirational schools were: Arizona State University, Georgia State University, Michigan State University, Santa Clara University, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and the University of Rochester.

The EBI survey has two parts. Part one asks questions on program demographics (questions A-L) and student evaluations of its instructional quality (questions N and O). Part two consists of 70 questions exploring specific program elements. There are 7 options for each of the 70 questions. Responses are numerically calculated and reported by EBI using a scale of 1 to 7, where the scores of 1 and 7 represent lowest and highest levels, respectively.
The questions are grouped to identify 15 program assessment factors.
1. Faculty and Instruction for Required Courses
2. Faculty and Instruction for Elective Courses
3. Satisfaction with Elective Courses
4. Breadth of the Curriculum
5. Curriculum Addresses Ethics and Social Issues
6. Faculty and Non-Faculty Advising
7. Program Office Services
8. Facilities and Computing Resources
9. Fellow Students
10. Course Availability
11. Learning Outcomes: Effective Communication and Team Work
12. Learning Outcomes: Use and Manage Technology
13. Learning Outcomes: Effective Management and Leadership Skills
14. Learning Outcomes: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
15. Overall Satisfaction with the Program.

Highlights:
1. Responses of the UNR graduating MBA class gave our program a higher average ranking than the select aspirational schools in 14 out of 15 factors. The UNR MBA was ranked first in overall program satisfaction (Factor 15), learning outcomes related to use and management of technology (Factor 12), and learning outcomes related to effective communication and team work (Factor 11). The UNR MBA was ranked second in program office services (Factor 7), faculty and instruction for elective courses (Factor 2), and breadth of the curriculum (Factor 4).
2. Responses of the UNR graduating MBA class gave our program a higher average ranking than the select peer schools in all of 15 factors.
3. The UNR MBA program had a higher average than the Carnegie group in all 15 factors. We ranked first in overall program satisfaction (Factor 15), second in program office services (Factor 7), breadth of the curriculum (Factor 4), learning outcomes related to effective management and leadership skills (Factor 13), and satisfaction with elective courses (Factor 3).
4. 92% of the UNR MBA graduating class had at least 2 years of full-time work experience prior to being admitted. The respective averages for the select aspirational schools and Carnegie group were 93% and 89%.
5. 88% of our graduating class earned salaries of at least $30,000 upon entering the program. The select aspirational schools and Carnegie group had averages of 93% and 90% with salaries of at least $40,000 upon program entrance.
6. 92% of UNR MBA graduates had the expectation that their salaries upon graduation would be at least $40,000. The select aspirational schools and Carnegie group averaged 90% and 92% respectively with $40,000 expected salaries.
7. 87% of our graduating class had either a full-time or part-time job. The select aspirational schools and Carnegie group averaged 89% and 84%.
8. 76% of our MBAs indicated that over 61% of instructors in the program were excellent. The select aspirational schools and Carnegie group averaged 50% and 44% in this category.

I'm pleased to report the results of the 2005 AACSB/EBI exit studies for the COBA MBA program, based on surveys completed by students in the capstone course, BADM 781, in December 2004 and May 2005. The survey results are compiled by EBI and compared with aspirational and peer schools (6 in each category). There were 94 participant schools in 2005 for the AACSB/EBI exit study for part-time MBA programs, and 27 of these had the Carnegie Class designation. Our survey results were compared with all schools and with the Carnegie subset. The aspirational schools were Michigan State, Arizona State, Georgia State University, University of Colorado Boulder, University of
Pittsburgh and University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Highlights of the AACSB/EBI Survey:
1. Compared against the 6 aspirational schools, COBA is ranked in the top 4 in 10 out of 15 factors. The 10 factors are: learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 1st), learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 1st), program office services (ranked 3rd), overall program effectiveness (ranked 3rd), elective courses: satisfaction with aspects of courses (ranked 3rd), curriculum: addresses ethics and social issues (ranked 4th), curriculum breadth (ranked 4th), learning outcomes: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 4th), required courses: quality of faculty and instruction (ranked 4th), and fellow students (ranked 4th).

2. Compared against the 27 participating Carnegie Class schools in the AACSB/EBI part-time MBA surveys, COBA is ranked in the top 14 in 13 out of 15 factors. The 13 factors are: learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 2nd), program office services (ranked 4th), overall program effectiveness (ranked 5th), learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 5th), curriculum: addresses ethics and social issues (ranked 7th), required courses: quality of faculty and instruction (ranked 8th), learning outcomes: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 9th), curriculum breadth (ranked 9th), facilities and computing resources (ranked 11th), elective courses: satisfaction with aspects of courses (ranked 11th), fellow students (ranked 12th), advising (ranked 14th), and learning outcomes: critical thinking and problem solving (ranked 14th).

1. Compared against the 6 aspirational schools, COBA is ranked in the top 4 in 9 out of 15 factors. The 9 factors are: learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 1st), learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 1st), learning outcomes: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 1st), overall program effectiveness (ranked 2nd), program office services (ranked 3rd), learning outcomes: critical thinking and problem solving (ranked 3rd), advising (ranked 4th), and curriculum: breadth (ranked 4th).

2. Compared against the 24 participating Carnegie Class schools in the AACSB/EBI part-time MBA surveys, COBA is ranked in the top 10 in 10 out of 15 factors. The 10 factors are: learning outcomes: use and manage technology (ranked 1st), learning outcomes: effective communication and team work (ranked 3rd), learning outcomes: effective management and leadership skills (ranked 3rd), overall program effectiveness (ranked 4th), program office services (ranked 4th), learning outcomes: critical thinking and problem solving (ranked 6th), curriculum: addresses ethics and social issues (ranked 7th), curriculum: breadth (ranked 9th), advising (ranked 10th), and elective courses: quality of faculty and instruction (ranked 10th).

College of Education
Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology
Counseling Program

CEP has begun to notice that scores on certain sections of the CPCE Examination have declined in the past five years. We conducted an analysis of scores over that period to confirm our hypothesis and found it to be true. CEP continues to have students perform well on both the written essay and the counseling session components of the comprehensive examination.

Overall, master’s students in counseling fully met counseling skills and moral reasoning levels. This indicates that the curriculum and performance levels for these two key program outcomes were successful.
The key findings are that all graduates have both the required knowledge and skills to become professional counselors.

The results will be used to determine if individual student have necessary knowledge and skills to use human growth and development theories and counseling skills with clients. Also, the aggregate results will be used to assess the effectiveness of the human growth and development and helping skills curriculum for meeting CACREP standards of human growth and development and helping relationships.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Educational Psychology: M.Ed. Program**

During the spring, 2005 semester, 3 M.Ed. students completed their degree and successfully satisfied all performance assessment activities. The mean for their comprehensive examination was 73.3 (passing score = 70) and all portfolio entries were rated by educational psychology faculty as proficient. No posttest data collected for Fall 2005.

From the time we have begun collecting assessment data, posttest score means on the comprehensive examination have increased substantially from pretest means. This is an indication that (1) students are taking performance assessment activities much more seriously and (2) performance assessment activities are providing good information about quality of delivery of instruction of course content.

The above is based on the data from 2006 to 2008. Our students have met the standards of the program and are making progresses toward their goals.

Students' post-test score means on the comprehensive examination have increased substantially from the pretest means. This indicates that (1) students are taking performance assessment activities much more seriously, (2) performance assessment activities are providing good information about quality of delivery of instruction of course content.

Three M.Ed. students completed pretest and posttest activities. Pretest average for these students = 57.5; Posttest average = 72.50. All students satisfactorily completed posttest activities and graduated in 2004.

The 2002-2003 academic year was the first time that assessment of the M.Ed. program occurred. Assessment consisted of an exit examination and faculty discussions of program effectiveness. In general, faculty were satisfied that students were adequately demonstrating knowledge and skills in core areas of the M.Ed. program. However, exit examination scores were low in all areas for most students. This probably occurred because students were making a transition from a traditional written examination to a more objective exam and thus may not have taken the exam as seriously as they should have. Another problem may be related to course content.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Educational Psychology: MS Program**

The above is based on the assessment data from 2006 to 2008. Our students have met the standards of the program and are making progress toward their goals. Five graduated from 2006 to 2008 have passed the comprehensive examination, and have competed the program portfolios that demonstrate the
framework of their studies and their understanding to the knowledge and skills in the field of using
information technology in education.

Four M.S. students completed posttest activities. Since these students entered the program prior to fall,
2003, they had not participated in pretest activities. They participated in posttest activities on a
voluntary basis. Posttest data included scores on a 100-question comprehensive examination, mean =
72.66.

During the Spring, 2005 semester, 3 M.Ed. students completed their degree and successfully satisfied
all performance assessment activities. The mean for their comprehensive examination was 73.3
(passing score = 70) and all portfolio entries were rated by educational psychology faculty as proficient.
No posttest data collected for Fall, 2005.

From the time we have begun collecting assessment data, posttest score means on the comprehensive
examination have increased substantially from pretest means. This is an indication that (1) students are
taking performance assessment activities much more seriously and (2) performance assessment
activities are providing course content.

* Student portfolios indicate adequate ability to understand and apply knowledge and skills related to
information technology in education.
* Student performance on an exit examination over core coursework was poor, probably because this
was the first year that the examination was administered and students did not take it as seriously as the
traditional written examination. Another problem may be related to incongruence between exam
questions and related course content.

The counseling faculty has found some consistency across scores on the CPCE examination. This is
especially true for the competency areas of social and cultural foundations, career development, and
appraisal. Students, as a group, have lower scores on these dimension than on the other 5 core
competency areas.

The faculty also noted that, while inter-rater reliability may be adequate on the DVD scoring, faculty
use differing criteria to grade the DVDs.

Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning
Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program

In the 2005-2006 year, there were a total of 18 program completers in the elementary and secondary
master's program. It was also a time when there was a marked increase in admission to the two
programs, a total of 55 students. This was especially evident in the secondary master of education
program with 31 students accepted. This is possibly attributed to the change in admission from a fixed
entrance date of October 1st and March 1st to open admission. The secondary department also saw a
sharp increase in admit tees to content areas that have a high need for teachers, notably in science,
mathematics, and foreign languages. The elementary first-time licensure had a small rise in admissions
but the number total for the year in the M. Ed program was 7.

In terms of actual numbers and acceptance, the following data capture the statistics:
Elementary (Fall 2005-Spring 2006): M.A. (5) M.S. (5) and M. Ed. (7)
Secondary (Fall 2005-Spring 2006): M.A (3) M.S. (4) and M. Ed. (31)
The number of program completers was higher in the elementary programs as compared to the
secondary program:
Elementary (Fall 2005-Spring 2006): M.A (1) M.S. (0) and M.Ed. (12)
Secondary (Fall 2005-Spring 2006): M.A. (1) M.S. (0) and M.Ed. (4)

During the year, 4 students completed their advanced assessment program. The following data capture their scores on their final advanced assessment:

- Foundations (average of 2)
- Diversity and Learning (average of 2)
- Curriculum (average of 1.75)
- Instruction (average of 2)
- Research and Assessment (average of 1.75)
- Professionalism (average of 2)

Score of 1 reflects satisfactory; score of 2 reflects proficient; and score of 3 reflects distinguished. When scores are able a level, they are rated at the next highest level. Therefore, the graduate in the program scored an average of proficient overall (1.75) in their six domains and in each of the domains.

During fall 2006- through spring 2007, there were 24 graduates in the Master's programs in CTL. Of these, 6 were M. Ed elementary graduates, 15 were secondary M. Ed graduates, and 1 was a secondary Master of Science graduate. In the secondary graduates according to subject area, 5 were science majors; 4 were social studies majors; 2 were English majors, 2 were occupational technology majors, 1 was a Spanish majors; 1 was a mathematics major, and 1 was a fine arts major. Most of the students (n=14) completed an advanced portfolio; 9 presented a professional paper or a project, and 2 successful answered their comp exams.

The graduate programs in CTL have undergone revisions in terms of assessment protocol. This is the first year of data collection. Preliminary findings tend to indicate that graduate students report that their coursework provides them with strategies that are effective in today's classroom. There continues to be a need to provide strategies for students who are presenting learning challenges - students considered "at-risk" of not completing school, gifted students, and students who are considered "English-Language Learners." Courses that have continued to change to meet the needs of today's classroom are those that are focused on curricula development, assessment strategies, and those specially focused on content (e.g., science and mathematics).

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Equity & Diversity Program**

This program began in 2004 and the first students will be graduating in the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Literacy Studies Program**

This was the first full year the literacy studies used a consistent approach for evaluating applied projects with a rubric. We found that students needed a great deal of support in developing, implementing, analyzing and presenting their findings. The expectation for student performance is a rating of 1 in each domain. The program faculty reserve higher ratings for performance beyond expectations.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Special Education & Disability Studies Program**

The expectation for performance on the culminating project/exam is a rating of 1 in each domain. The program faculty reserve higher ratings for performance beyond expectations. Our highest area is in professionalism, possibly because it is the easiest for the students to demonstrate. Assessment is our lowest area, although still above expectation overall. We will continue to emphasize the use of child
data in making instructional decisions about their teaching. We continue to look for ways to help our students collect and interpret data that reflects the impact of their instruction on their pupils.

Based on student performance in classes, comprehensive examinations, and applied projects, students have acquired the necessary skills and knowledge to be successful as teachers.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**TESOL Program**

This was the first year the TESOL program used a evaluation rubric with students and issues of applicability are still being addressed. In the past, exams were Pass/Fail without a rating. The expectation for student performance is a rating of 1 in each domain. The program faculty reserve higher ratings for performance beyond expectations.

Student performance on the written and oral comprehensive examination indicates students have acquired the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in serving in various roles within the field of TESOL. The one student, who failed the comprehensive examination, struggled in several critical classes.

**Department of Educational Leadership**

**Educational Leadership Program**

One key finding is that most completers demonstrate high levels of competence in all SLO's we have a few who do not reach the desired level.

The one area of training where there is significant difference between students is in the internship experience. The EL Dept. is conducting ongoing discussions on methods to improve the internship experience. A second key finding is that most do not move into higher-level professional positions immediately upon completion of the degree even though several did over this past year.

Our key finding is that whole most completers demonstrate high levels of competence in all SLO's we have a few who do not reach the desired level.

The one area of training where there is significant difference between students is in the internship experience. The EL Dept. will be making significant changes in the internship experience beginning in the Fall of 2009.

Another key finding is that most do not move into higher-level professional positions immediately upon completion of the degree.

We need to identify and remediate borderline students much earlier in their program.

While most program completers are performing well a minority do no exhibit behaviors congruent with the instructional program.

**Department of Human Development & Family Studies**

**Human Development & Family Studies Program**

Graduates of the HDFS Master's program appear to be competent and able to perform well in professional positions or further graduate level work. They rate the quality of the program highly and appear to be appreciated as highly qualified in their positions of employment.
Most students complete a thesis, and thus have a very good appreciation for and understanding of the research process. The report of plagiarism occurring in the graduate level research methods course is troubling, and will be addressed below.

There are 18 graduate students enrolled in the master's program; 5 of these are currently inactive. An additional 4 students completed a thesis and graduated in 2003-2004. Although there is evidence from multiple sources that indicates that our graduates are successful and gainfully employed, faculty would like to improve the quality of the students that we are attracting to the program.

Little progress has been made in moving forward with graduate program assessment, as we have put most of our effort into assessment and improvement of the undergraduate program. This year, we have a new director of the graduate program and we are examining how to recruit and retain high quality students. A renewed effort will be made to collect assessment data from existing classes using the plan we developed last year.

**College of Engineering**  
**Department of Biomedical Engineering**  
**Biomedical Engineering Program**

Since program inception a decade ago, student feedback has indicated a desire for a single place of contact to meet administrators, faculty and other BME students (particularly students ahead in their course of study). Previously, the inter-disciplinary graduate program in Biomedical Engineering (BME) has relied on a number of different support personnel in the Graduate School as student contacts to perform routine administrative tasks (typing up contracts, determining call numbers, etc.). Although all Grad School personnel have been both courteous and competent, support personnel performed these tasks on an "as available" basis and the lack of a single "go to" person has been confusing to BME students.

During the past year, the department of Electrical Engineering formally changed its name to the department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering. One purpose of this name-change was to be able to hire "core" BME faculty. Additionally, as a result of this administrative change, biomedical engineering students now have a single point-of-contact (Pam Jitloff) for the vast majority of their administrative needs. This has added stability and provides an "administrative home" for BME students. It has dramatically helped the day-to-day operations of the graduate program by providing a well-equipped, central office for students to handle their administrative needs. Pam is now well-versed in all aspects of BME student needs.

As another part of a strategy to foster the sense of a "home" for BME students, the administration has supported student efforts to develop a local student chapter of the professional society that represents the biomedical engineering discipline. The student chapter is now formally affiliated with the national biomedical engineering society (BMES) and meets regularly for social and professional interactions. The physical proximity of BMES student activities to the student chapter representing electrical engineering (IEEE) also promotes cross-fertilization between the student chapters.

By and large, the BME program is meeting most objectives. Two specific areas have been identified as needing improvement:

1) Course offerings are limited in exposure to modern-day "virtual instrument" development tools. In recent years, many common-place dedicated laboratory instruments (oscilloscopes, multi-meters, function generators, spectrum analyzers, etc.) have been replaced by data acquisition interfaces and
software packages incorporated within general-purpose computers. These are so-called virtual
instruments where computer-based instrumentation is often less expensive, more flexible, more
accurate and more amenable to developing an integrated multi-instrument based solution to biomedical
problems; and
2) There is a need to expand core BME faculty.
Biomedical Engineering is a nascent discipline where nationally there are a number of administrative
models to support its inherently inter-disciplinary nature. Currently, the administrative structure at
UNR is strictly as an inter-disciplinary graduate program supported by a number of adjunct faculty and
largely coordinated by a graduate program director. However, the trend at the national level is
incorporation of Biomedical Engineering or Bioengineering programs within colleges of engineering
where, for example, ABET accreditation of such programs has recently been added.

**Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering**

**Chemical Engineering Program**

Feedback that we have received from employers indicates that our graduates perform at a very high
level, comparable to that of National Labs.

**Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering**

**Metallurgical Engineering Program**

Students are doing really well in their research. Their research is publishable, in most cases.

**Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering**

**Civil Engineering Program**

The Graduate Committee in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering completed an
in-depth review of the graduate programs for the four different sub disciplines and focus areas within
civil engineering during 2006. This review indicated that different sub disciplines often have different
requirements for completing a graduate degree. The committee developed recommendations and
guidelines to standardize some of the degree requirements within the department across the various sub
disciplines and focus areas.

**Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering**

**Civil Engineering: Environmental Program**

A shortcoming among some MS EnvE students completing Plan B has been poor performance on the
written and/or oral comprehensive exams. Several students have has to re-take the exams in order to
pass. Students must be encouraged to carefully prepare to take these exams.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**

**Mechanical Engineering Program**

Objective #1 -- ability to define, design and execute... -- was expected to be the most difficult to fulfill,
and indeed it was. Also indicative was the decided disconnect between faculty and student responses --
for the most part, the students felt that they were doing well in achieving this objective; the faculty
thought that their performance was merely marginal. Disappointingly, only six student responses were
recorded; so that the inherent bias may have been large. The faculty took a more optimistic view for Objective #3 -- theoretical foundation -- and Objective #4 -- ability of students to advance the engineering discipline. Here, only 10% of the graduate students were deemed to be faring poorly.

As a part of graduate assessment, Dr. Kwang Kim has tracked the post-graduation careers of our 41 MS students and 7 PhD students who have been awarded their degrees since Fall '01. As of September '05 he has found that among 41 MS graduates,
26 (63%) have engineering positions in industry;
1 (25%) are continuing their education in a PhD program;
2 (5%) are working as research scientists (or equivalent) in national laboratories;
3 (7%) have either left the field of engineering or else have not yet found a suitable engineering position.
Our survey results indicate that both faculty and students are satisfied with the ME - MS program. The few unsatisfactory responses can be traced to individual (and anonymous) students, rather than to general dissatisfaction with the program.

As part of graduate assessment, Dr. Kwang Kim has tracked the post-graduation careers of our 45 MS students who have been awarded their degrees since Fall '02. As of September '06 he has found that among these 45 graduates:
26 (58%) have engineering positions in industry;
15 (33%) are continuing their education in a PhD program;
4 (9%) are working as research scientists (or equivalent) in national laboratories.
Our survey results indicate that both faculty and students are satisfied with the ME-MS program. There were, however, two written comments which indicate a serious problem that the graduate faculty needs to be aware of:
COMMENT #1
Group study not defined (students think that group study means copying).
Lots of plagiarism is going on and no action being taken.
COMMENT #2
Various courses are required for graduate students.
Need more graduate courses & need more research-active faculty.

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Anthropology
Anthropology Program

Student Learning Outcome 1: Eleven M.A. students completed a series of three core graduate seminars during the year. Of these, 29 percent received an A, 34 percent A-, 21 percent B+, 10 percent B, and six percent B-. The anthropology faculty reviewed the performance of all M.A. students during the year and sent letters to each.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Seven students graduated from the anthropology MA degree program during the academic year 2003-2004. Of these, two entered a doctorate program in anthropology at the University of New Mexico, four gained employment as staff archaeologists for cultural resource management companies in the private sector, and one is working in a field unrelated to anthropology.

Student Learning Outcome 1: 11 M.A. students completed a series of four core graduate seminars during the year. Of these, 56 percent received an ‘A’, 33 percent ‘A-’, 9 percent ‘B+’, and 2 percent ‘B’.
The anthropology faculty reviewed the performance of all M.A. students during the year and sent letters to each.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Two students graduated from the anthropology master's degree program during the academic year 2004-2005. Of these, one gained employment as a staff archaeologist for a cultural resource management company in the private sector, and one is working for a state agency in the field of historic preservation.

"The interests and abilities of new graduate students have changed in the last few years, and the methods faculty use for mentoring them in preparation for the all-important comprehensive exams are being re-thought under a general curriculum review procedure accompanying the hiring of two new faculty members."

Student Learning Outcome 1: 11 M.A. students completed a series of four core graduate seminars during the year. Of these, 56 percent received an ‘A’, 33 percent ‘A-’, 9 percent ‘B+’, and 2 percent ‘B’. The anthropology faculty reviewed the performance of all M.A. students during the year and sent letters to each.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Two students graduated from the anthropology master’s degree program during the academic year 2004-2005. Of these, one gained employment as a staff archaeologist for a cultural resource management company in the private sector, and one is working for a state agency in the field of historic preservation.

Student Learning Outcome 1: The Performance Indicators suggest that students in the MA program are acquiring knowledge of four-field anthropological concepts and skills in their areas of specialization such as archaeology or cultural anthropology. In general, however, student performance on the comprehensive exams needs to be improved, with 20 to 50 percent of the responses falling into the low pass or fail category. Most students in the program are making satisfactory progress toward completion of the MA.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Five graduates of the MA program who specialized in either archaeology or cultural anthropology entered the job market and doctoral programs during the year. The program continues to instill the necessary professional and academic skills needed to compete in the marketplace.

Student Learning Outcome 3: During the year, five students successfully completed and defended the thesis requirement, which is a good measure of the acquisition of original research skills and experience. Ten others completed research methods courses, and seven submitted thesis research plans to their research advisors and committees.

**Department of Art**

**Art: Fine Arts Program**

Overall, the Department of Art continues to provide highly challenging and competitive BA Studio Art and Art History Programs. Our top students compare well, and at times exceed, those from peer institutions. Our students are generally well prepared in the techniques and concepts endemic to and developed within the Department's Concentration Areas.

Students have found employment in art-related fields following graduation from the Department's Program and, given the highly competitive nature of Graduate program Admissions, a good percentage find their ways to graduate school and to careers "making" art, many remaining in the Reno area becoming vital participants in the growing community of Art and Artists.

Challenges continue to exist in several key areas and are being addressed on an on-going basis as funding, instructional space and other resources become available particularly in the following areas:

- Visual Foundations: The Department, as a whole, is addressing a variety of issues concerning both
the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes. There is a continuing discussion about the possibility of making the Visual Foundations class a two [rather than the presently one] semester class divided into two and three dimensional considerations based on the classic Composition style classes taught in Architectural Science oriented programming. There is discussion regarding the possible return to a Visual Foundations program which would incorporate beginning drawing, painting, sculpture and Digital Media into the instructional format taught by a four-member Faculty-team; however, the drain on faculty time is a major mitigating variable with which the Department will have to deal. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with Spring 2009.

- Art History: The Department has secured a phenomenal 20th Century Art Historian who is in the process of redesigning the contemporary art history courses, realigning context and content toward "movement" rather than "artist" and moving much of what has been somewhat fragmented into survey-based material. Dr. Van Hoesen's joining the Department Faculty will result in some major changes which will dictate the area of specialty of the next Art Historian recruiting which will occur as the Department is awarded its next new position. The Department is continuing its active search to recruit additional qualified part-time Art History instructors to teach much-needed survey art sections.

- Independent Study: The Department of Art Undergraduate Adviser has been largely successful in insuring that prerequisites are completed and that consistent contact between student and faculty oversight is met thereby affecting the greatest degree of success possible. In doing this, the enrollment in these courses has seen a small reduction from which it should recover in the next several semesters.

- Scholarships: Scholarship guidelines, requirements and application forms are posted on the Department's website. We continue our efforts to get information to all art students, recognizing that the responsibility for application, etc. is the student's.

- Internships: The Department of Art Undergraduate Adviser continues the coordination of Internship possibilities and placement for our students. We continue to encourage all Faculty to be attentive to Internship possibilities and to be mindful of the student qualifications for and instructional advantages of such internships.

Overall, the Department of Art continues to provide highly challenging and competitive BA Studio Art and Art History Programs. Our top students compare well, and at times exceed, those from peer institutions. Our students are generally well prepared in the techniques and concepts endemic to and developed within the Department's Concentration Areas. Students have found employment in art-related fields following graduation from the Department's Program and a large percentage find their ways to graduate school and to careers "making" art, many remaining in the Reno area becoming vital participants in the growing community of Art and Artists.

Challenges continue to exist in several key areas and are being addressed on an on-going basis as funding, instructional space and other resources become available particularly in the following areas:

- Visual Foundations: The Department, as a whole, is addressing a variety of issues concerning both the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes. There is discussion about the possibility of making the Visual Foundations class a two [rather than the presently one] semester class divided into two and three dimensional considerations based on the classic Composition style classes taught in Architectural Science oriented programming. There is discussion regarding the possible return to a Visual Foundations program which would incorporate beginning drawing, painting, sculpture and Digital Media into the instructional format taught by a four-member Faculty-team. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with Fall 2007.

- Art History: The Department is considering a number of possible options depending upon the recruitment of that person who will replace our retiring Art Historian in the Fall of 2007. We have begun recruitment for a 20th Century Art Specialist who will develop and teach larger and more
comprehensive survey-type couring along with smaller, more movement- focused courses. The securing of this Art Historian will dictate the next Art Historian recruiting which will occur as the Department is awarded its next new position. The Department is also actively seeking to recruit qualified part-time Art History instructors to teach much-needed courses.

- Independent Study: The Department of Art Undergraduate Advisor is undertaking the coordination of Independent Study classes to insure that prerequisites are completed and that consistent contact between student and faculty oversight is met thereby affecting the greatest degree of success possible. * Scholarships: Scholarship guidelines, requirements and application forms are posted on the Department's website. We continue our efforts to get information to all art students, recognizing that the responsibility for application, etc. is the student's.
- Internships: The Department of Art Undergraduate Advisor is undertaking the coordination of Internship possibilities and placement for our students. We are encouraging all faculty to be attentive to Internship possibilities and to be mindful of the student qualifications for and instructional advantages of such internships.

Our graduate students are thriving in their environment with the beginnings of healthy exhibition records and follow through.

Department of Criminal Justice
Criminal Justice Program

For our program to flourish, not just survive, it needs resources. We could use at least 4 full time teaching assistants, and by having these assistants available, we could enhance the undergraduate educational experience while giving these graduate students the experience necessary for success in later graduate programs.

Department of English
English Program

Exit interviews with graduating MA students has revealed a high level of satisfaction with the program, with special praise given to the quality of mentoring and advisement and the flexibility of the MA that students felt they could tailor to their own interests and goals.
We are still developing the alumni survey that we plan to administer at three-year intervals for twelve years with particular attention to jobs held, publications, achieving tenure and/or job advancement in non-academic careers.

Admissions statistics for 2005 demonstrate the appeal and strength of our M.A. program, which continues to serve Nevadans while increasingly attracting students from around the country and, in some cases, the world. We received 31 applications to our M.A. program during 2005, 20 of which were accepted (approximately two-thirds, at 65%). Of the 20 admits 16 have (or will, in the case of mid-year admits) attended (approximately three quarters, at 80%). These encouraging numbers are comparable to those for 2004, although this year saw a significant rise in the percentage of M.A. admits who accepted our offer of admission (from approximately 60% in 2004 to 80% in 2005).
Thirteen M.A. students have (or will, in the case of two who will graduate in December) graduated in 2005 (this is comparable to the 14 M.A. students we graduated last year). As in 2004, our M.A. students have gone on to advanced graduate study (in English, law, education, and academic administration) at universities around the country, and have moved into nonacademic careers in nonprofits, teaching, communications, editing and publishing, and many other fields. This record shows continued productivity and success among graduate students at the M.A. level.
Exit interviews with graduating M.A. students show a high level of satisfaction with our M.A. program and the emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the flexibility and range of the curricular and professional development trajectories available to M.A. students. Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student’s professional development trajectory; the range of teaching opportunities for students in composition and humanities courses; the summer research assistantships (which compensate students to collaborate on faculty research projects); and, the strong instructional support for M.A. students as apprentice teachers.

1. Experience on the job and results from 2008 self study: I am new to the Graduate Director's position as of July 1, 2008. One of the first problems I faced was two students asking for extensions on time to degree (6 years for MA; 8 years for PhD). Further, from our Self Study, we learned that we need to do a better job of tracking progress of students through our various degrees.

2. Experience on the job: I have found that some of our new graduate faculty are not fully familiar with graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees.

3. Experience on the job: I have found that some of our students are not fully familiar with graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees.

4. Data from alumni surveys: Thirty percent of MA student alumni rank advisement as good or fair; seventy percent rank it excellent. Twenty-seven percent of MA student alumni rank level of faculty interactions as good or fair; 73% percent rank it excellent.

5. Focus group interaction: A focus group of graduate students expressed a wish that our academic job series could be a bit more student-focused.

6. Student feedback: Some students in the Literature and Environment degrees appeared a bit confused about the relationship between Literature and Environment on the one hand and Literature on the other.

7. Student feedback: Students have been confused in planning their programs of study because we have had a not entirely transparent course rotation schedule at the 700 seminar level.

8. MA chair feedback and results from 2008 self study: Some students take 600-level courses instead of 700-level courses; This has been determined to be a problem because of the mixture of not only undergraduate students in 400/600 level split courses but also graduate special students and students admitted to our MA or PhD programs.

Admissions statistics for 2007 demonstrate the appeal and strength of our M.A. program, which continues to serve Nevadans while increasingly attracting students from around the country. We received 37 fully complete applications to our M.A. program during 2006, 22 of which were accepted (59%). Of the 22 admits, 16 have joined our programs (73%). These encouraging numbers are comparable to those for 2006 (when we had 33 applicants), although this year saw a recovery in the percentage of M.A. admits who accepted our offer of admission (from approximately 80% in 2005 to 50% in 2006, and now back up to 73% in 2007).

8 M.A. students graduated in 2007. Our M.A. students have gone on to advanced graduate study at universities around the country, and have moved into nonacademic careers in nonprofits, teaching, communications, editing and publishing, and many other fields. This record shows continued productivity and success among graduate students at the M.A. level.

Exit interviews with graduating M.A. students show a high level of satisfaction with our M.A. program and the emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the flexibility and range of the curricular and professional development trajectories available to M.A. students. Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student's professional development trajectory; the range of...
teaching opportunities for students in composition and humanities courses; the summer research assistantship program (which compensates students to collaborate on faculty research projects); and, the strong instructional support for M.A. students as apprentice teachers.

Interviews with graduates produced several suggestions about how our programs might be further improved:

- There remains a range of approaches taken by individual faculty members to certain aspects of graduate advisement, including how the chair of a student's graduate committee communicates and consults with other members of the committee. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate an explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to committee communication issues.
- Because our department has continued to hire new assistant professors each year in recent years (and has three searches ongoing now), we remain concerned that new departmental graduate faculty members receive an appropriate introduction to the department's graduate advisement mechanisms, including the many responsibilities of a graduate committee chair.

Admissions statistics for 2006 demonstrate the appeal and strength of our M.A. program, which continues to serve Nevadans while increasingly attracting students from around the country. We received 33 applications to our M.A. program during 2006, 22 of which were accepted (67%). Of the 22 admits, 11 have joined our programs (50%). These encouraging numbers are comparable to those for 2005 (when we had 31 applicants), although this year saw a reduction in the percentage of M.A. admits who accepted our offer of admission (from approximately 80% in 2005 to 50% in 2006). We believe the reason for this is that our M.A. applicants are becoming stronger, while the number of available TAs with which to recruit them is not changing substantially, and we are thus losing many of these students to other programs which are able to offer them funding.

7 M.A. students graduated in 2006. Our M.A. students have gone on to advanced graduate study at universities around the country, and have moved into nonacademic careers in nonprofits, teaching, communications, editing and publishing, and many other fields. This record shows continued productivity and success among graduate students at the M.A. level.

Exit interviews with graduating M.A. students show a high level of satisfaction with our M.A. program and the emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the flexibility and range of the curricular and professional development trajectories available to M.A. students. Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student's professional development trajectory; the range of teaching opportunities for students in composition and humanities courses; the summer research assistantships (which compensate students to collaborate on faculty research projects); and, the strong instructional support for M.A. students as apprentice teachers.

Interviews with graduates produced several suggestions about how our programs might be further improved:

- Because our department has hired quite a few assistant professors in recent years (and has three searches ongoing), we are concerned that new departmental graduate faculty members may require a more formal introduction to the department's graduate advisement mechanisms, including the many responsibilities of a graduate committee chair.

There are certain aspects of graduate advisement that department graduate faculty members handle on a case-by-case basis. These include the specific format of the written comprehensive examinations and the amount of time permitted to elapse between the written comprehensive examinations and the oral examination. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate an explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to these sorts of graduate advisement issues.

- It was felt that graduate special students, because they are not formally members of any graduate
program, were not receiving sufficiently timely and helpful advisement, and as a result were occasionally making unwise decisions that might have been avoided had they received earlier or better advisement.

**Department of English**  
**English: Teaching English Program**

Our exit interview with the one MATE student who graduated this year revealed genuine enthusiasm for the program and appreciation for the teaching opportunities the student received here.

As our Program Study reported, there are few students who are now well served by the M.A.T.E. program. For example, the degree is redundant with programs offered by the College of Education. Changes in the M.A. Writing and M.A. Literature programs have made those degrees more appropriate for students who might otherwise enroll in the M.A.T.E. program. Student focus groups and national trends as well as local need indicate that an M.F.A. would be an attractive degree to offer from our department.

2 M.A.T.E. students graduated this year. Exit interviews suggest that although they tend to move through the program slowly, M.A.T.E. students are generally satisfied with the program. They especially praise the flexibility of the program and the mentoring they receive from faculty who understand their professional profiles, constraints, and goals. There was some concern among both students and faculty that the requirements of this program are sometimes less clear than they should be, especially with respect to the interface between the English requirements and the requirements (and/or options) in the College of Education (which are also part of this degree program).

Interviews with graduates produced several suggestions about how our programs might be further improved (note that some of these are not specific to the M.A.T.E. program, but instead affect both M.A. and M.A.T.E. students).

- The department needs to coordinate the requirements and options of the M.A.T.E. program more carefully with respect to program options that involve coursework in the College of Education
- Because our department has hired quite a few assistant professors in recent years, we are concerned that new departmental graduate faculty members may require a more formal introduction to the department's graduate advisement mechanisms, including the many responsibilities of a graduate committee chair.
- There are certain aspects of graduate advisement that department graduate faculty members handle on a case-by-case basis. These include the specific format of the written comprehensive examinations and the amount of time permitted to elapse between the written comprehensive examinations and the oral examination. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate a more explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to these sorts of graduate advisement issues.
- It was felt that graduate special students, because they are not formally members of any graduate program, were not receiving sufficiently timely and helpful advisement, and as a result were occasionally making unwise decisions that might have been avoided had they received earlier or better advisement.

As we tend to receive only one or two applications to the M.A.T.E. program each year, admissions statistics for 2005 are fairly typical. We received only one application (which we did not accept). No M.A.T.E. students graduated this year, so no exit interviews were conducted. However, ongoing advisement meetings with current M.A.T.E. students suggest that although they tend to move through the program slowly, these students are making good progress toward the degree. In these ongoing advisement meetings students seemed especially satisfied with the flexibility of the program and the
mentoring they are receiving from faculty who understand the students’ professional profiles, constraints, and goals.

The M.A.T.E. program does not enroll many students, and so admissions statistics for 2007 are fairly typical. We received 2 applications, 1 of which we accepted, and that applicant did enroll. However, once enrolled the student realized that they were a better fit for the M.A. program, and so the DGS requested (and the Graduate School approved) that the student be moved from the M.A.T.E. to the M.A. program. So, in effect, no new students entered the M.A.T.E. program in 2007.

Only one M.A.T.E. student graduated this year. The exit interview and a great deal of other, anecdotal evidence - suggests that although M.A.T.E. students are generally satisfied with the program, there are some substantial challenges to the continued vitality of this program. Among the challenges to the M.A.T.E. program are the following: fewer and fewer students apply to the program each year, and as of Spring, 2008 we will have only one student (out of 85 graduate students in the department) in the M.A.T.E. program; this has been caused by several factors, chief among which is that the increasingly flexible requirements of our MA programs now make them more appealing to students who would once have chosen the M.A.T.E. It is also the case that the interface between the English requirements and the requirements (and/or options) in the College of Education (which are also part of this degree program) are increasingly complex and difficult to negotiate. The results of interviews with current M.A.T.E. students, with graduates of the program, and with faculty have resulted in the department's reconsideration of whether it is wise to continue to offer the M.A.T.E. At present the proposal to eliminate the program is being considered by the appropriate committees within the English Department.

Following are suggestions about how our MA programs might be further improved (note that some of these are not specific to the M.A.T.E. program, but instead affect both M.A. and M.A.T.E. students).

• If the M.A.T.E. program is to be continued, the department needs to coordinate the requirements and options of the M.A.T.E. program more carefully with respect to program options that involve coursework in the College of Education.

• There remains a range of approaches taken by individual faculty members to certain aspects of graduate advisement, including how the chair of a student's graduate committee communicates and consults with other members of the committee. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate an explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to committee communication issues.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures
Foreign Languages & Literatures Program

Students receiving the MA in Spanish continue to be placed at high-ranking Ph.D. programs. Students for whom the MA is a terminal degree have used it to obtain gainful employment in the field of education.

Seven students planned to take the M.A. exams in Spanish in S05, of whom six passed. One of them was doing a retake of the Latin American portion and passed. Two students planned to take the M.A. exams in Spanish in F05, but both postponed taking them to S06. No graduate students in French or German planned exams for 2005; several plan to do so in S06. Of the six students who graduated in S05 with an M.A. in FLL and a specialization in Spanish, two are pursuing coursework leading to the PhD and employed with Teaching Assistantships in Spanish programs at other universities, one is employed as an instructor in our department, two more are teaching part-time at TMCC, and another could not be reached.

Students in the MA program in Foreign Languages and Literature continue to be placed in high-ranking
Ph.D. programs. Students for whom the MA is a terminal degree have used it to obtain gain employment in related fields or have continued to be active in the field.

Of the seven students who graduated in S06 with an M.A. in FLL and a specialization in French or Spanish, five of them are either studying a Ph.D. in Spanish at another institution or applying to a Ph.D. program in Spanish or French; two of them have language teaching positions in Reno.

Six students took the comprehensive written exams this Spring 2003 semester. Four students completed the written and final oral comprehensive exams satisfactorily, and two students did not complete certain sections of the written comprehensive exam satisfactorily. These two plan to re-take the exam in Fall 2003. Of the four students who satisfactorily completed the exams and fully met all M.A. graduation requirements this Spring, one is employed at Lake Tahoe Community College, one has received a Teaching Assistantship to pursue coursework leading to the PhD at the University of California, Irvine, one is currently job hunting in the business and financial industry, and one is on vacation.

Seven students specializing in Spanish took the comprehensive written exams in F03, S04, and F04. Six students completed the written and final oral comprehensive exams satisfactorily, and one student did not complete two of the five sections of the written comprehensive exam satisfactorily. This student plans to re-take those two sections in S05.

Of the four students who graduated with an M.A. in F03 and S04, two are pursuing coursework leading to the PhD and employed with Teaching Assistantships in Spanish programs (at UCLA and at University of Kansas); one is employed as an administrator at the Washoe County School District; and one is co-authoring a book with professor Kate Berry. Of the two students who graduated with an M.A. in F04 both are applying to PhD programs at other universities.

**Department of History**  
**History Program**

The Master's of Arts program is meeting its stated goals in regards to student learning outcomes. Our biggest issues, however, is student retention in the first year of graduate work. Most of the students who ceased their graduate studies were in the Master of Arts program. One long-standing issue is the lack of financial support for our students in general.

The 2008 Assessment report for the MA program in the Department of History focuses on Time To Degree and Outcomes.

With regard to TTD, the average time to degree (mean) is 3.75 years. While I have been unable to find national statistics on TTD for social science and humanities degrees, I have been able to find averages for UCLA for comparison; there, the average (mean) TTD for social science degrees earned between 1997 and 2002 is 3.07 years and for humanities degrees it is 3.13 years. Our statistics do not compare favorably with these numbers.

With regard to outcomes, our data collection is presently limited. We find that out of 18 graduating since 2000, the current activities of eight are unknown; five went on to further postgraduate study. Those entering PhD programs went on to such universities as University of Washington, Indiana University, University of Arizona, and UNR. One went on to the University of Melbourne International Studies program for a second MA. Other MA recipients are presently employed at the Veterans Administration, UC Santa Cruz as an assistant head coach, UNR in the Admissions Department, Nevada Department of Corrections, and elsewhere.
Department of History

History: Teaching History Program

Fifth-Year Assessment of the Master of Arts in Teaching History program as planned from its inception, the MATH program is going through the assessment process in its fifth year. The process is taking two forms: a meeting of most graduates of the program with the Department Chair and the Graduate Advisor of the Department of History, and an evaluation form given/sent to the seven present graduates of the program. At the meeting, which took place in December 2007, a lively discussion developed over the particular successes and weaknesses of the program. Five graduates of the program participated.

They were unanimous in their pride in completing a challenging program that they felt had significantly advanced their understanding of History and how to teach it. But they felt that the History Department faculty did not always understand how they as K-12 teachers differed in their needs from our other more traditional graduate students. Some felt like second-class citizens in relation to the traditional students. There was a certain degree of confusion among students as to how to proceed through the various steps of the MATH program. One graduate wanted more emphasis on unit plan production for their classes, while others valued more traditional work such as historiographies. Some hoped that it would be possible to publish their unit plans. Graduates of the program felt that not all history teachers in Northern Nevada would benefit from the program due to its rigor; but none wanted the program to decrease in vigor.

Statistical data from the evaluation forms sent/given out will be included when more forms have been returned (two have been returned so far). However, please find some of the more extensive written comments below:

• "In general, the available information about HOW to go about organizing and setting up the [elements of the MATH program] was lacking. It was much easier to figure out what to do to fulfill all requirements than it was to determine how to get them set up. I felt I was forced to rely too much on the Department Office Manager, which seemed unfair and unnecessary. In general, more transparency would be SO nice."

• "My increased content knowledge and access to diverse sources helped make my classroom a richer environment. I have taken every single lesson and unit plan created for this program and have implemented them with great success."

• "I appreciate the rigor of the program - I really earned this degree! I am also very proud of the units I created. Working with and taking classes from Scott Casper is a dream!"

• "When putting together our final curriculum project a required independent study with Prof. Obenchain is needed. I think we should be ready to have the curriculum part be published."

• ("highlights of the program for you?") "The cohesive group of MAT grad students. The intensity of the program - I graduated feeling I was a historian."

The department is pleased with the results of its learning outcomes in terms of students and their development and success in the program itself. However, the department needs to better ascertain how and with what frequency, educators are making use of their unit plans.
**Department of Judicial Studies**  
**Judicial Studies Program**

Study progress through the program of study has slowed some. This is primarily due to student workload (as judges), having to run for re-election, and funding sources becoming more limited. Students continue to need additional methodological, statistical, and analytical assistance.

It is still too early in the program to assess completely. As the program moves into its third year, more concrete findings are anticipated.

Faculty benefit from a clear understanding of the education needs of the students on various topics and overall perception of performance for teaching students of this caliber (judges).

**Department of Judicial Studies**  
**Justice Management Program**

Additional instruction is needed on statistical analysis and interpretation.

It is still early in the program to fully assess completely. As the program moves into its fourth year, more concrete findings are anticipated. Overall students demonstrate knowledge of course materials as well as research design, methodology, theory, and skills to present research in a concise, professional written form. In addition, they demonstrate skills in applying their knowledge in their work environment.

Faculty received high evaluations regarding expertise and course content. Students expressed a desire for more individualized feedback within online courses and faculty have been responsive to this.

**Department of Music & Dance**  
**Music Program**

Graduate music students now have an expected level of competence in music theory and music history that is clearly assessed in their new entrance exams (administered prior to their first semester of graduate study).

Graduate music students now have an expected level of competence in music theory and music history that is clearly assessed in the entrance exams (administered prior to their first semester of graduate study).

Graduate music students now have an expected level of competence in music theory and music history that is clearly assessed in the entrance exams (administered prior to their first semester of graduate study).

Remedial course work is recommended when necessary. Graduate students are allowed to take each entrance examination a maximum of three times to pass the requirement.

Currently, the music faculty is discussing a revision of how the Master of Music "oral" final exam in administered as well as how the comprehensive graduate music theory and music history exams are implemented. Department of Music policies and guidelines are currently being reviewed.
Department of Philosophy
Philosophy Program

1. M.A. exams: We note improved scores on our M.A. exams (see above).
2. Exit interviews conducted by the current department chair and the two previous chairs indicate a high level of satisfaction with our programs: with their content, with the range of offerings, with the accessibility and flexibility of the programs, with the friendliness and availability of the faculty, with the responsiveness of faculty to student needs, with the availability of faculty for advice. The findings result from descriptive comments and, for three years, student ranking of our program on a scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high). In the latter, rankings were: ranking of 10: 33%; ranking of 9: 33%; ranking of 8: 33% (no rankings below 8).

The high level of satisfaction is consistent with results we found during a previous academic program review in interviews with a random sample of alumni from different graduation years. The responses of the alumni randomly sampled at that time were uniformly highly positive.

3. Student comments to chairs in exit interviews, and in other forums, give some evidence of some amount of lack of consistency in advisement, with some graduate students indicating lack of advisement on basic requirements in the program and some need for help in rectifying deficiencies in earlier education (for students lacking an undergraduate philosophy degree).

Some undergraduate and graduate students have indicated that we may be losing students from or not attracting students to our program due to insufficient diversity of course content in lower-level offerings (viz., course content with greater global perspective, greater gender content, and a wider representation of different races and issues concerning race) (see below for curricular and staffing efforts to broaden diversity offerings).

4. Value tracks: After reviewing a number of undergraduate and graduate program, we discovered that specialized tracks in value theory, i.e. in areas such as ethics, political philosophy, philosophy of law, social philosophy and aesthetics, are now common in departments of philosophy both at peer institutions and at higher level institutions (see below regarding value track efforts we have taken).

5. Review of peer and higher level departments indicated some gaps in our program (see general curricular improvements below for examples of those gaps and of how we have filled them).

Department of Political Science
Political Science Program

Program is operating successfully. Students are moving towards degree completion and are meeting program goals.

The MA PSC program appears to be operating successfully in terms of educational outcomes.

The MA program is successful in educating its students and helping them pursue higher education and/or their chosen career paths.

The MA program is successful in educating its graduate students and helping them to pursue higher education and in their chosen career paths.
Department of Political Science
Political Science: Public Administration & Policy Program

The MPA program is doing a successful job of educating graduate students and helping them to pursue higher education or enter/return/remain in their chosen career paths.

The MPA program is moving forward in achieving its goals.

The MPA program is doing a successful job of educating graduate students and helping them to pursue higher education or enter/return/remain in their chosen career paths.

The MPA program is achieving its educational goals.

Program is operating effectively. Students are successfully completing their degree programs. There is some evidence that further methods/statistics courses are of some use/interesting to employers of our alumni.

Department of Psychology
Psychology: Behavioral Analysis Program

All master's students are performing very well on the new SLOs in the Plan.

Students in the masters program continue to make outstanding progress and are finding employment as behavior analysts upon graduation.

Students in the masters program continue to make outstanding progress and are finding employment as behavior analysts upon graduation. Finalized research projects necessary to meet the goals regarding research will all be met this fall and were 80% met as of August 08.

Department of Sociology
Sociology Program

The alumni survey data provide an overall favorable picture of the extent to which alumni perceived that they got what the faculty thought that students should be getting out of the program (namely, the SLOs). Two of the SLOs were fully achieved (#1 & #2) and one was partially achieved (#3). Whereas the M.A. program succeeds in providing its students with substantive training in sociological theory and a supportive learning environment, the main weakness seems to be the research methods training (addressed below).

Overall findings of our 2008 assessment were very positive. In particular, it appears that changes implemented during the prior year (e.g., to assign students to an advisor from the beginning of their first year on) had positive consequences for the success of the students and the atmosphere in the program. Informal interviews with students often reveal some measure of discontent about the fact that the course offerings for sociology MA students are limited; however, all students also say they understand that this is simply due to the program's size--which in turn is often mentioned as a big plus as it enables close interactions with faculty.
1. After raising the bar on admission requirements, we are pleased to report that learning outcomes are more achievable for our graduate students. We see a quality increase in the work they have submitted over the past year (i.e., papers, projects, in class presentations, etc.).

2. Co-authored publications for 4 of our MA students were published this past year, indicating a practical application for and mastery of the research methods/statistical knowledge they've learned in class.

3. Interviews with potential students indicate that many students need course offerings after 5pm.

1) Seminars (700-level) elicit depth of cognitive learning, but not necessarily breadth. It is common for students to select a specialty within any topic (seminars in interpersonal, organizational, and persuasion) and spend the semester researching that topic. However, it is in the 600-level courses that breadth is developed. Our students tell us that these 600-level courses are essential to develop the broad knowledge of the communications field we seek in SLO #1.

2) We have discovered a two-class graduate culture, those who are competent in research design, methodology and statistics, and those who are not. We have still not convinced most M.A.'s that research methodology is the sine qua non of graduate education.

3) We have discovered that 'improving speech communication competence' is not part of our program. When we find that many M.A. candidates demonstrate those skills, we cannot prove that our program caused them.

1. Oral communication skills as a learning outcome is not being achieved in any consistent or systematic way. The evidence shows the same result as noted last year. We cannot demonstrate that things we do in our courses cause or explain a candidate's spoken competence. This outcome contrasts with our undergraduate program, in which we have found a direct relationship between classroom activities and observable speech skills.

2. Research skills appear to be improving. The renewed focus with our new graduate faculty person may be changing perceptions. Our COM 700 Research Methods course does not have to stand alone in developing student skills; rather, we can maintain learning momentum by requiring more attention to research methods in other graduate courses.

3. The course sequence within a candidate's program appears to affect some learning outcomes, especially research skills. Students are lucky if the COM 700 course is offered early in their program. However, with just 4 graduate faculty we can only offer a particular seminar once every 3 semesters. Thus, some students are not exposed to this vital content until after they have take several topical courses with significant research content. In most graduate programs, every new student takes a research course in the first semester of the program. Our assessment comparing students with beginning vs. ending exposure to research suggests that timing affects this learning outcome.

1. Our learning outcomes are achievable with our current courses and requirements. There appear to be no gaps in topical content or types of graduate student performance activities. Most candidates have the freedom to move beyond COM courses and include two or three related field or minor courses in their Program of Study. They all take a statistics course in another department. Our candidates are not missing any coursework that keeps them from achieving the SLO's.

2. Our learning outcomes could be more ambitious with more graduate faculty. Collaborative research, independent studies, internships and mentoring opportunities are difficult to provide and are available only to our most talented and motivated students. Our four graduate faculty (two 1.00 FTE and two .5 FTE) do not have time to provide individual instruction. Yet we know that such attention is a predictor of higher graduate student performance, especially in terms of research skills. We cannot approve "Plan A--Thesis" programs except for a small fraction of candidates with exceptional ability. Until we have at
least 5.0 FTE graduate faculty, our M.A. program’s learning outcomes will remain adequate but not comparable to M.A. programs in major research universities.

3. Low GRE scores correlate with marginally-performing candidates. In the past two years, 3 of our 15 student had been admitted provisionally despite lower than approved scores. Their eventual performance on the most challenging graduate projects—in 700-level seminars and on comprehensive exams—was substandard. We have concluded that, despite the wider debate about the fairness and validity of these standardized tests, we must become more stringent in our admission decisions. Low GRE scorers appear to show inadequate cognitive ability required for performance in all three of our SLO’s.

4. Our assessment process is limited by lack of exit survey and alumni survey data. Our original implementation plan included both types of data-gathering strategies. Neither have been developed due to limited graduate faculty time. Therefore, we have no empirical way to assess applied outcomes of our program, except perhaps from anecdotal data from some of our graduates who stay in contact.

5. Our M.A.’s who teach for us as part-time faculty provide some qualitative evidence of program effectiveness. Twelve former graduates students have taught or now teach COM sections at the 200-400 level. Their observed performance in that role tells us that our program has achieve SLO #1 (theory and principles) and SLO #3 (critical thinking and communication skills).

1. Low GRE scores correlate with marginally-performing candidates. We again learned that higher achievement is more likely when these scores, an not undergraduate grades alone, form the basis for our admission. Seminar research and comprehensive exam quality are better when the candidate has high-level cognitive skills.

2. Research methods achievement SLO 2) and analytical thinking achievement (SLO 3) are related. Comprehension of quantitative methods in COM 700 and depth of analysis in other seminars are seen in the same candidate. The reverse also holds; students who cannot "get" the structure and logic of research methods tend not to comprehend the analysis and evaluation of theoretical models and their assumptions.

3. Achievement expectations for 600-level courses are lower than expectations for 700-level seminars. We find candidates who perform easily with the 400-600 course who have difficulty with the self-directed study and research requirements of seminars. The SLO's are more achievable, and observable, in the graduate-only seminars.

College of Science
Department of Biology
Biology Program

Our overall assessment of students completing their degree in the 2003-2004 academic year indicates students are meeting learning outcome expectations. These findings are based on an assessment rubric that was completed by the student’s advising committee and/or major professor.

The institutional Alumni Survey of students who completed their degree in 2002, 2003, and 2004 indicate a general satisfaction with the program as all students rated the overall quality of the degree program as being good or excellent. Similar responses were given to the preparation the degree program provided students for their career paths. Most of these students are either now employed in a disciplinary related position or are continuing their education. One is currently looking for a position while two have delayed their career plans on account of family obligations.

All of the students who graduated with Masters' Degree in Biology during 2008 have met or exceeded expectations of the program.
Our overall assessment of students completing their degree in 2004-2005 indicates students are meeting learning expectations. These findings are based on an assessment rubric that was completed by the student's advising committee and/or major professor.

The institutional Alumni Survey of students who completed their degree in 2005 indicates a general satisfaction with the degree program as responses to various questions on that survey tended to be in the "good" category. One exception to that was in the area of advising which was regarded as being "excellent." Both students are now continuing their education.

Our overall assessment of students completing their degree in 2004-2005 indicates students are meeting learning expectations. These findings are based on an assessment rubric that was completed by the student's advising committee and/or major professor.

The institutional Alumni Survey of students who completed their degree in 2005 indicates a general satisfaction with the degree program as responses to various questions on that survey tended to be in the "good" category. One exception to that was in the area of advising which was regarded as being "excellent." Both students are now continuing their education.

Master's Program in Biology has overall successfully met the proposed SLOs. Unfortunately, we have not been able to fully implement proposed Exit Interview this time.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry Program

Overall, what are the key findings from the program assessment activities? Several key findings have become apparent during the first 4 years of implementation of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:

(1) graduated MS students are doing very well;
(2) the cohort of MS graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate; and
(4) with an expected larger data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained in subsequent evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle one) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:

(1) graduated students are doing very well;
(2) the cohort of graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle one evaluations; with only small numbers in the data pool, the % values can be perturbed easily; and
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle two) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:

(1) graduated MS students are doing very well;
(2) the cohort of MS graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle two evaluations; and
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 2 years, statistically better data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.
Overall, what are the key findings from the program assessment activities:
Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle three of a 4-year cycle) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduated MS students are doing very well;
(2) the cohort of MS graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle three evaluations; and
(4) with an expected larger data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.

Overall, what are the key findings from the program assessment activities:
Several key findings have become apparent at this early of implementation (cycle four of a 4-year cycle) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
1. graduated MS students are doing very well;
2. the cohort of MS graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;
3. achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four evaluations; and
4. with an expected larger data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.

**Department of Geography**

**Geography Program**

Such major changes have been brought to the graduate programs in MLU PP and MS Geography that it is difficult to make ready conclusions. Furthermore, the largest cohort we have ever admitted just came into the program, and its success is unknown. That said, there is considerable and demonstrable satisfaction with the 700 course, as a curriculum item preparing graduate students for later work in the major, and there is considerable flexibility evident in getting graduate students to move toward meeting of requirements & a broad cross-section of courses (and independent study classes) that students can take to meet methodology requirements, for example. We would like to monitor further before coming to decisive conclusions.

Once again, our graduation rate remained high -- nine MS students in Geography. Over the past three years, faculty have understood the necessity to move students through the program, and this year our efforts have come to fruition over the past two years. Average time to MS used to range from seven years to two. With two exceptions, average time to a Masters for these nine graduates was just over three years. The two exceptions were, in fact, success stories, as well. Having been "missing in action" as advisees of previous faculty, current faculty revived their graduate careers and moved them to completion after a hiatus of several years.

This year saw a concerted effort by the Grad Director and the Chair to move MS students along through the program, commensurate with their time in the program. Obviously, this plan of attack worked. All MS Geography students are currently on track.
Department of Geography
Geography: Land Use Planning Program

As it currently stands, only one LUPP grad student is working as an RA. The rest of the LUPP grad students have full-time jobs and do not require financial assistance. This is normal for the program.

The LUP program still needs work. Students are not moving through the program as expeditiously as we would like. To a great extent, this is the result of previous mismanagement of the program.

The MLUPP degree has seen major changes in the last year. We are in the midst of a transition, from a program in which the course offerings were largely outside of the department, to a program in which many more courses will be available from within the department. We are also in transition from a cohort of part time students that have been in the program for what could be termed an overly long period, to a new cohort that is on a more streamlined schedule similar to the MS in Geography of 2-3 years. With the hire of a new Director, Paul Stangl, we anticipate more changes in this program this year. Students in the program are making good progress towards completion and we see these changes as positive.

Department of Geological Sciences
Geological Engineering Program

MSGE students are performing well. No significant problems or concerns are noted.

The MSEG program is presently very strong. Students are performing quite well. In terms of student numbers, the MSEG program is larger than the BSGE and Geoengineering Ph.D. programs. Students are completing degrees on time and are proceeding to Ph.D. programs or jobs.

Some student motivation for degree completion is being lost. This problem may be isolated to one student, yet the reason for the lost motivation is unclear. Student came in well prepared academically and earned both an RA and TA, providing funding for 4 semesters, yet did not complete the degree.

1. Employer survey data suggests general satisfaction with MSEG grads. Some minor concern regarding student preparation is noted, but with only one of the employer responses. This issue will be monitored to see if it becomes a bigger issue.
2. Student surveys suggest some dissatisfaction with their degree program and advisement. Yet, average MSEG responses were a little better than UNR averages over all categories. Many advisement issues existed in the past that do not exist at the present time.

1. Some alumni dissatisfaction with quality of advisement is coming to light. This is a new concern.
2. Timelines of degree completion remains a concern.

That some MSEG students require a considerable amount of attention and guidance is becoming a concern. MSEG students often complete degrees in a timely manner, but this is often due to personal initiative. Some students do not feel the need to complete their degrees quickly. This requires some attention.
Department of Geological Sciences  
**Geology Program**

The vast majority of MS-GS students in the program in 2007 were reported to be making satisfactory progress (25 of 28). Our 2007 graduates were highly successful in the job market, going into the energy and minerals industries. The two students who chose non-geology career paths did so for personal career shifts choices, not for lack of employment opportunities. Only 1 of the 8 is pursuing an academic career path in geology, pursuing a PhD now. Attrition has been tracked and over the last 10 semesters from Fall 2002 through fall 2007. No students entering in 2006 or 2007 have yet dropped out. Roughly one third of the student body attended professional meetings, field trips, or short courses this year. This number seems low, but is likely due to a significant percentage of students finishing up while working full time for industry. Many students who did not report attendance at a professional meeting were in the final stages of finishing and had attended or presented at a meeting the year before. Students midway and towards the end of their degree reported to be actively participating in the write-up of their thesis for publication.

Department of Geological Sciences  
**Geophysics Program**

A key indicator of our program's success is that all tracked graduates since 1999 have either continued on for a higher degree or found professional employment utilizing their degree in industry or government agencies. Our program also continues to attract qualified students that should result in continued employer demand for graduates. A current measure of the program's value to students and employers is that one of our year two students has received two employment offers.

Based on enrollments, student and employer satisfaction and demand for graduates at premium starting salaries, the MS geophysics program is clearly an attractive and relevant advanced degree choice. Enrollments are limited primarily by the faculty time and faculty generated research resources required by each student. Adoption of a non-thesis degree track option would facilitate increased enrollments and shorten time to graduation, but would also change the culture of the degree program. This topic remains under discussion by the program faculty.

Based on 4 MS program graduates Dec 2000 to May 2007 have directly gone on to:
1. Employment as petroleum exploration geophysicist by a major oil company in Houston, TX;
2. Employment as a remote sensing scientist at the Desert Research Institute, Nevada;
3. Employment as a geo-scientist at Spec-TIR Corporation, & a remote sensing contractor; and
4. Continue with and complete a Ph.D. geophysics degree in UNR's program.

Department of Physics  
**Physics Program**

80% of MS graduates met outcomes expectations. However, there were concerns about the Physics Qualifying Exam. Also, students expressed the concern at exit interviews that elective courses in advanced research topics are not offered often enough and sometimes don't even exist in relevant research areas.

100% of our MS graduates substantially met outcomes expectations. However, quite a few current MS students are behind schedule in filing a program of study.
90% of MS graduates met outcomes expectations. 57% of MS alumni replied that, if they could start over, they would definitely attend UNR again, while 21% replied they would probably attend UNR again. However, students have expressed the concern that elective courses in advanced research topics are not offered often enough. Also, the program would benefit from having a bigger student cohort.

75% of MS graduates met outcomes expectations. However, in 2005, the Physics Graduate Faculty held several discussions assessing the efficacy of Physics Qualifying Exam, and drafted a 9-page document on the issue. This assessment is still in progress.

**Division of Health Sciences**

**Department of Health Ecology**

**Public Health Program**

100% of graduates are employed or pursuing further education (e.g., MDs, PhDs).
100% pass rate of graduates on Certified Health Educator Specialist exam.
Alumni have obtained prominent positions in public health including leadership positions in nonprofit and private settings.

On the whole, alumni report being very satisfied with MPH program and their current employment. On a scale of 1-4 with 4 being "strongly agree", students mean reported satisfaction with the overall quality of the MPH program is 3.31.

Employer data for recent alumni (2006 & 2007 graduates) are limited (N=3). 100% of these employer respondents indicated that MPH graduates were "very prepared": to carry out writing tasks, to work cooperatively on a team, to use computers or other workplace technology, continue learning, consider ethical implications of behavior, and to be able to work in a culturally diverse environment. The employers rated the MPH alumni as "very or somewhat prepared" to express themselves orally, develop solutions to workplace problems and to think critically. All employers reported they were "somewhat" or “very satisfied" with MPH alumni.

**Department of Nursing**

**Nursing Program**

Continue to offer the high quality graduate program with its options leading to advanced nursing practice. Continue to improve the quality of teaching, research and public service activities directly related to the UNR and OSN Mission. Continue to offer curricula related to the graduate program options that are timely, prepare graduates for an invigorating practice, and related to evidence. Continue to provide high quality graduates who are sought after by employers and provide excellence in advanced practice nursing. Continue to prepare graduates to pass national certification examinations in related specialties. Evidence from data collected in various students, alumni and employer surveys indicate satisfaction with teaching methods, rigor, and outcomes of the program. Employers are satisfied with graduates. Two recent graduates are matriculated in doctoral studies at nationally reputable programs for nursing.

Overall, the results of this assessment are positive. With the exception of one terminal objective, all others are being met at 70% or more and the majority of objectives are being met at 100%. Employers are satisfied with our graduates, and for the most part alumni feel that OSN prepared them for their current positions.
Because of the revisions made to the terminal objectives and graduate curriculums, no data were collected on the objectives that are listed.

**Department of Social Work**  
**Social Work Program**

From Fall Semester to Spring Semester the mean scores improved noticeably resulting in higher levels of intellectual functioning. The score improvements were supported by field instructor evaluations of student performance.

Findings indicate that Social Work concentration students continue to be rated by the School of Social Work Instructors' evaluation quite favorably. The majority of students continue to fully meet expectations of identified school outcomes over 80% of the time. These findings also support the notion that graduate students are being prepared to practice autonomously upon graduation.

Social Work graduate students continue to be rated quite favorably by the School of Social Work Instructor's Evaluation of Field Practicum program outcomes. The majority of students fully meet expectations of identified outcomes over 80% of the time. The only outcome needing further assessment by school faculty is in the area of students being able to understand the legislature process and the role of social work in policy and legislative development.

1. The data used for this report indicate that students are excelling in the areas of practice and theory. The areas of research, social activism and diversity are in need of further curriculum development.
2. While data collected from students and faculty members were aggregated for the purposes of this assessment report, there were striking differences in the self-rating of students compared to the ratings faculty members give to students. At this time we do not have an explanation for this discrepancy, but plan to examine further how students rate themselves.

Social Work concentration graduate students continue to be rated quite favorably by the School of Social Work Instructor's Evaluation of Field Practicum program outcomes. The majority of students fully meet expectations of identified outcomes over 80% of the time. These outcomes support graduate students being prepared to practice autonomously upon graduation.

**Interdisciplinary Degree Programs**  
**Department of Atmospheric Sciences**  
**Atmospheric Sciences Program**

Key results are that the M.S. degree students are performing well in all of the Learning Outcomes. Specific areas of need related to communication skills and application to societal issues were identified (as began to be evident in the previous year's report), and resources are now available to address these needs.

The implementation of a new progress report that answers specific questions related to the Learning Outcomes is now completed jointly by the student and their academic advisor has provided valuable new narrative information about student progress in coursework, research training, technical knowledge, and communication skills. These results were utilized in the Report this year, for all students who have been in the program more than one semester. The new students this year will be included in that evaluation process next year, which will provide a larger cohort for evaluation.
It can be noted that the M.S. candidates showed good progress in their academic achievements, while some of them performed somehow worse in the research tasks due to inexperience and longer adjustments compared to the Ph.D. students.

Program assessment indicates a large majority of Masters students are meeting all learning outcomes, but that additional effort in the areas of communications and interdisciplinary applications would benefit certain students in establishing a successful career.

The majority of students are meeting academic and research expectations. The faculty are studying the possibility to further improve research and communications skills in the ATMS curriculum.

The M.S. students in the Atmospheric Sciences graduate program are succeeding in our stated program goals in almost all cases. We have used an Annual Student Progress report for the second year now, and it is helping in establishing common ground between the students and faculty members about learning objectives for the coursework and research. We introduced a new Graduate Seminar in Spring 2005 for Atmospheric Sciences students, and this has provided new focus on communications, professional development and scientific ethics.

**Department of Environmental Sciences & Health**  
**Environmental Sciences & Health Program**

Our graduates obtained work in private and public sector jobs. This included work with a locally based biomedical research firm, an environmental testing firm, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, the State Department of Health and the Washoe County Department of Health. Students were also first or later authors on an estimated 12 peer-reviewed papers published in the past calendar year. Students presented posters at an estimated 8 national societal meetings. Students applied field and laboratory techniques to generate data needed for thesis and dissertation work. This involved laboratory instrumentation associated with chemical analysis and biological assessments. Examples of chemical analytic techniques applied included use of ion chromatographs, atomic absorption/spectrophotometric instruments, standard electrode-based field measurements and other laboratory and field techniques. Examples of data analysis techniques applied include use of neural network analogs for processes that have a Bayesian structure, categorical data analysis, standard distribution-based techniques for establishing and evaluation strengths of correlation and simple hypothesis-testing techniques.

Students in the program successfully completed research related to the effects of environmental contaminants on migratory bird behavior, triggers for severe asthmatic attacks, non-biological nitrogen fixation, acid mine drainage remediation, and effects of environmental tobacco smoke on cell disruption and mutation. They were well prepared to carry out such research as a result of faculty mentoring, personal dedication, classroom experience and ability to learn independently.

As noted as part of the report for Outcome 1 students were active in publishing papers in peer-reviewed journals, presenting results at national societal conferences and defending their theses or dissertations. Each activity involved use of written, numerical, graphical, spoken, and computer-based forms of communication.
Department of Hydrologic Sciences
Hydrogeology Program

All of the metrics used to evaluate the efficacy of the Graduate Program of Hydrologic Sciences (GPHS) indicate that the students are learning the material required of them and employers are generally satisfied with GPHS students. A majority of former students rated the Hydrologic Sciences as excellent in terms overall quality and preparation for their career. One weakness may be that 22% of those surveyed rated their preparation as fair. The results of the employer survey are generally positive with most of the survey results being better than the University average. The Program scored below the University average on problem solving, cooperation, and cultural diversity.

Department of Hydrologic Sciences
Hydrology Program

All of the metrics used to evaluate the efficacy of the Graduate Program of Hydrologic Sciences (GPHS) indicate that the students are learning the material required of them and employers are generally satisfied with GPHS students. A majority of former students rated the Hydrologic Sciences as excellent in terms overall quality and preparation for their career. One weakness may be that 22% of those surveyed rated their preparation as fair. The results of the employer survey are generally positive with most of the survey results being better than the University average. The Program scored below the University average on problem solving, cooperation, and cultural diversity.

School of Medicine
Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
Speech Pathology & Audiology Program

The percentage of students achieving performance indicators increases as courses advance to higher levels.

1) Seminars (700-level) elicit depth of cognitive learning, but not necessarily breadth. It is common for students to select a specialty within any topic (seminars in interpersonal, organizational, and persuasion) and spend the semester researching that topic. However, it is in the 600-level courses that breadth is developed. Our students tell us that these 600-level courses are essential to develop the broad knowledge of the communications field we seek in SLO #1.

2) We have discovered a two-class graduate culture, those who are competent in research design, methodology and statistics, and those who are not. We have still not convinced most M.A.’s that research methodology is the sine qua non of graduate education.

3) We have discovered that ‘improving speech communication competence’ is not part of our program. When we find that many M.A. candidates demonstrate those skills, we cannot prove that our program caused them.

Students in this program achieve at high levels of performance. All students were employed after graduation.

Students who complete required prescribed program usually meet standards of assessment. Students are achieving established learning outcomes.
The majority of graduate students met the expectations and ultimately graduated. All graduate students in this cohort passed the national examination in speech-language pathology which had a national failure rate of 20%. All graduate students in this cohort are currently employed as speech-language pathologists. The program appears to be meeting its mission to graduate high quality clinicians.
Program Key Findings: Doctorate Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biochemistry Program

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry Ph.D. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the intimate research environment it affords. The students liked the accessibility of the faculty and the excellent quality of research mentors. Students noted better communication about the structural requirements of graduate committees. Students have experienced less confusion about program requirements due to better communication by the graduate program director.

Weaknesses: One weakness of the program is that it lacks rigorous advisement and a well-structured core curriculum during the first year. Students would like to have a core curriculum during the first year while they are conducting their research rotations. A continuing major weakness of the program is that students feel that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, students thought that a graduate level course in cancer biology and plant molecular biology should be offered. Students thought that they should also be advised more aggressively to hold more committee meetings in order to gather input and research advice from graduate committee members. Students would like to see more team taught courses offered. Shorter rotations would be desirable so that the students do not waste time in lab in which they do not intend to stay.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry Ph.D. programs had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last 3 years particularly in the areas of plant molecular biology and protein structural analysis research.

Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of UNR campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, and the graduate school.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry Ph.D. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses.
Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last three years particularly in the area of plant molecular biology and protein structural analysis research. Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of UNR campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry Ph.D. program had a number of major strengths and weaknesses. Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the intimate research environment it affords. The students liked the accessibility of the faculty and the excellent quality of research mentors. Students noted better communication about the structural requirements of graduate committees. Students have experienced less confusion about program requirements due to better communication by the graduate program director. Weaknesses: One weakness of the program is that it lacks rigorous advisement and a well-structured core curriculum during the first year. Students would like to have a core curriculum during the first year while they are conducting their research rotations. A continuing major weakness of the program is that students feel that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, students thought that a graduate level course in cancer biology and plant molecular biology should be offered. Students thought that they should also be advised more aggressively to hold more committee meetings in order to gather input and research advice from graduate committee members. Students would like to see more team taught courses offered. Shorter rotations would be desirable so that the students do not waste time in lab in which they do not intend to stay.

The key findings of the program assessment activities were that the Biochemistry Ph.D. programs had a number of major strengths and weaknesses. Strengths: The major strengths of the program were that most students were pleased with their graduate experience and the program in general, with available course work and laboratory opportunities and training settings. The students like the accessibility of the faculty and though there was excellent communication among departmental faculty. There was a perceived improvement in the graduate faculty through the recent hiring of new faculty within the department over the last 3 years particularly in the area of plant research. Weaknesses: The major weaknesses of the program were that most students thought that there were limitations in research options and course offerings based on the limited number of faculty available to take on new students or to teach new courses. In particular, courses that should be offered included a graduate level course in biochemistry, bioinformatics, and more specialized courses. There was a perceived division among the faculty due to their physical separation at opposite ends of campus. Many students would have experienced less confusion about program requirements if there were better communication between the student and their committee members, the graduate program director, and the graduate school.
**Department of Resource Economics**  
**Economics Program**

This assessment is based on PhD students who passed four core theory and quantitative methods courses in the first year, and then passed PhD qualifying exams based on this coursework. The coursework and qualifying exams appear to work well in preparing students to meet expectations. Students who cannot meet PhD expectations are transferred into the MS program. For these reasons it is not a surprise that the assessment finds 95% or more as meeting expectations.

The major finding this year is the much improved pass rate on the preliminary examinations in microeconomic theory and quantitative methods. This suggests that materials covered and the performance expectations in the core theory and methods courses are helping students master this material.

Success of students on the preliminary examinations in microeconomic theory and quantitative methods will likely be a principal measure of student mastery of core theory and methods. As a consequence, we will closely monitor student performance on preliminary exams.

**College of Education**  
**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**  
**Counseling Program**

We found that the only person who substantially failed to meet expectations was a Native American who had performed well in the classroom.

The Counseling and Educational Psychology Department faculty will actively review all data collected from the doctoral assessment plan activities. The department faculty will modify courses and learning activities based on the findings to ensure that all student learning outcomes are adequately addressed and competence is assured.

To date no students have graduated this year in Counseling and Educational Psychology.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**  
**Educational Psychology Program**

Five students graduated with PhDs in Counseling and Educational Psychology. All found work related to their training. Current doctoral students also find that the course work of the doctoral program is clearly aimed at their career goal.

Three students graduated with PhDs in Counseling and Educational Psychology. All three found work related to their training.

**Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning**  
**Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program**

During 2006-2007, four students successfully defended their dissertations in the Ph.D. program. Two of
the students continued as teachers in a school district and two graduates obtained a teaching position at a university

At this time, the doctoral program is growing. Overall, there are 18 doctoral candidates, three of whom completed their dissertations in 2004. The program continues to grow and there are presently 3 new applicants for the program in 2005. The emphasis for the doctoral program has expanded as the new department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning has developed specific areas of emphasis - Secondary or Elementary Content or Curriculum Studies. Data will help provide more evidence at the end of 2005.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Education Specialties Program**

It is important to note that both students are working at universities in their discipline. In the future, we will follow-up with the students and assess their success in their positions.

This program began in 2003. Several students are nearing the end of their programs and will soon graduate. Students may need more scaffolding for their comprehensive exams.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Literacy Studies Program**

Our students make progress through the program but may be taking too much time to do so. We need to keep closer connections to them to keep them on-track.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Special Education & Disability Studies Program**

Students are making progress toward completion of the degree and support activities for students have become more effective. The coming year will see more student achieving assessment milestones (see comments section of this report). Not unexpectedly, those students who are able to work full-time on their degree are making better progress toward degree completion than those who are currently working in school districts or other professional settings outside of the university.

**Department of Educational Leadership**

**Educational Leadership Program**

1. We have few truly full-time students in the Educational Leadership Department. Almost all our students are employed full time so the need to find/gain full-time employment upon completion of their degree is different from most academic fields. Consequently many/most do not move into leadership positions upon completion of a degrees. Most of our graduates move into higher level roles within a few (3-5) years later so our data in is area is always skewed low.

2. Both completers demonstrated high levels of competency in research skills.

The first SLO needs to be broadened.
We need to change the first SLO to include all appropriate employment.
Four key findings are critical:
1. An extremely high number of doctoral candidates were completing their course work and comprehensive examination and then not completing the dissertation;
2. This finding was deemed unacceptable;
3. The Educational Leadership Department moved to a new system that requires doctoral students to begin dissertation planning not later than the end of the second year of enrollment and also changed the comprehensive examination process so that it supports the dissertation effort; and
4. Initial progress from the new system is promising in that 21 students have established dissertation research questions/problems and are beginning work on their comprehensive examination project.

All three doctoral completers were employed in positions congruent with their degree and field and are continuing in the respective positions.

Most of the program completers at the doctoral level have been actively employed in leadership positions and continue those positions upon completion of the degree.

College of Engineering
Department of Biomedical Engineering
Biomedical Engineering Program

By and large, the BME program is meeting most objectives. Three specific areas have been identified as needing improvement.
1) Conflict between research project planning and grade assignment in BME 780, grant writing exercise.
A single course (BME 780, grant-writing exercise) within the BME curriculum has generated >90% of the assignments of an incomplete grade at the end of semesters in which students have enrolled. In the past, students have enrolled for the course in semesters in which they anticipate: 1) writing a grant application and most often 2) initiating their doctoral research project. The grant-writing exercise can formally be on any topic; however, students are encouraged to write a grant (and even submit it to a funding agency) on their doctoral research. If not, they are required to prepare a separate document for their committee laying out their research plans and to keep this documentation (grant or separate document) up-to-date as research plans change. For a variety of reasons including: 1) technical difficulties within experimental setups, 2) changes in research plans, and most frequently 3) the sense of increased security in research plans by repeatedly obtaining "just one more preliminary set of experiments"; students have encountered delays in submitting grant-writing exercises to their doctoral committee. In these cases, the desire to plan and execute the strongest possible research project can conflict with the administrative timing of the assignment of grades.
2) Course offerings are limited in exposure to modern-day "virtual instrument" development tools. In recent years, many common-place dedicated laboratory instruments (oscilloscopes, multi-meters, function generators, spectrum analyzers, etc.) have been replaced by data acquisition interfaces and software packages incorporated within general-purpose computers. These are so-called virtual instruments where computer-based instrumentation is often less expensive, more flexible, more accurate and more amenable to developing an integrated multi-instrument based solution to biomedical problems.
3) There is a need to expand core BME faculty.
Biomedical Engineering is a nascent discipline where nationally there are a number of administrative models to support its inherently inter-disciplinary nature. Currently, the administrative structure at
UNR is strictly as an inter-disciplinary graduate program supported by a number of adjunct faculty and largely coordinated by a graduate program director. However, the trend at the national level is incorporation of Biomedical Engineering or Bioengineering programs within colleges of engineering where, for example, ABET accreditation of such programs has recently been added.

Since program inception a decade ago, student feedback has indicated a desire for a single place of contact to meet administrators, faculty and other BME students (particularly students ahead in their course of study). Previously, the inter-disciplinary graduate program in Biomedical Engineering (BME) has relied on a number of different support personnel in the Graduate School as student contacts to perform routine administrative tasks (typing up contracts, determining call numbers, etc.). Although all Grad School personnel have been both courteous and competent, support personnel performed these tasks on an "as available" basis and the lack of a single "go to" person has been confusing to BME students.

During the past year, the department of Electrical Engineering formally changed its name to the department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering. One purpose of this name-change was to be able to hire "core" BME faculty. Additionally, as a result of this administrative change, biomedical engineering students now have a single point-of-contact (Pam Jitloff) for the vast majority of their administrative needs. This has added stability and provides an "administrative home" for BME students. It has dramatically helped the day-to-day operations of the graduate program by providing a well-equipped, central office for students to handle their administrative needs. Pam is now well-versed in all aspects of BME student needs.

As another part of a strategy to foster the sense of a "home" for BME students, the administration has supported student efforts to develop a local student chapter of the professional society that represents the biomedical engineering discipline. The student chapter is now formally affiliated with the national biomedical engineering society (BMES) and meets regularly for social and professional interactions. The physical proximity of BMES student activities to the student chapter representing electrical engineering (IEEE) also promotes cross-fertilization between the student chapters.

Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering

Chemical Engineering Program

Feedback that we have received from employers indicates that our graduates perform at a very high level, comparable to that of the National Labs.

Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering

Metallurgical Engineering Program

Graduate students perform research at a very high level, comparable to that of National Labs.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering

Civil Engineering: Environmental Program

Each doctoral student completing a PhD degree in environmental engineering has demonstrated their academic qualifications by completing a program of study that was developed in consultation with their PhD advisor(s) and committee members. They have demonstrated their ability to conceive and conduct research by successfully defending their dissertation. They have demonstrated their ability to complete scholarly work through preparation and submission of abstracts and manuscripts for presentation at
professional conferences and preparation and submission of research papers to professional journals. Some doctoral students have also prepared and submitted research proposals to secure funding and have demonstrated effective teaching abilities in the classroom.

**Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering**  
**Civil Engineering Program**

Each doctoral student completing a PhD degree in the CEE Department has demonstrated their academic qualifications by completing a program of study that was developed in consultation with their PhD advisor(s) and committee members. They have demonstrated their ability to conceive and conduct research by successfully defending their dissertation. They have demonstrated their ability for scholarly work through preparation and submission of abstracts and manuscripts for presentation at professional conferences and preparation and submission of research papers to professional journals. Some doctoral students have also prepared and submitted research proposals to secure funding and have demonstrated effective teaching abilities in the classroom.

**Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering**  
**Electrical Engineering Program**

From this faculty survey it is evident that most of the EE doctoral students substantially meet the program expectations but need improvement to fully meet the expectations especially in the areas of comprehensive knowledge and paper publication in the journals and conference proceedings.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**  
**Mechanical Engineering Program**

Objective #1 -- ability to define, design and execute... -- was expected to be the most difficult to fulfill, and indeed it was. Also indicative was the decided disconnect between faculty and student responses -- for the most part, the students felt that they were doing well in achieving this objective; the faculty thought that their performance was merely marginal. Disappointingly, only six student responses were recorded; so that the inherent bias may have been large. The faculty took a more optimistic view for Objective #3 -- theoretical foundation -- and Objective #4 -- ability of students to advance the engineering discipline. Here, only 10% of the graduate students were deemed to be faring poorly.

As a part of graduate assessment, Dr. Kwang Kim has tracked the post-graduation careers of our 45 MS students and 8 PhD students who have been awarded their degrees since Fall '02. As of September '06 he has found that among the 8 PhDs:
2 (25%) have engineering positions in industry;
4 (50%) have either joined a university in a tenure-track position or as a postdoctoral research scientist;
1 (12%) is working as a research scientist (or equivalent) in a national laboratory; and
1 (12%) is unemployed.

Our survey results indicate that both faculty and students are satisfied with the PhD program. In particular, the graduate faculty view the PhD students as quite capable of beginning either an academic or a business-oriented career after graduating.
As a part of graduate assessment, Dr. Kwang Kim has tracked the post-graduation careers of our 41 MS students and 7 PhD students who have been awarded their degrees since Fall '01. As of September '05 he has found that among the 7 PhDs:

(15%) have engineering positions in industry;
(57%) have either joined a university in a tenure-track position or as a post doctoral research scientist;
(29%) are working as research scientists (or equivalent) in national laboratories;

Our survey results indicate that both faculty and students are satisfied with the ME - PhD program. In particular, the graduate faculty view the PhD students as quite capable of beginning either an academic or a business-oriented career after graduating.

**College of Liberal Arts**  
**Department of Anthropology**  
**Anthropology Program**

Student Learning Outcome 1: One doctoral student successfully completed and defended a dissertation during the year, and another took the doctoral qualifying exam with very good results. All of the students in the doctoral program received good annual progress evaluations.

Student Learning Outcome 2: The only student who completed the doctoral program during the year chose not to enter the marketplace at this time because of a pending maternity.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Student teaching evaluations as a measure of the ability of doctoral students to teach and explain anthropological concepts have mixed results. Two of students in the doctoral program appear to have been very good skills in this regard, but two others considerably less so.

Student Learning Outcome 1: Only one doctoral student took core graduate seminars during the year and received an ‘A’ in one class and ‘A-’ in the other. The anthropology faculty reviewed the performance of all doctoral students during the year and sent letters to each.

Student Learning Outcome 2: No students graduated from the anthropology doctorate program during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Three doctoral students taught introductory classes in anthropology during the year. Course evaluations rated the doctoral students on a 5-point scale from “strongly agree” (excellent) to “strongly disagree” (poor). One doctoral student received ratings of 70.5 percent strongly agree, 19.2 percent agree, 7.9 percent neutral, 1.8 percent disagree, and 0.6 percent strongly disagree. Another doctoral student received ratings of 45.9 percent strongly agree, 42.1 percent agree, 9.6 percent neutral, 2.0 percent disagree, and 0.4 percent strongly disagree. The third doctoral student received ratings of 48.1 percent strongly agree, 33.7 percent agree, 12.5 percent neutral, 4.3 percent disagree, and 1.4 percent strongly disagree.

Assessment data for 2007-2008 suggest that most students in the doctoral program in anthropology are meeting the expectations of the SLOs. The performance of 86 percent of the doctoral students in anthropological critical thinking, writing, and oral presentations was evaluated as excellent or good in graduate seminars. Student teaching evaluations as a measure of the ability of doctoral students to teach and explain anthropological concepts yielded mixed results. Of the students in the doctoral program who taught courses during the year, 71 percent appear to have very good skills in this regard but the remaining 29 percent less so. During the year, four doctoral students demonstrated mastery of a specialization in anthropology by completing comprehensive exams and successfully defending a dissertation prospectus. Another doctoral student demonstrated significant research skills by
completing a dissertation, publishing an article in a professional journal, and co-editing a book that was published during this time period. Finally, the one doctoral student who graduated during the year is currently employed in the Department of Anthropology at Baylor University.

Student Learning Outcome 1: The only two doctoral students taking core graduate seminars during the year received an A in the class. The anthropology faculty reviewed the performance of all doctoral students during the year and sent letters to each.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Two students graduated from the anthropology doctorate program during the 2003-2004 academic year. Of these, one is employed as a staff archaeologist for a federal government agency and the other is a private consultant.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Two doctoral students taught introductory classes in anthropology during the year. Course evaluations rated one of the doctoral students as 71 percent excellent, 22 percent good, and six percent fair. The other doctoral student received ratings of 65 percent excellent, 31 percent good, and four percent fair.

"Doctoral students are successful in all measures, both before and after graduating."

Student Learning Outcome 1: No doctoral students completed and defended a dissertation during the year.

Student Learning Outcome 2: No doctoral students completed and defended a dissertation during the year.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Student teaching evaluations as a measure of the ability of doctoral students to teach and explain anthropological concepts have mixed results. Two of the students in the doctoral program who taught courses during the year appear to have very good skills in this regard but three others considerably less so.

Department of Basque Studies

Basque Studies Program

The two students expected to defend their dissertations in 2008 did so successfully. Another student is expected to defend her dissertation in spring 2009.

The structure put in place during 2006 has helped both faculty and students. Two students are now due to defend their dissertations next semester.

Pedro Oiarzabal was admitted to the tutorial Ph.D. program in Basque Studies for the academic year 2001/2002 and successfully completed all requirements for his doctorate in August 2006. The assessment program plan for the Center was substantially altered during the spring and summer of 2006, in order to give the tutorial Ph.D. program more rigor and structure, factors which should improve Ph.D. students' completion rates by establishing clearer learning outcomes for students and more effective means of charting and evaluating students' progress.

The previous Plan did not reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the program. It needed to focus on elements of achievement common to all students – process.
Department of English

English Program

Admissions statistics for 2005 demonstrate the continued appeal and strength of our doctoral program. We received 35 applications to our doctoral program during 2005, 13 of which were accepted (approximately one-third, at 37%). Of the 13 admits 9 ultimately attended (approximately two-thirds, at 69%). These encouraging numbers are comparable to 2004, although this year saw a slight rise in PhD. applicants (from 33 to 35).

Placement statistics and reports suggest that our strong recruiting numbers are probably related to our strong placement record. Five doctoral students graduated in 2005. Of them, three have already accepted tenure-track professorships (University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Tampa; Mansfield University), one has accepted a term lectureship in our own department, and one is actively on the academic job market at the moment. This record continues the department’s doctoral student placement record of almost 100% (a record unmatched even by some top-ten English doctoral programs in the country).

Exit interviews with graduating doctoral students show a high level of satisfaction with our Ph.D. program and the emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the focus on professional development that is central to the mission of our doctoral program. Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: the structure of seminar requirements to reflect actual work in the profession; workshops on dissertation writing conducted by departmental faculty; departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student’s professional development trajectory; the range of teaching opportunities for students in composition, humanities, and literature courses; the summer research assistantships (which compensate students to collaborate on faculty research projects); the strong instructional support for doctoral students as apprentice teachers; and, the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on major research projects including textual editing, website development, and journal editing.

Findings from experience on the job, focus group activity, data bases, and 2008 Self Study follow:

1. Experience on the job and results from 2008 self study: I am new to the Graduate Director's position as of July 1, 2008. One of the first problems I faced was two students asking for extensions on time to degree (6 years for MA; 8 years for PhD). Further, from our Self Study, we learned that we need to do a better job of tracking progress of students through our various degrees.

2. Experience on the job: I have found that some of our new graduate faculty are not fully familiar with graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees.

3. Experience on the job: I have found that some of our students are not fully familiar with graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees.

4. Data from alumni surveys: Six percent (n= 1) of PhD student alumni rank advisement as very poor; thirty-eight percent rank it as fair or good; only fifty percent rank it excellent. Twenty-eight percent of PhD student alumni rank level of faculty interactions as good or fair; seventy-two percent rank it excellent.

5. Focus group interaction: A focus group of graduate students expressed a wish that our academic job series could be a bit more student-focused.

6. Student feedback: Students have been confused in planning their programs of study because we have had a not entirely transparent course rotation schedule at the 700 seminar level.

7. PhD chair feedback and results from 2008 self study: Some students take 600-level courses instead of 700-level courses. This has been determined to be a problem because of the mixture of not only undergraduate students in 400/600 level split courses but also graduate special students and students admitted to our MA or PhD programs.
The quality of mentoring, advisement, and attention to professional development are widely credited for our students' success in the job market. Some students felt that the department could do more to foster a graduate student culture, especially for PhD students who are no longer taking classes, by hosting more public occasions, readings, and the like. We are still developing the alumni survey that we plan to administer at three-year intervals for twelve years with particular attention to jobs held, publications, achieving tenure and/or job advancement in non-academic careers.

Statistics suggest that our strong recruiting numbers are related to our strong placement record. Two doctoral students graduated in 2005, both of whom are returning students who are unlikely to pursue a national job search. Despite this unusual year (normally we graduate more students who seek professorships immediately after graduation), the department's doctoral student placement record is nearly 100% (a record unmatched even by some top-ten English doctoral programs in the country). Exit interviews with graduating doctoral students show a high level of satisfaction with our Ph.D. program and the emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the focus on professional development that is a core the mission of our doctoral program.

Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: the structure of seminar requirements to reflect actual work in the profession; workshops on dissertation writing conducted by departmental faculty; departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student's professional development trajectory; the range of teaching opportunities for students in composition, humanities, and literature courses; the summer research assistantships (which compensate students to collaborate on faculty research projects); the strong instructional support for doctoral students as apprentice teachers; the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on major research projects including textual editing, website development, and journal editing; and, the thoroughness of the department's new Academic Job Placement Workshop series. Interviews with graduates produced several suggestions about how our programs might be further improved:

• Because our department has hired quite a few assistant professors in recent years (and has three more searches ongoing now), we are concerned that new departmental graduate faculty members may require a more formal introduction to the department's graduate advisement mechanisms, including the many responsibilities of a graduate committee chair.

• There are certain aspects of graduate advisement that department graduate faculty members handle on a case-by-case basis. These include the specific format of the written comprehensive examinations and the amount of time permitted to elapse between the written comprehensive examinations and the oral examination. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate an explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to these sorts of graduate advisement issues.

• It was felt that graduate special students, because they are not formally members of any graduate program, were not receiving sufficiently timely and helpful advisement, and as a result were occasionally making unwise decisions that might have been avoided had they received earlier or better advisement.

Admissions statistics for 2007 demonstrate the continued appeal and strength of our doctoral program. We received 27 applications to our doctoral program during 2007, 10 of which were accepted (37%). Of the 10 admits 5 ultimately attended (50%). These numbers are roughly comparable to 2006, although this year saw a reduction in matriculation among admitted Ph.D. applicants (from 83% to 50%), a change that may be attributable to the fact that we lost several good applicants to other programs which were able to offer an assistantship package more attractive than ours. Statistics suggest that our strong recruiting numbers are related to our strong placement record. Two doctoral students
graduated in 2006, both of whom received offers of visiting assistant professorships in their first year on the job market. We have several finishing or recently finished doctoral students on the job market this year, and their prospects also look quite good. The department's doctoral student placement record remains at nearly 100%.

Exit interviews with graduating doctoral students show a high level of satisfaction with our Ph.D. program and the program emphases within it. Students praised the commitment of their faculty mentors to their professional success, and they appreciated the focus on professional development that is a core mission of our doctoral program. Among the sorts of professional support the students mentioned were the following: the structure of seminar requirements to reflect actual work in the profession; workshops on dissertation writing conducted by departmental faculty; departmental financial support for travel to professional conferences; conference paper workshops conducted by faculty; portfolio advisement systems in which faculty and students consult about the student's professional development trajectory; the range of teaching opportunities for students in composition, humanities, and literature courses; the summer research assistantship program (which compensates students to collaborate on faculty research projects); the strong instructional support for doctoral students as apprentice teachers; the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on major research projects including textual editing, website development, and journal editing; and, the thoroughness of the department's Academic Job Placement Workshop series.

Interviews with graduates produced several suggestions about how our programs might be further improved:

• There remains a range of approaches taken by individual faculty members to certain aspects of graduate advisement, including how the chair of a student's graduate committee communicates and consults with other members of the committee. The department's Graduate Committee felt that it was important to initiate an explicit dialogue among the department's graduate faculty about best practices with respect to committee communication issues.

• Because our department has continued to hire new assistant professors each year in recent years (and has three searches ongoing now), we remain concerned that new departmental graduate faculty members receive an appropriate introduction to the department's graduate advisement mechanisms, including the many responsibilities of a graduate committee chair.

Department of History

History Program

The department of history believes passed on the data generated in this assessment project that the vast majority of students are meeting the stated learning outcomes.

The 2008 Report on the History PhD focuses on Time to Degree and Outcomes of our PhD's who graduated between 2000 and 2008. We are concerned to evaluate the length of time that it takes students to complete their degrees, and the success that they achieve on the basis of their degrees. In all, the PhD program appears to be doing well in both areas.

The average (mean) Time to Degree for UNR History PhD's is 7.25 years. Four completed their degrees in 8 years, two in 7 years, and two in 6 years. This compares well with national averages for TTD's for the Social Sciences ( ) and even better for the Humanities ( ).
With regard to Outcomes, we find that all eight UNR History PhD's graduating since 2000 are presently working in academia. 50% of our graduates from 2000-2008 have tenure-track jobs at four-year colleges (Carroll College, Montana; Georgia Southwestern University, Georgia; Great Basin College, Nevada and Grand Valley State University, Michigan). 25% have achieved tenure. 12.5% have significant administrative jobs in Academia (Associate Director, UNR Academy for the Environment), and 37.5% have adjunct/lecturer positions (UNR, Nevada State College, California State Sacramento).

The publication record of our graduates between 2000 and 2008 includes two books, published at the University of Nevada Press and the Edwin Mellen Press, and several articles published in such venues as the scholarly journals Early Modern Women, Global Studies Journal, Nevada Historical Society Quarterly, and a book Emerging Voices: Experiences of the underrepresented Asian Americans.

**Department of Judicial Studies**  
**Judicial Studies Program**

Faculty can benefit by understanding the educational needs of their students on the various topics as well as an overall perception of performance for teaching students of this caliber (judges).

Students are struggling with conducting their research and analyzing the data. Resources near them (2 of 12 are out of state) are not readily available, or they are unaware of the resources.

Study progress through the program of study has slowed some. This is primarily due to student workload (as judges), having to run for re-election, and funding sources becoming more limited. Students continue to need additional methodological, statistical, and analytical assistance.

**Department of Political Science**  
**Political Science Program**

The PhD. program is running very smoothly; students are successfully moving through their degree program.

The PhD. program is doing a successful job of educating graduate students and helping them to pursue higher education or enter/return/remain in their chosen career paths.

All PhD PSC students are required to take rigorous comprehensive exams in two major fields and one minor field of study. The successful passage rate exceeds 95 percent. We are preparing our students for success and they are succeeding!

The PhD. program is doing a successful job of educating graduate students and helping them to pursue higher education or enter/return/remain in their chosen career paths.

**Department of Psychology**  
**Psychology: Behavioral Analysis Program**

Six doctoral students have graduated this year as of Sept-08 and another is expected by December. All but one has obtained employment, and this one is contracted to start services this fall. The Behavior Analysis Training Committee (BATC) is pleased with the outcomes of this year's assessment activities.
In addition, BATC is also pleased with the outcomes derived from its Total Performance System (TPS), which tracks the program's academic progress as well as financial position. The 12% not meeting the research goals simply have not finding entered within each SLO description with revised Plan.

The Behavior Analysis Training Committee (BATC) is pleased with the outcomes of this year's assessment activities. In addition, BATC is also pleased with the outcomes derived from its Total Performance System (TPS), which tracks the program's financial as well as academic progress.

**Department of Psychology**

**Psychology: Clinical Program**

Our program continues to meet its stated goals.

The Clinical Psychology Program went through a site visit from the American Psychological Association in May 2007, the basis of that review being the Clinical Psychology Program was awarded accreditation and the next site visit is scheduled for 2012. The Clinical Psychology program will be listed annually among accredited programs of professional psychology in the American Psychologist and on the American Psychological Accreditation web pages [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org).

**Department of Psychology**

**Psychology: Cognitive & Brain Science Program**

We have met several times during the review period to discuss student application and progress. We are currently pleased with the progress of the students and the success of the changes implemented last year.

We have found that most of the faculty and students have been prolific in production of scientific research and successful in teaching.

Students and faculty have been quite productive this year regarding publications and research. The numbers of undergraduates being taught continues to increase. We have occasionally found ourselves short of graduate student TA positions.

We are confident that our students are making satisfactory progress towards their goals. We are however, currently limited by our resources in order to employ students as TAs and to provide funds for travel to scientific meetings.

All students progressed at expected rates through the program this year. As the result of a program review a number of changes were made to the program curriculum and thesis formats that were designed to enrich the student's education and research skills and better prepare them for subsequent employment.
College of Science  
Department of Chemistry  
Chemistry Program

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle one) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduated students are doing very well;  
(2) the cohort of graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;  
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle one evaluations; with only small numbers in the data pool, the % values can be perturbed easily; and  
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 5 years statistically meaningful data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 5-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle three of a 4-year cycle) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduated PhD students are doing very well;  
(2) the cohort of PhD graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;  
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle three evaluations; and  
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle two) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduated PhD students are doing very well;  
(2) the cohort of PhD graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;  
(3) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle two evaluations; and  
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next 2 years, statistically better data can be expected to obtain following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.

Several key findings have become apparent during the 4 years of implementation of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
(1) graduated PhD students are doing very well;  
(2) the cohort of PhD graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;  
(3) achievement at all levels; and  
(4) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained in subsequence evaluations. (See below, under Comments for more explanations.

Several key findings have become apparent at this early stage of implementation (cycle four of a 4-year cycle) of the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan:
1. graduated PhD students are doing very well;  
2. the cohort of PhD graduate students of the current evaluation cycle are doing very nicely;  
3. achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle 4 evaluations;  
4. with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years, statistically better data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the 4-year cycle of evaluations.
**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Geo-Engineering Program**

This is a relatively new Ph.D. program. It is essential that students at this level understand their responsibility to forward the state of knowledge in their field. Most of these students are meeting this responsibility; some are slow to start. For this program to remain of high quality, students meeting this responsibility are to be rewarded by conferral of degrees; students not meeting this responsibility should not.

2008 has seen a marked improvement in the ability of UNR geo-engineering Ph.D. graduates earning jobs commensurate with their degree level, including tenure-track faculty appointments, temporary faculty appointments, post-doctorate appointments, and division leaders of state government organizations.

The purpose of having a Ph.D. program should be re-examined. Students are not very successful when competing for academic appointments. If this is an important objective, then this lack of success is a major concern.

The Ph.D. degree program in geo-engineering is a young program (8 years since approval). The total number of graduates is small, so small that there is no employer or student questionnaire data. Faculty advising Ph.D. students do not necessarily instill in these students the drive to enable the student to be competitive in academia. Faculty are not fully engaged in outcomes assessment and there is no effective method for compelling them to be more involved if they are not responsible for writing the reports.

This is a new Ph.D. program. It is essential that students at this level understand their responsibility to forward the state of knowledge in their field. Most of these students are meeting this responsibility; some are slow to start. For this program to remain of high quality, students meeting this responsibility are to be rewarded by conferral of degrees; students not meeting this responsibility should not.

Our geoengineering students are beginning to be recognized by employers. They are making significant contributions to their field, recognized by NASA in news releases, and Idaho State University with award nominations.

---

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Geology & Related Earth Science Program PhD**

PhD students during early and mid stages of program are largely active in professional development, including presenting their research at meetings, attending meetings, workshops, and field trips, and actively pursuing their own research funding. PhD students have been successful in passing the milestones of writing a successful research proposal, demonstrating basic competency in their specialization, and advancing to candidacy, however many of the current PhD students are stalled in the late stage writing phase of their degrees, apparently due to full time employment demands. Of the current students pre-candidacy, mean time in the program for the current students is 4 semesters, however for those advanced to candidacy; mean time in the program is 11semesters. Low graduation numbers make job placement figures difficult to assess. 2 out of 3 students graduating since2005 are employed as geologists in the minerals/petroleum industry.
Department of Geological Sciences  
Geophysics Program

Four Student Survey and four Employer Survey responses were available for the 2002 through 2008 survey cohorts. Of the 7 graduates since 2002, 3 completed the program in 2007 - two of these graduates were surveyed in the 2008 cohort. All program graduate and employer surveys continue to rate the overall quality of the program and preparation in major as excellent.

Although annual enrollments have historically fluctuated, this program remains a highly resource-efficient compliment to the BS and MS geophysics programs. The program serves the State by producing a small number of elite doctoral graduates who can credibly represent Nevada as specialists and leaders in assessing and managing; Nevada's varied geo-science concerns. The core requirement of this program remains a published Dissertation typically based on an externally funded research project developed and supervised by a specialist graduate faculty member. Efficiencies of scale are inherently illusive in such research-based graduate education; instead the program emphasis is on the impact and quality of the students' research.

For the graduates of the Ph.D. geophysics degree program, only 1 UNR Student Survey and 1 Employer Survey responses were available for the 2002 through 2007 survey cohorts. Of the 7 graduates since 2002-03 completed the program in 2007 - too recent to be surveyed. The program graduate and employer surveys rated the overall quality of the program and preparation in major as excellent.

The main indicator of our Ph.D. program's success is that all of our Ph.D. graduates completing the program in the last five years are employed as geophysicists by government agencies, national laboratories, academic institutions, or industry where many play leading roles in their fields.

Department of Physics  
Physics Program

All PhD graduates fully met outcomes expectations, and the PhD program was found to be very successful. However, in 2005, the Physics Graduate Faculty held several discussions assessing the efficacy of Physics Qualifying Exam, and drafted a 9-page document on the issue. This assessment is still in progress. Also, a need was identified for a second graduate class on plasma physics, at a higher level than the first.

All PhD graduates fully met outcomes expectations, and the PhD program was found to be very successful. However, a second graduate class on plasma physics is needed, at a higher level than the first. Also, there were concerns about the Physics Qualifying Exam.

100% of our PhD graduates substantially met outcomes expectations. However, quite a few current PhD students are behind schedule in filing a program of study.

90% of PhD students and graduates met outcomes expectations, and the PhD program was found to be very successful. 100% of PhD alumni replied that, if they could start over, they would definitely (50%) or probably (50%) attend UNR again. However, students have expressed the concern that elective courses in advanced research topics are not offered often enough. A second graduate class on plasma physics is needed, at a higher level than the first, and students would benefit from an advanced quantum theory class. Also, there are concerns about the uniformity of standards in the administration of the oral component of the Physics Comprehensive Exam. Finally, the program would benefit from having a bigger student cohort, with a greater percentage of students supported by Research Assistantships.
**Interdisciplinary Degree Programs**

**Department of Atmospheric Sciences**

**Atmospheric Sciences Program**

The doctoral program assessment activities indicate that these students are attaining our objectives for learning and professional development. One area of continued effort is to improve communications skills in a wide variety of modes, and we address this through the new Graduate Seminar course, expectations for conference participation and publications, and encouragement of presentation for diverse audiences.

The depth and diversity offered by the Atmospheric Sciences doctoral program is preparing students very well in most instances. There are a few cases where students, particularly those who have come from other countries, to need additional experience with communication and with relating their research to broader issues in our scientific field.

We were pleased with the progress of all our doctoral students. Achievement in across all learning outcomes was satisfactory and in many instances exemplary.

The PhD students in Atmospheric Sciences progress rapidly due to their strong preparation. A prior M.S. degree is required for the Ph.D. program in Atmospheric Sciences, and the UNR M.S. program in Atmospheric Sciences requires a thesis. The overall performance is strong in all of the Learning Outcomes. The advisors and instructors are generally satisfied with the achievements of the doctoral students. A new annual student progress report that is completed jointly by an advisor and their student has been very useful in gathering assessment data and feedback.

The statistics shows that the PhD candidates are progressing well in the program. It is important to note that the students managed to balance success quite well between academic and research accomplishments. One student was not able to complete his PhD. study and left the country due to a family situation.

**Department of Cell & Molecular Biology**

**Cell & Molecular Biology Program**

A high percentage of CMB graduates have successfully gained postdoctoral or other employment. This is the major assessment criteria for the CMB program.

**Department of Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology & Physiology**

**Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology & Physiology Program**

The CMPP program has trained excellent graduate students over the years who have for the most part found post-doctoral positions in top-rank institutions. Many of our graduated CMPP students now hold academic research positions or professional positions in the private sector. Our experienced and well funded CMPP faculty have been and continue to be committed to train their students early at writing their own abstracts and manuscripts. Many CMPP students have graduated with more than one or two peer-reviewed publications where they appear as first author. Basic skills in English, science and
mathematics of our incoming students are often weak. Even though a reputable institution, the small size of our school impedes on our ability to attract the best students in the country and around the world as most of them wish to be trained in big schools. Basic skill deficiencies must therefore be compensated by extracurricular education provided by CMPP faculty.

**Department of Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology**

Ecology, Evolution, & Conservation Biology Program

The EECB Program is healthy. A large majority of students are scientifically productive. These students are publishing regularly and are attending professional meetings where they present their results. Students for which we have data have been successful in acquiring professional positions.

1. Students will understand the theoretical and empirical basis of ecology, evolution, and conservation biology and related fields. For this learning outcome 69% of the students have fully met expectations, 28% have substantially met expectations, and 3% are substantially failing expectations.

2. Students will obtain knowledge of the application of computer tools, conceptual and analytical models, data analysis techniques, and field and laboratory procedures. For this learning outcome 59% of the students have fully met expectations, 39% have substantially met expectations, and 2% are substantially failing expectations.

3. Students will develop an ability to articulate scientific concepts and results in written, graphical, and verbal formats. For this learning outcome 13% of the students have fully met expectations, 23% have substantially met expectations, and 64% are substantially failing expectations.

4. Students will secure positions in their field upon graduation. All students fully meet expectations.

Obtaining some of the data specified in the Assessment Plan written by my predecessor is unworkable. For example, faculty members simply do not have time to prepare written evaluations of all EECB students enrolled in their classes. Furthermore, for many other metrics, obtaining reliable data on students who have been in the program for several years is virtually impossible. Students’ folders only contain forms required by the program and the graduate school; information on presentations at scientific meetings, publications, and details on comprehensive and oral exams (except for pass or fail) have not been recorded in the past, and students’ memories apparently are short.

**Department of Environmental Sciences & Health**

Environmental Sciences & Health Program

As noted as part of the report for Outcome 1 students were active in publishing papers in peer-reviewed journals, presenting results at national societal conferences and defending their theses or dissertations. Each activity involved use of written, numerical, graphical, spoken, and computer-based forms of communication.

**Department of Hydrologic Sciences**

Hydrogeology Program

All of the metrics used to evaluate the efficacy of the Graduate Program of Hydrologic Sciences (GPHS) indicate that the students are learning the material required of them and employers are generally satisfied with GPHS students. A majority of former students rated the Hydrologic Sciences as excellent in terms overall quality and preparation for their career. One weakness may be that 22% of
Appendix 3F

those surveyed rated their preparation as fair. The results of the employer survey are generally positive with most of the survey results being better than the University average. The Program scored below the University average on problem solving, cooperation, and diversity.

Department of Hydrologic Sciences

Hydrology Program

All of the metrics used to evaluate the efficacy of the Graduate Program of Hydrologic Sciences (GPHS) indicate that the students are learning the material required of them and employers are generally satisfied with GPHS students. A majority of former students rated the Hydrologic Sciences as excellent in terms overall quality and preparation for their career. One weakness may be that 22% of those surveyed rated their preparation as fair. The results of the employer survey are generally positive with most of the survey results being better than the University average. The Program scored below the University average on problem solving, cooperation, and diversity.

Department of Social Psychology

Social Psychology Program

This assessment report confirms that the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program does an excellent job in providing students with relevant skills and experiences needed for success. We are particularly pleased with the scholarly productivity of our students. However, whereas most of our students are progressing nicely, the only concern is that some students are slow in developing a dissertation prospectus. The present assessment reveals that, in 2008, our Ph.D. students were productive in terms of publications and conference presentations. Most students did present or publish, laying the foundation for a future career within or outside of academia. And there are students who in terms of number of publications and accomplishments do exceed faculty expectations! However, there is a small group of students who, despite their advanced standing in the program, show only low scholarly productivity.

A similar majority-minority split is found with regard to meeting program expectations. Most students move at the pace expected by the program, complete requirements and graduate on time. However, it appears that there is a small group of advanced students who do not meet expectations with regard to their comprehensive exam, dissertation prospectus, and ultimately, their time-to-graduation. In one or two cases, worries as to whether the student will indeed graduate, appear to be justified. At the same time, it is not clear whether students facing problems at the dissertation stage (prospectus, thesis) are the same ones who faced problems at an earlier stage in the program.

In terms of placement, results were quite satisfactory, especially in light of the weakening job market. Perhaps the most favorable picture emerged with regard to teaching as more than three quarters of all advanced students in the program had taught their own courses—an important asset on the academic job market. There appears to be, however, a persistent tension between teaching and meeting program requirements. In other words, in various cases it has to be suspected that students' formal progress in the program has been delayed because they focused on teaching, instead of their own dissertation process. Since most of those who accept opportunities to teach a course continue to hold down a graduate research assistantship at the same time, this combination of factors may be delaying progress toward degree completion of a few students. Because of the need to have both teaching experience and research productivity at the time of degree completion, and because the pay for teaching a single course is not sufficient to provide support, the need to obtain both experiences while moving toward timely graduation (while beautifully mastered by some students) remains challenging for others.
School of Medicine  
Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology  
Speech Pathology Program  

We had three doctoral students in our program but two graduated in May. All doctoral students performed as well as junior faculty.

Most students achieved the desired goals.

SLOs identify successful students.

Two students have graduated in the past year and both met all SLOs.
Program Planned Changes: Bachelors Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Animal Biotechnology
Animal Science Program

The department has an ongoing process of program and curriculum review. Comments from the senior exit interview will be the starting point for making program changes and updating. There has been a 25% turnover in faculty with four new/replacement positions filled in the last year. The new expertise and talent will be utilized in realigning the curriculum and programs to meet changing expectations and demands. The faculty encourages the undergraduate students to utilize internships to gain experience in production agriculture, if that is their primary interest. The demand for expertise and experience in work with lab animals in biomedical research in the Truckee Meadows will far outstrip the supply of graduates furnished by the Nevada System of Higher Education. There is also increasing demand for recreational animal science, such as equitation courses. After the department evaluates the new skills and interests available to the teaching program, appropriate changes and updating will be made to the curriculum.

The department has started a process of program and curriculum review. Comments from the senior exit interview will be the starting point for making program changes and updating.

The department has an ongoing process of program and curriculum review. Comments from the senior exit interview will be the starting point for making program changes and updating. The department has hired two new faculty in the areas of veterinary medicine and animal science and is in the process of recruiting to fill a position in animal science production. After the department evaluates the new skills and interests available to the teaching program, appropriate changes and updating will be made to the curriculum. The Assessment Plan will be reviewed and updated along with the curriculum.

The department has an ongoing process of program and curriculum review. Comments from the senior exit interview will serve as starting point for making program changes and updating. The expertise and talent of our faculty will be utilized to realign the curriculum and programs to meet changing expectations and demands. The faculty continues to encourage undergraduate students to utilize internships in order to gain experience in production agriculture, but have also made efforts to expand opportunities for students interested in the companion animal field. The demand for expertise and experience in work with lab animals in biomedical research in the Truckee Meadows currently outstrips the supply of graduates furnished by the Nevada System of Higher Education and efforts continue to provide training and education in the field.

Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biochemistry Program

Dr. Condit has done an excellent job over the last four years collecting and reporting findings for our current learning objectives. Much of this data clearly states that our students are being well trained in various areas of Biochemistry. In Fall 2006, Christie Howard has taken over the duties of undergraduate assessment for the Biochemistry Program. She is currently in the process of interviewing faculty members...
to determine if we should continue to focus on these current learning objectives or focus on other skill sets deemed important for Biochemistry majors. Interviews with faculty are almost complete and a faculty meeting is planned to discuss and prioritize our assessment goals. Interview will be completed by the end of the fall 2006 semester and the faculty meeting will be scheduled for early in the spring 2007 semester.

SLO 2: We will continue to give the ACS exam to our students for the Fall 08 and Spring 09 semesters. Some of the lecture material will be slightly modified to make sure we clearly cover the content found in the ACS exam. We will also be sharing the ACS exam with another faculty member who teaches a Biochemistry lab course concurrently with our one-semester lecture course in the fall.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences
Environmental Science Program

The fall 2005 course in NRES 482/682 Small Watershed Hydrology featured a field trip to The Nature Conservancy's River Fork Ranch in the Carson Valley and associated research projects and undergraduate assignment. The field trip was performed in coordination with NRES 485/685 Limnology. The collaboration with The Nature Conservancy and the limnology course may continue in future years. Other courses plan to include field trips and other activities for additional experience in the future. Program Plans for each of our three majors (Environmental Science, Forest and Rangeland Management, and Wild Ecology and Conservation) have now been developed. Next year, an Assessment Report will be generated for each independent major. The Department will continue to review the manner in which data on student performance is collected and reported in order to improve the quality of assessment data assembled. Courses plan to include field trips.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences
Forest & Rangeland Management Program

The name of the course should be changed in the catalog to reflect the taxonomic or botanic nature of the revised class (and units changed from 5 to 4) such as Range and Forest Botany. Or a taxonomy class should be taught under a new title and Range and Forest Plants could be taught as in earlier years using 250 mounted plants that students learn on sight and through field trips. The taxonomy skills prepare students to work in any region of the world and be able to collect and identify an unknown specimen. This basic skill previously overlooked in the curriculum should not be abandoned as all Federal agencies require 6 units of plant taxonomy for employment.

Plans are in place to photograph specimens from all plant families covered in more detail to better explain characteristics in lecture. A new collection of plant specimens for the students to learn by recognition will be undertaken this summer. Review of different required texts is ongoing. A required paper is being considered (topics under discussion). A plant collection will be mandatory.

In addition, the faculty of the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences Department have discussed the idea of extending a set of core courses to the Forest and Rangeland Management, Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Environmental Science, and Ecohydrology majors.
Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
**Wildlife Ecology & Conservation Program**

Efforts to ensure sufficient field and laboratory experiences will be encouraged but these aspects are limited by the availability of funds to support travel, supplies and equipment.

Efforts to ensure sufficient field and laboratory experiences will be encouraged but these aspects are limited by the availability of funds to support travel, supplies, and equipment.

The faculty of the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences Department have discussed the idea of extending a set of core courses to the Forest and Rangeland Management, Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Environmental Science, and Ecohydrology majors. Incorporation of more oral presentations.

---

Department of Nutrition  
**Nutrition Program**

At the end of the spring semester, 2004, the Nutrition Department asked an expert in survey data from another department to administer a questionnaire about the department to the largest 400 level class. The results of that survey have been of much greater practical value for the department than the class evaluations, which are driven by the grading in the classes. We intend to do this survey on an annual basis. Strengths of the department as noted by students, related to advisement, "caring" professors, the variety of science classes, and the usefulness of the information provided in classes. Things we can do better include more volunteer opportunities, more summer classes, offer more classes both fall and spring, offer more electives, etc. Many of these depend on additional resources/FTE which we hope to have now that we have moved to CABNR and that our enrollment has grown. Dr. Wilson has created two electives in the past two years, NUTR 240 and NUTR 325, and will submit an FYE success strategies class to begin, hopefully, Fall, 2005. The overall rating of the quality of the program was rated at 3.4/5. The quality of the courses was rated 3.6/5. Interactions with faculty were rated at 4.2/5.

We will develop a workshop on advising for department faculty members in the hopes that a review of advising resources in the department and on campus will improve advising.

The FYE class will be offered this Fall and will address some of the issues students currently find perplexing. We need to clearly define responsibilities for them.

The question of grade inflation and the false impressions it generates will be addressed in several classes.

We hope to find more effective tool to measure learning rather than attitude.

We have begun discussions on an exit or comprehensive exam to be used as an additional

We have continued to discuss a general comprehensive exam to be administered during the final spring semester for each graduating class in order to better assess the extent to which students are graduating with the level of knowledge the Nutrition faculty thinks appropriate.

The Department is continuing its collaboration with local businesses, Vitamin Research Products and ProThera. The laboratory funded by these donors is near completion and has been used for one class. We expect the lab to be fully equipped this year.
The Curriculum Committee is seeking to restructure the lower business core classes and the key ACC 401 class to improve the basic accounting skills. These curriculum changes should be introduced at the end of next year.

More writing and presentation projects need to be introduced to meet the expectation. These will be discussed at the Curriculum Committee meeting to identify areas where this is possible.

Improved gathering of data is necessary particularly when a new instructor takes over a different course. More formal processes are needed to ensure that instructors do include the necessary evaluation process.

We will be reviewing our undergraduate financial accounting and managerial accounting tracks in the forthcoming year. The possibility of introducing a "bridge" course in financial accounting will be considered. The content and assessment of managerial accounting track will also be examined in the year.

We will be significantly revising our assessment measures and plans for the forthcoming year. We are exploring the possibility of a new bridge course between the introductory and the intermediate levels. We believe that this will enhance student's technical skills. It will also enable more creative teaching at the upper division levels because continuous remedial skills training will be reduced.

We will be revisiting some of the metrics used in conjunction with the College core assessment process. The faculty is considering forming an advisory board of employers to aid in the assessment of graduates' skills and initial job performance. In the future assessment measures may be added through enhanced employer surveys. The faculty has embraced the assessment process and is looking to it for future improvement metrics.

For the next assessment year the assessment plan will be modified to consolidate several of the existing IS LO's into a single LO and expand the number of accounting LO's. The assessment results made it clear that the curriculum is not fully integrated and that course prerequisites may be incomplete. Faculty are currently undergoing a program review based on the assessment results. Faculty decided to review each course in the curriculum in relation to the learning outcomes to better understand where material is taught and at what level/depth the course material is presented. As part of the program review, we will also work with students and members of the professional information systems community to address the issues identified during assessment.

Starting next year we will be adding an additional learning outcome to those currently in the plan: Students will be able to teach themselves the skills necessary to stay current in the rapidly evolving technical areas of IS.
The assessment results made it clear that the curriculum is not fully integrated and that course prerequisites may be incomplete. Faculty are currently undergoing a program review based on the assessment results. Faculty decided to review each course in the curriculum in relation to the learning outcomes to better understand where material is taught and at what level/depth the course material is presented. As part of the program review, we will also work with students and members of the professional information systems community to address the issues identified during assessment.

Department of Economics
Economics Program

The curriculum and assessment committees will define ways to measure the progress of economics majors with the load of assessment being distributed among almost all faculty in the department. The use of the standardized test will be reevaluated with regard to timing and student motivation (e.g. making the test a component of the student's course grade). Similar instruments will be considered such as writing tests, quantitative tests and a capstone research course.

The department curriculum committee will give additional consideration to a proposed major capstone course. The course may become a good candidate to assess strengths and weaknesses of majors nearing graduation, with respect to the department's overall learning objectives. The proposed capstone is an economics research course intended to integrate all facets of economics education including the integration of core concepts, quantitative and analytical skills, and verbal and written communication skills.

The department assessment committee will continue to review data from the OUA website and COBA dean's office to consider which items to track in the future. The working groups will continue to work toward implementing recommendations to develop threads in the curriculum to ensure progression from introductory level to intermediate and higher level classes.

College of Education
Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning
Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program

In an attempt to integrate the student learning sample fully into the secondary internship, the Secondary Manual and the Secondary Student Learning Sample Manual were revised and combined. The Elementary Manual for internship and the Elementary Student Learning Sample Manual are in the final stages of draft and will be available for use in spring 2007.

The program will be modified to include:
1. Increased focus on meaning of student context, student environment, and diversity.
2. Increase attention to the different types of formative and summative assessment.
3. Pair written assessment feedback from the professors (evaluators) with verbal comments (use of debriefing session).
**Department of Education Specialties**  
*Education Specialties Program*

Responses from employers and alumni, as well as analysis of some of the sub-skills within our SLOs, tell us that we need to add more information about English language learners to our curriculum. In addition, changes to national education policy require us to add information about RTI (response to intervention) into courses covering assessment and instruction.

**Special Education Major:**
Program improvements for this program are being planned in light of the new requirements for highly qualified special education teachers (NCLB), as well as in response to assessment of student performance. Improvements include closer control of course sequence, more integration of assessment information in methods courses (in addition to the assessment course currently required), and changes to the supervision of field experiences. These changes are currently in the planning stages and would be phased into effect.

**Department of Human Development & Family Studies**  
*Early Childhood Education Program*

Because the program assessment plan recently underwent a major revision, it is necessary this year to strive to collect more data so that each domain can be more fully assessed. For example, the coordinator will attempt to collect internship evaluations, data from the alumni survey, and employer feedback to better assess each domain.

The program has recently changed Coordinators, and several modifications are being planned with regard to assessment. The current Coordinator plans to substantially revise the Assessment Plan so that it more accurately reflects student performance in this program. One particular modification will be the addition of an exit exam or survey to gain an idea of students’ perspectives of this program and what modifications they might suggest. In informal conversations with students graduating this semester, several modifications were suggested that would improve the program and student-Coordinator communication within the program. Due to the perceived value of this feedback, a more formal method of assessing student perceptions will be developed.

**Department of Human Development & Family Studies**  
*Human Development & Family Studies Program*

HDFS 231, the practicum, is being restructured to include an online component with self-paced modules and streaming videos. Students will be required to take three credits instead of two, and a standardized syllabus and objectives for the course have been developed. HDFS 470, the internship, is now being taught by a faculty member rather than an LOA, and is offered for a letter grade. This should provide the consistency and quality that students need. The pre-major was discontinued when we learned from assessment data that student performance has not improved, but enrollment has declined. Student feedback from the focus groups indicated that they have been given inconsistent and sometimes incorrect information about the CFLE from their advisors. In response, the director of the HDFS undergraduate program conducted a workshop with faculty and staff to update them on the latest information and requirements for certification. The need for better career advising has been a consistent theme in the focus groups. We are in the process of developing a careers handout for students and advisors to help resolve this issue, and we are redesigning our recruitment materials, advising materials, and department home page to focus more on
career planning. Student concerns about the way that a particular course has been taught are being addressed by reassigning the course to the instructor who developed it (concerns have only surfaced since the original instructor stopped teaching it). The rotation of courses is under review in response to students' requests for scheduling changes. For the first time, a statement about student learning outcomes has been added to HDFS syllabi, with information about how specific objectives of the course support each learning outcome. Finally, assessment of advising will be added to the Assessment Plan for 2007.

This past year we put considerable effort into obtaining Family Life Education certification for our undergraduate program. Students are excited about this new opportunity, and most are taking coursework that prepares them to qualify for gaining the Certified Family Life Educator (CFLE) designation. This year our major effort will encompass mapping our curriculum and using the information to revise our course offerings. The department was reviewed in February 2004 and feedback from the review team indicates that we need to limit our course offerings and build our graduate program. We plan major curriculum revision based on these recommendations and the findings from our curriculum mapping. The issue of better career advisement also will be addressed.

Our initial effort to assess students with the online exam is being evaluated and will be modified for the future. We are currently adding questions to the senior online exam question bank, and we are adding a new exam covering the adolescent portion of the lifespan. These changes will be implemented this spring. We anticipate that data from the fall, 2003 assessment will provide additional information for making future changes in the program. We will have internship supervisor ratings and alumni data to add to our data pool next fall. Based on the data from our first round of assessment, we anticipate that the following changes will be (in some cases they already have been) implemented: 1. A student chapter of National Council on Family Relations has been created to serve as a peer mentoring program. Graduates of the program and professionals in the field are scheduled as guest speakers to help students explore potential careers. 2. The department chair has been mentoring the instructor for the internship course and together they have developed student and supervisor handbooks and supervisor rating forms. The instructor is also visiting sites and developing relationships with community partners. We expect that these efforts will produce high quality feedback on the student's internship experience that will allow us to do a more comprehensive assessment of their knowledge and skills. 3. Faculty are discussing dividing HDFS 436 into two separate courses in order to promote retention of the extensive content covered in this course. Student feedback from the mosaic focus group supports making this change.

College of Engineering
Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering
Chemical Engineering Program

Syllabi will be modified to include more discussion on sustainability and the impact of engineering projects on society, in general. The problem of approaching open ended problems has been identified as a significant challenge for senior students enrolled in the capstone design course. This indicates that students need to identify concepts and principles from all stages of their chemical engineering education which might apply to design problem solutions. In the context of a large design project, students have great difficulty in recognizing engineering problems of the type that they have encountered in previous engineering courses. They often don't know when to apply which skills from their engineering toolbox. The design instructor (Dr. Alan Fuchs) has recently concluded that he will incorporate less synthesis and more process analysis and optimization, to help students overcome this challenge.
Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering  
**Materials Science & Engineering Program**

The faculty will:
(a) Keep emphasizing the importance of oral and written communications by requiring written reports;
(b) Reports and oral presentations will increase the level of discussion relative to sustainability;
(c) Syllabi will be modified in such a way that class discussion will increase on sustainability and impact of engineering projects; also increased opportunities will be offered to the students for increased effort in writing reports and making oral presentations.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
**Civil Engineering Program**

1. Instructors will emphasize the importance of sound knowledge of fundamental science and mathematics in various courses.
2. More emphasis will be placed on AutoCAD throughout the curriculum where appropriate.
3. The CEE Space Committee plan for renovating and upgrading the teaching laboratory facilities will be pursued with the Administration.
4. Opportunities for students to improve their communication skills will be emphasized earlier in the curriculum. Submission of written project reports and delivery of oral presentations will be incorporated into all senior capstone design courses.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
**Civil Engineering: Environmental Program**

1. In-progress and proposed curriculum changes should be implemented.
2. The CEE Space Committee plan for renovating and upgrading the B.S.Env.E. laboratory teaching facilities should be pursued.
3. A review of course content in CS 135 and its contribution to the B.S.Env.E. curriculum will be performed.
4. Opportunities for students to improve their communication skills will be emphasized. Core courses should require submission of written project reports in addition to oral presentations to the class.

Department of Computer Science  
**Computer Science Program**

The committee reaffirms its recommendation that we develop one or more senior level course(s) which can be used to introduce students to advanced and relevant topics.

In addition, specific student suggestions made in all three years lead the committee to reaffirm its previous recommendation that faculty supply some educational opportunities in using commercial software packages.

The committee recommends that some mechanism for encouraging and supporting student study for certification is developed, but not that a requirement be established.
The committee reaffirms its previous recommendation that more homework assignments be presented as projects, which can easily be accomplished in senior level courses, and that faculty continue to support team work on student projects.

The committee reaffirms its recommendation that we develop one or more senior level course(s) which can be used to introduce students to advanced and relevant topics. The committee recognizes this variability of student background and recommends support for the current work being done to develop CS 105 as a freshman level introductory CS&E course. The proper content in such a course could be a great help in providing a common launch point for other CS&E courses.

The committee recommends that for more capable students the faculty in all levels of courses offer extra credit programming assignments with a broader range of applications. The committee re-affirms its recommendation that faculty include some communications component in senior level courses. There were several mixed responses about individual courses. However, there were several requests during 2002, 2003, and 2004 for more project work and more “real-world” projects. The committee re-affirms its recommendation that faculty try to approach more local companies to cooperate on senior level projects that relate to real-world problems. We also recommend that this item be presented for discussion at the next departmental advisory board meeting. Finally, more emphasis on project management skills and systems thinking should be discussed. Perhaps the use of more students team projects.

The committee has read carefully all faculty reports and would like to make the following recommendations:

• There should be stronger connections made between current and past faculty assessments. For example, it should be made clear which of the ideas that faculty suggested in their reports last year were implemented and to what extent they were successful. The committee would like to encourage all faculty to include a discussion in their reports, connecting past and current issues in their courses.

• The committee would like to suggest that faculty become more specific in their approaches/ideas to address various issues raised by the students. For example, faculty comments like "I will try to fix this problem" should be followed by providing further information about how the problem would be resolved exactly.

• In several courses, students expressed concerns about the pace of the course being very fast. Obviously, this is a difficult problem to address and student comments are usually mixed with regards to this issue. The committee would like to recommend that faculty consider this issue carefully and revise course material accordingly.

• In some courses, students reported that they could not handle the programming assignments very well while in other courses they requested more programming assignments. Programming assignments is a key component to almost all CS courses and are very critical in helping students to understand the course material. The committee would like to suggest that instructors re-evaluate both the number and complexity of assignments in their courses. Splitting large programming assignments into smaller ones, whenever this is possible, might help students to finish them successfully. Last year, it was also suggested by the committee that students might become more motivated if the programming assignments related to practical problems. Therefore, the committee would like to encourage all faculty to consider choosing programming assignments that relate to practical problems. Many times, students have criticized the textbooks used in various courses, however, comments on this issue are mixed. Although it is not easy to change textbooks often or even choose a textbook that would satisfy every student in class, the committee thinks that faculty should consider this issue carefully and take appropriate actions. For example, if it is difficult to choose a new text, augmenting course material with lecture notes and additional material other sources might be a way to satisfy most students. Last year, many students complained about the high student-to-teacher ratio in several courses. There were
similar comments made this year. The committee recommended last year that the Dept should take appropriate actions to keep this ratio as low as possible, for example, by hiring new faculty and LOAs. The Dept did hire two new faculty last year and several new LOAs, however, it is obvious that it would need to increase both faculty and LOA size to bring this ratio even lower. Several comments were made in various courses that graded material is not returned to the students on time. The committee would like to recommend that faculty should grade and return assignments and exams back to the students in a timely fashion. In courses involving graduate teaching assistants, efforts should be made to coordinate effectively with them, avoiding unnecessary delays in grading. In some cases, the committee feels that it might benefit the students if the best solutions/implementations are also discussed/presented in class. Offering help to students outside of class is very important. Some students complained that several instructors and TAs were not available outside of class. Faculty have addressed these concerns by proposing to hold extra office hours and help sessions. The committee would like to recommend that faculty increase office hours and help sessions, especially before exams. Also, faculty should be more flexible in meeting with students outside of class, especially students who work full-time or have important family responsibilities.

- There were some comments that there were many exams in some courses and that the time allowed in each exam was not enough. Faculty have addressed this issue by proposing to reduce the number of exams and restructuring exam content (e.g., reduce number of questions). The committee would also like to recommend that faculty should make efforts to identify students with potential learning disabilities. These students should be allowed to take the exam separately (e.g. at UNR’s test center) and be given more time.

The student ACM chapter currently offers introductions to commercial software packages through Weekend workshops. We recommend the department more actively support these efforts. In addition, specific student suggestions made in both years lead the committee to recommend that faculty supply some educational opportunities in using commercial software packages:

During 2002 several students had requested more programming projects. We have found that if the Faculty simply refers to some programming assignments as projects instead of homework then students will perceive that they are doing more projects. There were no direct comments about programming projects in 2003. Also, there were many comments during 2002 about the lack of enough CS faculty. Two new faculty were hired to begin in Fall 2003 and there were no student responses this year indicating that the department needed more faculty. Both of the topic areas listed for 2003 were also noted in 2002. The comments about modern tools relates back to the responses to question 7. The committee recommends that we develop one or more senior level course(s) which can be used to introduce students to several advanced topics.

The committee recommends that for more capable students the faculty in all levels of courses offer extra credit programming assignments with a broader range of applications. Also, several students commented both years that upper division courses with group projects helped communication skills. One specific comment in 2003 requested that students receive some education in interpreting specifications for tasks they might receive in a work environment and then on preparing documentation to accompany the finished.

**Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering**  
**Electrical Engineering Program**

A complete revision of EE 231 will improve the mathematical competency of our students in key areas. So far it is too early to make meaningful changes based on our assessment efforts. However, we now have in place the mechanisms that will allow us to implement changes in the next assessment cycle.
We are currently revising our assessment plan, having learned from the experience of the last year, from the experiences of other electrical engineering programs, and from contacts with ABET representatives.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**  
**Mechanical Engineering Program**

In order to strengthen the design experience in Mechanical Engineering, the faculty is considering a restructuring of the undergraduate curriculum. A proposed course, Kinematics of Machinery (3 cr), will be introduced in the junior year to supplement the design experience in Mechanical Design (ME 351). In order to strengthen the students' ability to analyze designs, it is also proposed to modify the computational aspects of the ME curriculum. The faculty feel strongly that sophomores must learn how to use applications-oriented software, including Excel, MathCad and Matlab, rather than more general languages like the current C++. College-wide, there is a strong desire among three Departments to modify the introductory core computational course CS 135. The CEE and ME faculty in particular feel strongly that sophomores must learn how to use applications-oriented software such as Excel, MathCad and Matlab early in their college careers if we wish to "modernize" later aspects of our curricula. The current instruction in C++ is widely deemed to be failing our students' needs because it is remote from engineering Advisement did not receive high marks. This may be one of the aspects that can be improved somewhat easily if faculty accepts it as one of the priorities.

**College of Liberal Arts**  
**Department of Anthropology**  
**Anthropology Program**

A method of standardized sampling will be devised to provide more comparable data every year. In the future, standardized course exam questions will be used each time a course is taught by different instructors, exit interviews will be designed to supplement student evaluations for each class, and quantified sampling of test scores will be taken from benchmark exams in specific courses. A Curriculum Review Committee is beginning to address these tasks.

Two additional changes in the BA curriculum are planned:

One is to add a theory course requirement to the anthropology core curriculum. Two additional changes in the BA curriculum are planned. One is to add a theory course requirement to the anthropology core curriculum. The other is to add more course options to the research methods requirement. We also plan to make changes in the current assessment plan for the BA in anthropology by adding two SLOs: (1) SLO #5. Students who graduate with a B.A. in anthropology should understand and be able to apply the methods of anthropological research and scholarship. (2) SLO #6. Students who graduate with a B.A. in anthropology should be able to evaluate the connections between the theoretical foundations and the application of anthropological research and scholarship.

The other is to add more course options to the research methods requirement. We also plan to make changes in the current assessment plan for the BA in anthropology by adding two SLOs: (1) SLO #5. Students who graduate with a B.A. in anthropology should understand and be able to apply the methods of anthropological research and scholarship. (2) SLO #6. Students who graduate with a B.A. in anthropology should be able to evaluate the connections between the theoretical foundations and the application of anthropological research and scholarship. The department plans to add more Performance Indicators for Student Learning Outcome 2. One possible PI still under discussion is: "Student performance on class
research papers in selected advanced courses in the four subfields of anthropology." Another PI that is being discussed is performance on student portfolios. We also plan to add another Student Learning Outcome (with Performance Indicators) that focuses on undergraduate students demonstrating mastery of knowledge and skills. One possible SLO still under discussion is: "Students will be able to do and to evaluate anthropological research and scholarship."

**Department of Art**

**Art: Fine Arts Program**

The Department of Art faculty is continuously discussing ways to improve this important program. We successfully engaged in two day-long retreats that involved intensive reflection and discussions on all aspects of department activities - including the BFA program. Primary to these discussions were ideas related to the rotation of existing and new department faculty into the BFA teaching sequence and the desire to, one day, obtain adequate BFA studio workspaces. The BFA program will next year be ten years running. It is our sense that we have largely honed the BFA into a highly functional program that is producing students of the highest caliber. We continue to seek ways to improve this program, including exploring the possibility of hiring additional art history LOA’s and the anticipated new hire to replace retiring Professor Joanna Frueh this position will continue to be crucial for the successful continuation of this program.

The department of Art Faculty is continuously discussing ways to improve this important program. We successfully engaged intensive reflection and discussion about BFA program during faculty meeting. Primary to these discussions were ideas related to the rotation of existing and new department faculty into BFA teaching sequence and the desire, one day, to obtain adequate BFA.

**Department of Art**

**Art: Studio and Art History Program**

1. Although results are pending and on-going, Outcome 2: preliminary discussions indicated the "need" and has led to the proposal for the creation of another required survey course (Art 118) to complement the two existing surveys. Art 118 will concentrate on Art since 1950 and/or contemporary issues. Art 313, Contemporary Art, now required for majors, will become an elective for BA program.

2. We have also re-discussed and reestablished a priority for any new positions to include another art historian, with a non-western area of specialization.

3. Outcome 3 Assessment information is still pending. However preliminary discussions have indicated that some formal overview or direction of the Art 121-221 drawing courses would be beneficial. Currently Art 121 is also being taught by LOA’s, in the evening, and without coordination with other sections. At this stage, student outcomes appear to be successful, but we feel some development of a common course outline and expected outcomes would improve department performance.

We have endeavored to address the identified challenges as noted in the last section.

Efforts include:

- Art History - we are currently considering a number of options in this regard. One of our Art Historians will be retiring as of December, 2006. We have already started serious discussions as to the nature of the replacement position in this field. We will surely be considering bringing in a 20th century Art Historian who will teach larger and more comprehensive survey type courses along with smaller, more focused curriculum. We are also actively seeking to recruit qualified LOAs to teach much needed courses.
-Foundations - The department’s courses and curriculum committee has been charged with addressing a variety of issues concerning our Visual Foundations and Drawing courses. Their primary task is to create a consistent and required curriculum for all offerings of these important classes. We have also had many discussions during department retreats as to how to improve said curriculum. We anticipate these curriculum changes to be implemented starting with the fall term of 2006.

-Independent Studies - the courses and curriculum committee is also considering the restructuring of these course offerings. We are considering the possibility of establishing an "Independent Studies Coordinator" for the department to insure that the courses are successfully completed by all participating students.

-Internships - we have discussed how to develop more internship possibilities for our students. As we do not have the staffing or the faculty who are able to specifically coordinate our internship program, we have encouraged all faculty to be mindful of internship possibilities and to be conscientious about relaying such opportunities to our students.

-Professional Preparation - with the recent successful hire of a full-time gallery director for the Sheppard Fine Arts Gallery, we anticipate being able to offer our Museum and Gallery Operations course for the first time in three years. Our intention is for this class to be available at least once every academic year. We are also considering the development of workshops for graduating seniors to learn about professional practices and encouraging our faculty to develop strategies to incorporate such content into their existing curriculum.

Visual Foundations:
The Department, as a whole, is addressing a variety of issues concerning both the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes.

There is a continuing discussion about the possibility of making the Visual Foundations class a two [rather than the presently one] semester class divided into two and three dimensional considerations based on the classic Composition style classes taught in Architectural Science oriented programming.

There is discussion regarding the possible return to a Visual Foundations program which would incorporate beginning drawing, painting, sculpture and Digital Media into the instructional format taught by a four-member Faculty-team; however, the drain on faculty time is a major mitigating variable with which the Department will have to deal. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with Spring 2009.

Challenges continue to exist in several key areas and are being addressed on an on-going basis as funding, instructional space and other resources become available particularly in the following areas:

* Visual Foundations: The Department, as a whole, is addressing a variety of issues concerning both the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes. There is discussion about the possibility of making the Visual Foundations class a two [rather than the presently one] semester class divided into two and three dimensional considerations based on the classic Composition style classes taught in Architectural Science oriented programming. There is discussion regarding the possible return to a Visual Foundations program which would incorporate beginning drawing, painting, sculpture and Digital Media into the instructional format taught by a four-member Faculty-team. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with fall 2007.
* Art History: The Department is considering a number of possible options depending upon the recruitment of that person who will replace our retiring Art Historian in the fall of 2007. We have begun recruitment for a 20th Century Art Specialist who will develop and teach larger and more comprehensive survey-type coursing along with smaller, more movement-focused courses. The securing of this Art Historian will dictate the next Art Historian recruiting which will occur as the Department is awarded its next new position. The Department is also actively seeking to recruit qualified part-time Art History instructors to teach much-needed courses.

Department of English

English Program

As of fall 2006, the department's Language committee is conducting an overall review of this part of the department's course offerings. Although their work remains underway, it seems likely that several of the following modifications may result:

• Substantial revision or elimination from all specializations of the ENG 282 requirement (code name: "Linguistics Lite") in favor of the more focused and rigorous ENG 281. ENG 282 may also be relegated to non-major status, or retained for education majors concentrating in English. The Language and Linguistics specialization will revise and reorder its prerequisites to provide a clearer path to this major.
• In order to provide a more consistent sequence of courses to the department's other most popular majors, Writing and Literature, the respective committees are preparing to propose new mid-level "gateway" courses for each specialization.
• In Spring 2006 instructors teaching and having recently taught ENG 298 will collaborate on syllabus design and revision, with an eye toward the SLOs related to literary research and documentation.

These findings having been determined only at the end of the 2007 fall semester, further discussions by the department's Undergraduate and Literature committees in spring 2008 will be necessary to fully digest their implications. However, based on previous conversations, the following program changes are likely to be implemented in fall 2008:

1. English 298: with a third of the sample essays substantially failing to meet expectations for using literary terminology to an appropriate degree, the department's long-awaited goal of having a glossary of literary terminology adopted as a common text seems to have some data-driven support.

2. English 303: with well over a third of the essays substantially failing to meet expectations for applying contemporary theory and criticism to texts, we will suggest that instructors of the new follow-up courses to ENG 303, the transatlantic surveys ENG 310 & 311, begin with a rigorous review of contemporary theory and incorporate the practice of applying criticism to the texts under consideration. (These two new courses were conceived and implemented in part to reinforce these The Literature Committee is also in the process of further redesigning the required foundation courses for their majors by creating a new course which will give students an historical overview of the field of English, something which is currently missing in our program. Additionally, the Undergraduate Committee has begun to explore ways to more accurately assess the writing skills and analytic ability of our graduating seniors. Each committee--Literature, Writing, and Language/Linguistics-- will develop a series of outcomes in their area, and then through a portfolio system, evaluate and report their findings to the department.

We are continuing to encourage faculty teaching ENG 298 to adopt Abrams's Glossary of Literary Terms and incorporate it into their weekly lesson plans. Staffing and enrollment problems have led to the postponement of the first offerings of the new courses for literature majors -- ENG 311 & 312 -- to
Fall-Spring 2008-09. This major modification of the literature program was a direct result of assessing majors as having an insufficiently broad understanding of literary periods, genres, and canon formation, which are among the SLOs addressed in ENG 298 and 303.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures  
Foreign Languages & Literatures: French Program

We will begin by reviewing our approach to French 305 and 306 (Composition I and II) in order to assess whether we are satisfied with the way writing and composition are being taught at this level. This would include a review of textbooks used as well as the amount and kind of writing assigned. It will also be necessary to explore ways in which writing may be assessed at the senior level so that a limited literary background does not fault the student.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures  
Foreign Languages & Literatures: German Program

The program should think about improving the teaching of oral skills, possibly by restructuring the syllabus in GER 309 and/or offering a new, three-credit oral skills class.

The data do seem to suggest that we are in essence doing really well. However, the strength of a program shows in its ability to lift weak students up to a high level, and since we did not have any, we cannot assess this aspect of our program.

If the German major were to survive, we would have to agree on common grading principles for seminar papers, since obviously the thesis format is not enforced by all teachers in the program.

Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures  
Foreign Languages & Literatures: Spanish Program

The Spanish faculty designed, had approved, and will begin implementation of a Certificate in Translation program that will begin in fall 2003. We feel this program will add a significant track of study to the major and will serve to attract more students. Two other courses are in the process of being approved by the university curriculum committee. For 2008, the Spanish section is considering the following changes: 1) changing FLL 703 to a 400/600 level course; 2) developing Spanish for professions courses (such as medical, business, law enforcement.).

Department of Interior Design  
Interior Design Program

A series of exercises will be developed for application throughout the curriculum to address specific areas identified for further improvement.

Students will continue to be encouraged to enter regional and national design competitions to have the quality of their work compared to students from other schools and evaluated by professional design practitioners.
• Teamwork experiences and evaluation will continue to be practiced
• A new class will be developed for the preparation of senior portfolios. New strategies will be implemented to enhance success in teamwork.
• Critique, feedback and revision will be continually utilized throughout the curriculum to reinforce key objectives, raise standards, refine skills, and build student confidence. To further strengthen the sequential nature of the program, one course needs to be changed from 300-level to 200-level.

Department of Music & Dance
Music Education Program

New courses, revised courses, and a new course of study will be implemented in the 2005-2006 academic year. These improvements to the music education curriculum have been an on-going assessment review by the department's coordinator of music education, chair of the department, and director of the school of the arts, as well as in consultation with the entire music faculty.

Department of Philosophy
Philosophy Program

So far our assessment plan is working well. All of the easily quantifiable indicators are "up" as well as our ability to track the progress of our majors and minors. Our diversity courses have been successful, and we are contemplating adding another, subject to staffing issues.

In sum, we have seen no need to revise our plan to date.

Discussed our interdisciplinary connection to the Criminal Justice program and ideas for possible changes in the courses CJ requires of its pre-law students (and other related possible curricular changes) and agreed to discuss these changes with CJ.

Future modifications:
1. Consider adding a few new courses to the catalog, for example, a course on philosophy of cognitive science, a course to make possible a greater range of course offerings for our assistant professor, and other possible courses that would expand our offerings and make them more accessible to our students.
2. Consider the possibility of introducing a new course and title specifically for Introduction to Asian Philosophy (depending on available staffing after budget rescissions).
4. Decide on, develop and institute the new value track(s). Continue making links to other programs regarding joint interests in value theory.
5. Develop the science studies consortium.
7. Begin annual ethics and social/political philosophy lecture.
8. Consider possible ways of strengthening the undergraduate experience, for example, strategies for ensuring that students take prerequisites for upper-level classes and does their lower-division course work first.
Department of Political Science  
Political Science Program

The department is working on efforts to build more course offerings in the area of global climate change as well as the political corruption course offerings.

We are working on changing the indicators used in assessment to include alumni survey and employer survey indicators.

A majority of the students think that this is an area that we could develop further and we will encourage faculty to include diversity and cross-cultural issues in their course curriculum. The University-wide survey is similar: 57.25% of student alumni surveyed indicated a positive response to the same indicators. We are going to encourage our faculty to include more cultural, racial and gender issues in their course offerings.

Student assessment will occur more frequently throughout the semester. Our experience in summer school reveals the value of frequent opportunities to write and present information.

Department of Political Science  
Political Science: International Affairs Program

New personnel (i.e., a new program director) will likely be hired this year and will be encouraged to focus attention on the aforementioned areas of the curriculum.

We anticipate a new hire for our Asian politics/studies dimension to our IA program.

Department of Psychology  
Psychology Program

We also planned last year to develop a survey to be administered by the advisor as students declare psychology as a major, enter, and exit the program with an ultimate goal to automate these surveys. Progress is being made in this area, particularly in the area of survey automation, but it has not yet been implemented, so it will form the major focus of improvement next year. Finally we plan additional assessment of advising with routine student evaluations of advising appointments, and using our undergraduate research day to evaluate performances outside of the classroom setting and in a way that goes across the whole department.

Department of Sociology  
Sociology Program

As a result of the findings we intend to update the SLOs to be in line with the reality "on the ground." The present results are based on the perspective of the learner, i.e. the student. Whereas this perspective is important to evaluate the success of an academic program, it is not the only one. In the future we intend to include additional data concerning the nature and quality of the academic training provided by the Department. More immediately, however, it is critical that we revise and update the SLOs to make sure that our assessment plan, as posted by OUA, adequately reflects our actual educational goals.
Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
Speech Communication Program

Analyze the demography of students in COM 113. Two years of assessment data from this service course tell us (1) that learning outcomes vary widely from those in other COM courses and (2) that including assessment data with other courses combines two very different populations.

The Department of Speech Communication and Theatre are currently doing the required Program Review and self-study (2007-08). After the outside reviewers present their recommendations, we will consider program modifications.

Specifically, we will be addressing several issues:

1. Do we need more or less emphasis in our courses on communication behavioral skills relative to cognitive skills?
2. Should our upper-division courses be less accessible to the general student population and outside majors (service mission) and restricted instead to our majors?
3. Do we have too many courses for our faculty size? Would fewer courses permit us to work more intensively on essential SLO's?
4. Should our SLO's include more career-based (professional school) outcomes, perhaps meaning fewer "liberal arts" outcomes?

1. Eliminate assessment of COM 113. We have learned that the assessment mission should focus on degree programs specifically, not academic departments generally. COM 113 is not a part of our B.A. degree program. Rather, it meets requirements of other departments' B.A. degree programs. Assessment activities in this course are a burden on the TA's and LOA's. The data on outcomes of approximately 30 sections of COM 113 per year clutter and distort what we may be achieving in our degree program.

2. Develop COM 113 as an academic product of the department and college, with other programs and their students as our customers. To develop this product and maintain its attractiveness and quality, we have the following strategy.

1. Market research discovered the demographics of our customers. That process, mentioned in the 2005 report, has been completed and we now know the make-up of the course rosters by student year and major.

2. Hire a Director of the Basic Course. This person should supervise and coach the TA instructors, and manage all course and instructor evaluation. We have already augmented the stipend of an LOB instructor to include these duties, using existing department discretionary funds.

3. When we receive funding for a continuing lecturer in this role, the director should do assessment of course effectiveness independent of our degree program. Included will be dialog with customers (departments and students), developing quality control strategies with our instructors and measuring outcomes.

4. Re-evaluate COM 400 - Communication Theory. In last year’s report, we hoped to make this course requirement. However, we still have no assurance that an instructor will always be available. Second, the current LOA instructor reports poor student performance. We will
again assess student performance in this and other courses but will put on hold movement toward the course as requirement.

Convene discussions among instructors to develop skills activities in upper-division interpersonal communication courses. Despite the inherent problems of class size and academic assumptions about 300-400 level courses, it is in this portion of our program that we must develop personal communication skills.

The following courses will be studied:

1. COM 311 - Listening
2. COM 312 - Non-verbal Communication
3. COM 315 - Small Group Communication
4. COM 407 - Communication Between the Sexes
5. COM 411 - Interpersonal Communication
6. COM 412 - Intercultural Communication (CAPS)
7. COM 428 - Organizational Communication

Also decided on was:

Change emphasis of COM 113: A committee is now restructuring the basic service course to reduce the emphasis on public speaking and increase emphasis on interpersonal and small group settings. The new model syllabus is now prepared and all COM 113 instructors will begin using it in summer 2005 (7 sections) and fall 2005 (12 sections).

Change COM 390 from Advanced Public Speaking to Advanced Speech Composition: We find that oral competence (speech delivery) is an achievable SLO in existing courses, but language competence (SLO #6) in both speaking and writing remains low. So we have redirected the advance course toward content structure and style. The course now focuses on speech writing, students must demonstrate their use of language structure and style.

Offer COM 400 (Communication Theory) and require it for COM majors: Our failure to achieve the theory portion of SLO #7 means we must revive COM 400. Faculty shortages had curtailed our ability to offer this comparative theories course for several years. But we taught it in fall 2004, we will now offer it each year and next year it will become a required course for COM majors.

Change the requirements for COM 329 to include technology competence: As noted in SLO #11, our graduates can use visual support effectively, but only 1 in 5 prepare and demonstrate computer-generated visuals. Our committee looking at the multi-section COM 329 will recommend this outcome as a standard course objective.

Create a new course (or opportunities in existing courses) for skills practice in interpersonal communications events: Our assessment showed that our graduates know how to give a speech. They do not know how to perform interpersonal tasks required in careers; conducting an interview, responding to criticism, summarizing a point in a conversation, using active listening with an emotional colleague and other formal or informal activities. They can analyze communication problems, apply communication principles and suggest strategies. But we don not know how well they can do (perform) those strategies. We have many classroom activities that require students to provide answers. Now we must find ways for them to put those answers into practical operation.
Re-draft our Assessment Plan: We discovered that while our plan includes our high priority Student Learning Outcomes, the language of this plan is sometimes vague and redundant. Some SLO's are too broad to assess concretely. Perhaps it takes a trial year to apply the assessment model before we can determine its ease of use. In any event, we are already gathering assessment data for the 2004-05 report. And before that report is submitted, we'll be narrowing and rewording our SLOs that appear on the Assessment Office website.

Department of Speech Communication & Theatre

Theatre Program

SLO #1 and 2: Create a plan to continue the "Business of Theatre" course on a regular basis, perhaps every other or every third year. Find other ways to assist students in resume development. Find additional ways to provide feedback on presentation and auditioning skills.

In the area of sound design and reinforcement, efforts are being planned to strengthen this area through guest or, in future, a permanent faculty or staff personnel to teach, supervise, and mentor students working in sound technology. Discussions are in the early stages to share a position interdepartmentally with Music and Dance and possibly the Art Departments.

Department of Women's Studies

Women's Studies Program

A review of our assessment plan suggests that we should:
1. Develop an integrative question of sex race and gender and one on feminist theory to ask students during the exit interview.
2. For those students who select the thesis option, it would be reasonable to ask this question during their defense.

We are revising our Assessment Plan to more accurately reflect the shift in our program emphases.

We have developed more precise outcome statements for the 2006-2007 Plan. At the end of each semester, Women's Studies majors will be asked to submit their final paper or presentation from WMST 300, 419, 450, and 453 to the Women's Studies Web site. Relying on a rubric to be developed, a faculty committee will assess these as indicators of the degree to which we meet outcomes 1-3.

In addition, faculty discussions have led us to consider the development of a senior seminar for majors and minors in the program. The exit interview will be modified to include a question about the application of feminist theory to a particular social issue. No modifications will be made until the Director of Women's Studies returns from her one-year leave. At that time, a greater variety and quantity of data will be collected. If this leads to significant findings, modifications will be made at that point. (She will return for the 2008-09 academic year.) Rubrics have not yet been developed, so all information at this point is from exit interview.

Our assessment plan will be modified to reflect the fact that our exit interviews are primarily used to assess whether the program is providing classes for students to graduate in a timely fashion, providing classes that students see as useful as they pursue their degree, and to assess students' evaluations of the difficulty of the program and the quality of teaching. As such, we will remove the exit interview as an assessment method for the student learning outcomes we include in our assessment plan. We think that our reliance on end of
term exams and papers which are assessed by a committee of our faculty reviewing these papers for the purpose of ascertaining students understanding of the three areas of most significance to us is adequate and useful. We will emphasize to faculty who teach the Capstone courses as well as to those teaching our introductory course that the student learning outcomes we have committed to are important to our program and will suggest that they assure themselves they are attending these outcomes in their courses and that they contact the director if they would like guidance on this. We are currently exploring embedded assessment as a more "real" measure of SLOs.

1. Develop more exercises and focused discussion on the impact of race.
2. Provide more reading in core courses linking race, class and gender.
3. Encourage students who plan to attend graduate school to pursue the thesis option.

College of Science
Department of Biology
Biology Program

Update Curriculum Map.
1. Instead of conducting the ETS Major Field Test as a part of the major capstone course BIOL 415), as it has been done previously, development of a new 0-credit Senior Exit Seminar course has been proposed. Assessment Committee is in the process of developing curriculum for this new course. If approved by the department, the proposed course would be mandatory for all graduating seniors and could include the Major Field Test, along with a series of surveys and workshops that will assess seniors' opinions about the Biology curriculum and their preparedness for their chosen careers;

A new assessment tool that will evaluate the preparedness of our sophomores for upper division courses is being developed. This will be a pre-test that will be given in BIOL 300 (genetics) class starting Spring 2008 to assess students' understanding of major concepts of cellular/molecular biology taught in the general biology courses BIOL190 and BIOL 191, pre-requisites for BIOL 300.

Content Knowledge: Overall, our results appear to reflect the layout of our program and the choices students make when selecting elective courses in biology. All students take evolution as a senior major's capstone course and, as a likely consequence, rank very high in this area. In addition, our Ecology and Population Biology students excel in the area of ecology. Many of these students focus extensively on elective courses that have ecology as a major theme within the course and the ETS results indicate that they are getting a strong education in this area. In contrast, Cell Biology students have a broad array of elective courses to choose from and this may explain why their scores ranked close the national average in a broad range of sub-disciplines. The only exception was in the area of plant structure & function. Since most of our Cell Biology students plan to enter a health-related profession, they may be choosing biology electives related to health and medicine, and avoiding plant-related courses. Further studies will be conducted to support these preliminary conclusions.

Last year the Biology Curriculum Committee placed a strong emphasis on ways to broaden understanding and increase retention of knowledge. Proposals included changes in the curriculum to make sure all students were exposed to a wide array of biological subject areas when choosing elective courses. Another suggestion was to develop a sophomore-level course that introduces students to current topics in biology. This course would expand student understanding of science in many areas of biology while strengthening their baseline knowledge and critical thinking skills. Further action will take place this year.
Evaluation Skills (Critical Thinking): Two faculty members teaching requisite courses felt that the nationally-available rubrics for critical thinking were inadequate for scoring science-related writing assignments. A new document is underway. The rubric will be validated and used for assessing student performance at various stages of their development.

Applying Knowledge: The goal is to double the number of students conducting internships in the near future. In the area of teaching-related experiences, we have just recently been given access to a listserv of Biology undergraduates and plan to send information about the "Science Partners" program in order to increase participation and establish greater awareness of this program.

1. Based on the pre-tests and surveys conducted in core lower- and upper-division Biology courses (BIOL190, 191, 192, 300, 314, 315, and 316) recommendations are being made to the instructors teaching courses that serve as pre-requisites for subsequent ones, to modify the course outlines to include/put additional emphasis on the concepts that students find most difficult/confusing.

2. Department has started the discussion on how to enhance/improve our students' laboratory experience in Biology courses. Right now a Biology Major can graduate with a BS-BI degree after having taken just 2 Biology lab courses, each with 3 hours of laboratory exercises a week (BIOL192+395 or BIOL192+394). This does not provide them with sufficient experience in the field that has a heavy emphasis on "hands-on" experience and expertise.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Environmental Program

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications were made, however, based upon assessment of our curriculum: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered in 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research. All this is described below, under Comments.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Professional Program

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications were made, however, based upon assessment of our curriculum: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered in 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new student advisement protocols have been put into place, correlated with DARS.

Department of Geography
Geography Program

Department faculty reviewed the assessment findings at the Geography faculty retreat on August 22, 2008, and at the first faculty meeting of the fall semester, 2008. Results of the performance indicators for student learning outcomes 2, 3 and 4 suggest that students are doing very well in developing their analytical skills.
and increasing their disciplinary knowledge as well as capitalizing on their overall learning experiences in the major.

Furthermore, many of the professional skills seem to be well developed, including: writing; visual communication; library and archival research; qualitative analysis; and accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy. The discussion focused on how skills in verbal presentation, field work, computing and quantitative analysis might be better developed for geography majors, particularly given that deficiencies in these areas were noted in last year's assessment as well as this year's. For some other skills, such as computing, at this time it was not a high priority for each and every core course because this is a more focused goal, and not expected to appear in every core course.

A few ideas were generated that will be explored in the upcoming academic year, with the caveat that not all skills need to be extensively developed in each of the required classes. For verbal presentation, it was suggested that in Geog 103 might add discussion sections and short verbal presentation in the labs. We instituted a second semester of offerings in GEOG 314, Field Methods, and that offered students with another means of meeting the fieldwork component of their work. We agreed, as a faculty, to offer this course each semester, and to rotate the faculty who teach that course. We are in agreement, as a faculty, that anyone should be able to teach the "Field Methods, "or the "Research Methods" and "Geographical Thought" courses; therefore, those are being rotated on an irregular schedule.

Finally, over time Geography core courses will continue to be assessed and curriculum modified in relation to the student experience as they move through the major. Given the paucity of data and the fact that this is an initial phase of the assessment effort, as other classes and students report on communication skill development it will be revealing to note in next year's assessment report: a) if memorizing, analyzing and judgment continue to be well and widely integrated skills across the geography core courses; b) if weak reporting for computing and quantitative analysis skill development continue; and c) if skill development in the areas of synthesizing and accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy continues to show discrepancies between instructors and students' assessments of spatial analysis skills, and if this trend is apparent for any other skills. Additional data and clearer trends it may be possible to suggest implementation measures. Given the paucity of data and the fact that this is an initial phase of the assessment effort, as other classes and students report on communication skill development it will be revealing to note in next year's assessment report: a) if further trends develop in instructors and students' assessments of spatial analysis skills; b) if students in a wide range of courses identify skill development in human geography skills, such as perception and geography, regional understandings and cultural interpretations of place and landscape; c) if physical geographic analysis skills continue to be reported as strengths, both within physical geography courses and in other types of courses; and d) if human-environment interaction skills continue to be well documented by students and instructors in a variety of courses as well as in the seniors' self assessments. Additional data and clearer trends it may be possible to suggest implementation measures. Given the paucity of data and the fact that this is an initial phase of the assessment effort, as other classes and students report on communication skill development it will be revealing to note in next year's assessment report: a) if writing continues to be reported widely as a course skill, by instructors and students alike; b) if oral presentation skills continue to be identified in the seniors' self assessments as relatively weak; and c) if a greater number of courses and students identify visual communications as a skill developed in their required program coursework. With additional data and clearer trends it may be possible to suggest implementation measures.

Department faculty reviewed the assessment findings at the Geography faculty retreat on August 24, 2007. Results of the performance indicators for student learning outcomes 2, 3 and 4 suggest that students are doing very well in developing their analytical skills and increasing their disciplinary knowledge as well as capitalizing on their overall learning experiences in the major. Furthermore, many of the professional skills
seem to be well developed, including: writing; visual communication; library and archival research; qualitative analysis; and accountability, efficiency, precision and accuracy. The discussion focused on how skills in verbal presentation, field work, computing and quantitative analysis might be better developed for geography majors, particularly given that deficiencies in these areas were noted in last year's assessment as well as this year's. A few ideas were generated that will be explored in the upcoming academic year, with the caveat that not all skills need to be extensively developed in each of the required classes. For verbal presentation, it was suggested that in Geog 103 might add discussion sections and short verbal presentation in the labs. For field work, faculty will examine how this might be integrated into additional Geography core classes. For computing, at this time it was not a high priority for each and every core course because this is a more focused goal, and not expected to appear in every core course. For quantitative skills, it was suggested that we evaluate how to enhance the quantitative skills components of the GEOG 325 and GEOG 418 courses in the upcoming year. Possibly quantitative analysis components can be created and team taught by guest faculty for a few weeks during a semester. This will be addressed in more detail at future faculty meeting. Finally, over time Geography core courses will continue to be assessed and curriculum modified in relation to the student experience as they move through the major.

We have made significant changes in the curriculum in Fall 2004 and will evaluate the results and successes (and failures) of those in the year ahead. A major emphasis that we hope to implement is bringing students into the major earlier in their university careers. With larger numbers of Millennium scholars coming in, the opportunity to target students in the first or second year seems ripe. Further, we would like to target students even in the junior- or senior-years of high school, in the area, to see if there are some prospective majors to be brought in who will be able to take their geography studies through a four year window, instead of rushing through in two years.

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Geological Engineering Program**

GE 385 must be changed to engage students more in the design of processes for digitally mapping spatial data.

Based on this year's ABET review of geological engineering, the following changes are needed:

1. CEE 442, soil mechanics; BSGE students will now be required to complete this course for 4 credits to include the laboratory; in the past, BSGE students enrolled for 3 credits.
2. A new course may be developed to add to the engineering topical content of the degree program; this will be determined when the formal report from ABET is received.
3. ABET assessment was flagged as a concern for the BSGE program, even though annual assessment reports for the degree program have been filed through the UNR office every December.

**Department of Geological Sciences**

**Hydrogeology Program**

The Assessment Plan for the Hydrogeology degree is undergoing revision to become consistent and similar with those plans recently adopted for the other undergraduate degrees in the Department. It is anticipated that this revised plan will be voted on by the faculty in early 2008.
**Department of Physics**  
**Physics Program**

We are planning to further improve the introductory laboratory courses, by developing additional new experiments, especially for PHYS 182, updating lab manuals, and improving the synchronization of labs with lectures via increased involvement of the course instructor. We will develop a focused questionnaire for students in the labs, to assess the relative effectiveness of each experiment.

In 2008-2009, we will develop a strategy to improve lecture demonstrations, as this would have a broad impact, affecting many courses.

Moving to a more interactive project-based format for introductory classes is under discussion. This could yield increased enrollment in the B.Sc. program, if coupled with additional recruiting, the creation of minor programs in Astronomy and Astrophysics, tighter coordination with the Atmospheric Science major, and the creation of an additional track aimed at teachers and an additional option in Applied Physics or Engineering Physics (should it be moved from the College of Engineering).

The senior thesis is playing a very important and valuable role in the program, with most students spending longer than the nominal single semester working on an in-depth research experience. We are considering adding an additional optional semester to the senior thesis, as the Chemistry and Biology programs have, to recognize students' work and meet the requirements of the Honors Program.

Also under discussion are offering the honors sections of PHYS 180 and 181 every semester, and moving to a more interactive project-based format for these introductory classes.

---

**Division of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Nursing**  
**Nursing Program**

Program review and revision is currently underway.

---

**Department of Social Work**  
**Social Work Program**

The School of Social Work program evaluator will meet first with the program evaluation committee followed up with a meeting of the full faculty to discuss the implications of students being able to evaluate research studies and then applying the findings to practice. Also, further refinement and development of other measurement tools will be utilized in future reporting formats.

The School program evaluator will meet with faculty to discuss the implications of students being able to evaluate research studies and applying the findings to practice. Additionally, addition and refinement of measurement tools will be reviewed and incorporated into future program reports.

There will be a need for future discussions on how best to account for data results occurring from varied student levels. For example, how do SW 200 students compared differentially from SW 300 or SW 400 level students.
The School of Social Work will consider means of incorporating a comparison assessment method to the SW 600 foundation year courses. There will be a concerted effort to evaluate and improve the Curriculum Mapping Tool across all classes.

Reynolds School of Journalism

Department of Journalism
Journalism Program

While many of these changes have affected only the first four core classes so far, more change is on the way. We are about to ask the faculty to adopt a plan condensing our sequences to two: news and integrated-marketing communications.
Program Changes Planned: Masters Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biochemistry Program

Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Third, a departmental newsletter will be published starting in 2008 that will have information about the teaching and research activities of all graduate faculty in the program in order to foster communication and information sharing among students and faculty. This is necessary due to the physical separation of the faculty at opposite ends of the campus. Fourth, a plan to physically unify faculty within the department into a new building has been developed and is expected to be implemented in 2010.

Shortening the research rotations from two semesters to one semester is under consideration. AND To improve research options for the students, converting the BCH graduate program to an interdisciplinary program in Molecular Biosciences is under consideration.

Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biotechnology (Dual Degree) Program

SLO3: We need to develop a better system to obtain more quantitative data. As such, we will provide written questionnaires to the evaluators of the student talks and posters.

Currently, conduct round-table meetings once a month with students so that they can provide feedback for program improvement. This meeting also allows the faculty to present updated information to students regarding changes in the program.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences
Natural Resource & Environmental Science Program

Seek more 700 level courses.

Increase offering of laboratory field courses.

Encourage oral presentations in small classes.

Require the student to practice final oral presentations with the advisor and other students at least 3 times.
Department of Nutrition
Nutrition Program

The department is also considering the establishment of a program that links the MS degree to our dietetic internship. When (and if) this occurs, we expect to see an increase in enrollment in the department's graduate program.

Department of Resource Economics
Resource & Applied Economics Program

Our key findings are that better training in economic theory and more experience in problem solving activities are viewed by students and faculty as areas requiring some program

Student Learning Outcome 1
Understand the economic principles underlying producer and consumer behavior Describe students' overall achievement of outcome 1 The assessment of this objective is based on students' performance in APEC 710 and 720, as well as thesis / professional paper work and performance in independent studies where applicable. While students generally performed satisfactorily with respect to this outcome, it was found that students with substantial exposure to intermediate economic theory and economic applications of calculus prior to entering the Program advanced significantly faster in these courses than their peers. Instructors responded by designing remedial assignments and readings to bring the rest of the class at par with better prepared students, at substantial additional time costs and effort. Clearly, steps have to be taken to provide for a more homogeneous entry level of proficiency in intermediate theory and calculus before starting the theory sequence (= APEC 710 and 720). As mentioned, the Graduate Committee is considering changing the composition of the core requirements for terminal M.S. students. This would entail substituting ECON 702 for RECO 710 and substituting ECON 772 for RECO 715. Members of the Graduate Committee will be meeting with M.S. students after the fall semester ends and based on this and other input will make recommendations to the department.

College of Business Administration
Department of Accounting
Accountancy Program

We plan a substantive review of the curriculum for the whole graduate program in the forthcoming year to determine the future direction and emphasis for the program.

For the first and second objectives measures are available. However we have faced the problem that we have had instructors who have left the University and instructors who are temporary lecturers. In both cases, we did not capture data from their classes for use as assessment measures. We have also experienced situations where grades have not been retained or suitably fine detail of grades have not been recorded to provide adequate measures. In addition we may be trying to collect too many assessment measures related to one learning Goal.

The graduate faculty will refine the goals and assessment measures for the current year to make them more measurable. A review will be performed of the Masters program content this year. The assessment process will be revised in the current year. The nature of the masters program and its structure and curriculum are
actively under reconsideration at the present time. We are contemplating reducing the "tax track" masters which requires a substantial input from temporary faculty. We are also monitoring proposed changes to the CPA educational requirements by the State Board of Accountancy. These may have a material impact on the curriculum offerings by the department at the graduate level.

A full program review is to be performed in the forthcoming year. Both course content and assessment measures will be re-examined.

**College of Education**

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Educational Psychology: Med Program**

1. Each semester, the assessment coordinator will meet with newly admitted students to inform them about assessment activities and their associated responsibilities. 2. A formal scoring rubric will be used to evaluate student performance. 3. Items on the exit examination will be evaluated to make sure that they reflect course content.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Educational Psychology: MS Program**

Each semester, the assessment coordinator will meet with newly admitted students to inform them about assessment activities and their associated responsibilities. 2. A formal scoring rubric will be used to evaluate student performance. 3. Items on the exit examination will be evaluated to make sure that they reflect course content.

**Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning**

**Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program**

Based on preliminary data, additional courses are now being introduced as additional options in the graduate programs - Creative Strategies for the K-12 classroom and Teaching Strategies for At-Risk Learners. In addition, the department is working on developing one-credit modules to meet the specific needs of teachers in K-12 classrooms (e.g., Communication and Collaboration). These modules will be offered as on-line courses, helping to bring more learning to K-12 teachers in rural as well as urban areas.

**Department of Education Specialties**

**Equity & Diversity Program**

The enrollment in this program has not been robust so we are exploring offering an on-line option through Independent Learning. If this is accepted, the first courses will be offered in fall semester.
Department of Education Specialties  
Special Education & Disability Studies Program

We are currently discussing strategies to better align university assessment activities and assessment activities required by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). We anticipate changing the assessment structure during 2005.

Department of Education Specialties  
TESOL Program

The TESOL faculty have been involved in a re-examination of their courses based on professional standards and practices of other universities with TESOL programs. Course changes and program reorganization has grown from these efforts, with changes approved in fall 2008 with full implementation in fall, 2009. We are also looking at other forms of comprehensive exam, including professional papers rather than on-demand exams. We hope to finalize these changes/options in the next year.

Department of Educational Leadership  
Educational Leadership Program

We will do a full implementation of a review of each student's progress each semester.

Department of Human Development & Family Studies  
Human Development & Family Studies Program

Faculty are currently considering ways to modify the program to best meet the needs of our students while addressing the challenges of faculty loss. Faculty will continue to work on developing and restructuring this program plan during the spring semester and plan to submit a program revision as soon as possible, given the circumstances. Two specific issues will be addressed in the program modification, based on assessment data. First, an alternative method of teaching the research methods course will be considered (or offering an option for non-thesis students to take a more applied course) given the disconnect between students engaged in research and those who are not. Second, a stronger emphasis on professionalism will be fostered such that students understand the need for ethical behavior in their writing.

College of Engineering  
Department of Biomedical Engineering  
Biomedical Engineering Program

Core BME faculty
As a step toward developing a BME "core", two additional BME core faculty members in the areas of sensors have been included within the current $13.5M National Science Foundation EPSCoR proposal. The Electrical Engineering department has plans to recruit 2 additional faculty members with expertise in the area of Biomedical Engineering, replacing retiring faculty. The plan is to develop a core of full-time BME faculty members while maintaining the participation.
Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering
Chemical Engineering Program

The focus for the Chemical Engineering program is to increase the number students in our graduate programs.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Civil Engineering: Environmental Program

The Graduate Committee in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering was formed during the 2005-2006 academic year. The committee completed a review of the graduate programs for the four different sub-disciplines and focus areas within civil engineering. This review indicated that different sub-disciplines often have different requirements for completing a graduate degree. As a result, the committee recommended the implementation of uniform guidelines across the various sub-disciplines within the department. For example, for students completing Plan B (Non-thesis) degrees, the structure, content, format, and duration of both the written and oral examinations will now be standardized within the department. Various changes were considered and discussed among the faculty during department meetings in fall semester.

College of Liberal Arts
Department of Anthropology
Anthropology Program

One of five required graduate seminars will either be eliminated and its syllabus incorporated into the other four required seminars, or will be redesigned to prepare students better for rites of passage such as comprehensive examinations. Self-preparation of students for the comprehensive exams will be more closely monitored by student committee chairs, and proactive advisement procedures may be put into place for more direct faculty involvement.

Department of Art
Art: Fine Arts Program

Visual Foundations is addressing a variety of issues concerning both the Foundations and Beginning Drawing courses. Our primary task would appear to be the creation of a consistent, required curriculum for all sections of these classes. We anticipate a change in format and instructional content beginning with fall 2007. Art History is considering a number of possible options depending upon the recruitment of that person who will replace our retiring Art Historian in the fall of 2007. We have begun recruitment for a 20th Century Art Specialist who will develop and teach larger and more comprehensive survey-type coursing along with smaller, more movement-focused courses.
Department of Criminal Justice  
**Criminal Justice Program**

We have instituted our own Methods class to address the disparity in training that was noted due to students taking Methods in several different departments. We (hopefully) will be able to do the same thing with a Statistics class in the near future, and we will be sharing the class with Sociology graduate students so both Criminal Justice and Sociology can be assured that their respective graduate students will receive proper training in these necessary areas.

Department of English  
**English: Teaching English Program**

The department has applied to an received approval from the Provost to proceed with formal university approval to delete the MATE from our degree offerings. We have also applied to and received approval from the Provost to proceed with formal university approval to add an M.F.A. to our degree offerings.

To continue to support the professional development of our M.A. students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships (many of which are likely to go to M.A. students). Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students and has thus helped to make them more successful in their job searches and in their applications to pursue advanced graduate studies.

To address student concerns about nurturing graduate student culture, we have continued to support the recently-formed English Graduate Student Organization. The department has provided listserv support and photocopy support to help promote English Graduate Student Organization activities, and the DGS is now meeting regularly with student representatives of the organization. The DGS has also begun a monthly email newsletter that alerts students to program deadlines and professional opportunities and encourages their participation in departmental activities.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department’s graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. This was a productive meeting that recently-hired faculty found especially helpful, and that resulted in a series of initiatives that were referred to other standing committees in the department.

To improve the clarity of the process by which M.A. students not on Teaching Assistantship may apply for TA, the Graduate Committee revised the TA reapplication policy, announced this adjustment in an email to the graduate student listserv, and posted the new policy to the departmental website.

In order to address concerns about the advisement of graduate special students, the DGS has created a contact list (which will be kept updated) of all graduate specials, and has created a listerv by which information that will be especially helpful to graduate special students may be disseminated. The DGS has also begun a system of contacting each graduate special student to suggest an advisement meeting. The results of this approach have so far been very positive.
Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures
Foreign Languages & Literatures Program

In French, a graduate student was awarded the Distinguished Teaching Assistantship in Core Humanities. In Spanish, two unusually well qualified native speakers from Spain are helping to raise the overall quality of the program and are having a positive linguistic effect on non-native speakers. These sorts of students from abroad (France, Germany, and Spanish-speaking countries) would be unable to attend without TAships. The program plans to continue to lobby the administration for more TAships, the number of which has not kept pace with overall growth in the department.

The Spanish graduate faculty is in the process of reviewing the current M.A. reading list in Spanish and making the appropriate adjustments and updates. A new reading list is expected to be finished at the end of F06.

The graduate faculty in Spanish recently met to discuss policy concerning independent study courses and how they affect enrollments in regular courses. Additionally, the faculty discussed converting the existing FLL 703 (Teaching of Foreign Languages) course into a 400/600-level course.

Given the current budget crisis and the deleterious effect it has on the university as a whole and the Foreign Languages & Literature department specifically, the MA in German and French is currently under review with regard to its viability.

The Spanish section of FLL is in the process of revising the current MA reading list, in order to update readings and include the category of Chicano/Latino literature.

Department of History
History: Teaching History Program

The department should formulate a survey of graduates in this particular program regarding their experience in the program as it directly relates to the ramifications of their deeper understanding of historical material in the high school setting.

As the History Department re-evaluates its MA program in the light of the unsatisfactory statistics given above with regard to TTS and Outcomes, the present Grad advisor recommends that the Department focus on the following areas. With regard to TTD, we need to look at TAship distribution and at Comprehensive Examinations for modification. In particular it might be worth restructuring the examination process as this seems to be what slows down many MA degrees. We should also consider whether or not we need to change our roster of required courses, or offer them more frequently. With regard to Outcomes, the Grad Advisor recommends creating a grad alumni organization so that we can track outcomes more effectively.

Department of Judicial Studies
Judicial Studies Program

The program will review the course evaluation to determine possible revisions to extract additional information from the students.
Department of Judicial Studies  
Justice Management Program

We will discuss allowing students to participate in the Justice Management stats course for credit.

Department of Music & Dance  
Music Program

Further and continued discussion is occurring often within the music faculty and within our faculty meetings and retreats regarding refinement of the department of music's graduate degree.

Any music faculty decisions regarding the Master of Music degree plans will be discussed Spring 2005 with implementation beginning with the department's 2005-2006 handbook (revisions occur Summer 2005 prior to the Fall 2005 Semester).

Department of Political Science  
Political Science Program

The department would like to increasingly steer the students in the MA program into the PHD program following their completion of the MA; the department wants to make students more aware of the educational opportunities and accessibility of the PHD program.

Continued efforts are being made to maintain and continue to grow the quality of the program while simultaneously streamlining progress and requirements for completion. The department would like to increasingly steer the students in the MA program into the PHD program following their completion of the MA; the department wants to make students more aware of the educational opportunities and accessibility of the PHD program.

Department of Political Science  
Political Science: Public Administration & Policy Program

We would like to streamline the program by decentralizing comprehensive exams and streamlining the POD writing process.

The department continues to work on maintaining or improving a high quality program, while simultaneously working to streamline the program. We are continually working to move students from successful completion of the MPA program and into the PHD program which would further advance their skills and capacity.

If the MPA program is to become an accredited MPA program (accreditation is from American Society for Public Administration), then there will be a need for more faculty resources in the department and within this area of education. Accreditation will help to draw more students into the program, which is already doing well in terms of enrollment.

There has been departmental discussion about changing the MPA paper of distinction requirement to something more work-related or applied. This would tailor MPA student education to their specific job requirements.
Department of Sociology  
Sociology Program

Further, the department is currently involved in revising aspects of the research methods training of our M.A. student. Specifically, as part of the recent creation of the School of Social Research and Justice Studies we are in the process of establishing a new interdisciplinary masters-level research methods course. Also we expect to revise the statistics training in the

- The present results are based on the perspective of the learner, i.e. the student. Whereas this perspective is important to evaluate the success of an academic program, naturally it is not the only one. In the future we hope to include additional, perhaps more objective data concerning the nature and quality of the academic training provided by the Department.
- It is critical that we revise and update the SLOs to make sure that our assessment plan, as posted by OUA, adequately reflects our actual educational goals.
- The assessment committee of the department has already taken affirmative steps to address the research methods training provided as part of the program. This included, first, a meeting with current students at which the nature and extent of the concerns were discussed. We are currently working on reforming this aspect of the training through potential changes in the curriculum and the courses offered.

Department of Speech Communication & Theatre  
Speech Communication Program

1. Evaluate seminar content for breadth of coverage: This annual assessment process examines student behaviors. But, we must now evaluate the learning objectives of graduate seminars. We will meet this spring to determine whether 700-level courses can deliver (or should deliver) the cognitive competence we expect in basic topic areas in Speech Communication.
2. Get more data on student performance in research methods: A new tenure-track faculty member will now teach COM 700-Research Methods (fall Â¿05). We will ask her for feedback on student performance and determine whether we need more required coursework in this area.
3. Decide on the 'oral communication skills' portion of SLO #3: We must either commit to achieving this outcome, or eliminate it as a learning outcome in our assessment plan.

We are currently doing the year-long Program Review and self-study. After the outside reviewers provide their recommendations, we will make program modifications.

We will continue the modifications from last year's assessment:
1. Enforce GRE requirements for admission;
2. Recruit from our own undergraduate majors; and
3. Seek more tenure-track positions for graduate faculty.

1. Enforce GRE requirements for admission. We can no longer permit a high undergraduate g.p.a. and significant communication course background to override low GRE scores. This modification is now in place.
2. Recruit more vigorously from our own undergraduate majors. With our new national honorary chapter of Lambda Pi Eta in its second year, our top speech communication students are now visible and accessible. We see their work and assess their cognitive abilities. Now we are doing active recruiting.
3. Seek more tenure-track positions for graduate faculty. We need much more individual attention for our top candidates. Research competence and productivity will never be attained at the high "research university" level until more faculty are in place.

**College of Science**
**Department of Biology**
**Biology Program**

This is the second year for assessment of the Biology MS degree program. The sample size for the first year was small as only five students completed their degree during that year, and it was noted at the time that neither the sample size nor data was sufficiently dramatic to consider immediate modification of the program. Data for this year is similar to that of last year but the sample size is smaller as two students completed their degree requirements during this evaluation year. Collectively the two years have increased our assessment data, but it is still too small to consider program modification at this point in time.

**Department of Chemistry**
**Chemistry Program**

The Chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore are meeting daily with our graduate students. For the MS program we are proposing no new modifications beyond (1) the new instruments now being used for annual evaluation by mentors; (2) the Plan B MS degree; (3) a new 4-page rating/evaluation instrument for student seminars; and (4) the added charge to the Department's Curriculum and Assessment Committee to assume responsibility for assessment, with assistance from faculty members and Graduate Faculty.

**Department of Geography**
**Geography Program**

We will be able to evaluate this better in another year. For right now, many students appear to be making significant progress and we would like to see this continue. Finding specific benchmarks for their progress is difficult, at the moment. We would like to develop some further criteria, such as graduate student success in winning awards for meeting presentations, teaching awards, success in soliciting and obtaining extramural grant funds to support graduate research, publications either during a graduate career or in the immediate aftermath of study completion, but those are still preliminary. We have had only a very few graduate students go on to PhD granting institutions, and will need to evaluate how that transition goes in the future, as more students complete their degrees. Finally, especially for students working in applied projects in MLUPP and MS Geography, success in the workplace is probably another outcome that should be evaluated, but it does not fit in with SLO, necessarily, because in fact that is 'post' education or degree.
**Department of Geography**  
**Geography: Land Use Planning Program**

No modifications were made this year, however in 2005 we will produce a specific strategic plan for the LUPP degree which will probably include major changes to the student learning outcomes and performance indicators for this program. This program is moving towards becoming formally accredited, so any modifications will be in light of those expectations.

**Department of Geological Sciences**  
**Geological Engineering Program**

Some students choose a non-thesis option for their degree program. Whereas a professional paper is required, this paper is not necessarily the result of actual research. This SLO needs rethinking in light of our non-thesis degree option.

**Department of Physics**  
**Physics Program**

The Physics Qualifying Exam may be modified, depending on the outcome of an assessment in progress by Physics Graduate Faculty.

**Division of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Nursing**  
**Nursing Program**

Over the course of this next year, graduate faculty will consider incorporating evaluation tools into each curriculum, so data is reflective of all student's performance in their practice roles.

Ongoing discussion and evaluation of the appropriateness of thesis work at the master's level will continue. A review of the research course may be appropriate. It is possible that assessment outcomes might be changed to reflect more closely the work that is being done.

Health care delivery systems information will be evaluated, along with course objectives to evaluate the appropriateness of current content. As health care and the role of the advanced practice nurse changes, course content will need to reflect those changes.

Continued refinement and development of all clinical evaluation tools, along with content maps for each curriculum will assist faculty and students alike in making sure that the graduate programs at OSN continue to be of the highest quality.

During the course of this academic year, the revised terminal objectives will be evaluated and new outcome measures developed. These will be pilot tested over the summer semester 2006, and will be in place for fall 2006. Both the pilot and fall semester results will then be listed in the correct assessment format.
Department of Social Work
Social Work Program

Future discussions with faculty and key informants need to occur to problem solve how to account for and pull out data at different academic levels. Additionally, need to develop a comparison assessment tool for Social Work 600 level student performance measures.

The School program evaluator will meet with faculty to discuss the implications of program findings as applied to curriculum and field practicum studies. Additionally, addition and refinement of measurement tools will be reviewed and incorporated into future program reports.

1. This information will be shared with faculty as a whole and in particular with curriculum sequence committees to determine how to improve course coverage of research, diversity, and social activism. One of the problems identified through use of a curriculum mapping tool to assess student performance on the comprehensive project assignment was the need to further refine our curriculum mapping (CM) instrument. For example, as we use the CM instrument to assess each course in terms of alignment with other courses and the overall curriculum, we need to identify key Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) that are expected to be covered in each course and have students rate the course content only on those key items. Further, those key SLOs on the CM instrument need to be more fully defined and operationalized so that each item is clear to students and the data collected has higher validity.

2. Over this coming year, we plan to include more types of evaluation data to assess SLOs, such as data from how students are performing in the field.

Interdisciplinary Degree Programs
Department of Atmospheric Sciences
Atmospheric Sciences Program

Based on the results of the assessment, including feedback by faculty from a recent repeat survey and from faculty meeting discussions, the changes planned for this year that will specifically address improvement in the M.S. program are:

(1) A refinement of the Graduate Seminar with more writing and oral communications assignments (including speaking to public interest groups and schools);

(2) Proposal of a new ATMS 410/610 course in dynamic meteorology to improve the theoretical background of incoming M.S. students (especially those who do not have a B.S. degree in Atmospheric Sciences);

(3) Involving students more directly in the process of preparing their Annual Student Progress Report documentation. Another initiative is the creation of a Student Chapter of the American Meteorological Society, as a collaborative activity between the Atmospheric Sciences and Geography degree programs. With the recent addition of the B.S. and Minor degree options in Atmospheric Sciences, this is an opportune time to gather students from both the undergraduate and graduate cohorts to develop their leadership interests in academic and professional development. The Student Chapter will invite membership and chapter leaders from among students in any degree program at UNR, as well as invite participation of faculty, professional weather forecasters from the local National Weather Service Office and television stations, state and local agency scientists and other interested members of the public. Students will be encouraged to make scientific presentations, arrange group study, develop outreach activities, and pursue fellowship, conference and employment opportunities made available through the national headquarters of the American Meteorological Society.
Discussion with the faculty will be conducted in order to find new methods for providing Masters students with more training in the use of computer-based, written and verbal communication modes, and to give them a solid introduction to the interdisciplinary aspects of the atmospheric sciences, within the short 2-3 year time frame typically available for our MS programs.

School of Medicine  
Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology  
Speech Pathology & Audiology Program

1) Evaluate seminar content for breadth of coverage: This annual assessment process examines student behaviors. But, we must now evaluate the learning objectives of graduate seminars. We will meet this spring to determine whether 700-level courses can deliver (or should deliver) the cognitive competence we expect in basic topic areas in Speech Communication.

2) Get more data on student performance in research methods: A new tenure-track faculty member will now teach COM 700-Research Methods (fall 2005). We will ask her for feedback on student performance and determine whether we need more required coursework in this area.

3) Decide on the 'oral communication skills' portion of SLO #3.
Program Changes Planned: Doctorate Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Biochemistry Program

Shortening the research rotations from two semesters to one semester is under consideration. To improve research options for the students, converting the BCH graduate program to an interdisciplinary program in Molecular Biosciences is under consideration.

Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Third, a departmental newsletter will be published starting in 2008 that will have information about the teaching and research activities of all graduate faculty in the program in order to foster communication and information sharing among students and faculty. This is necessary due to the physical separation of the faculty at opposite ends of the campus. Fourth, a plan to physically unify faculty within the department into a new building has been developed and is expected to be implemented in 2010.

College of Education
Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning
Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program

The doctoral experience committee, a sub-committee in CTL, has proposed several changes to the Ph.D. program. At this time, the department has drafted a new version of the program, allowing students to have more of a concentration in a subject area.

Department of Educational Leadership
Educational Leadership Program

The first SLO needs to be broadened. We need to change the first SLO to include all appropriate employment.

College of Engineering
Department of Biomedical Engineering
Biomedical Engineering Program

As a step toward developing a BME "core", two additional BME core faculty members in the areas of sensors have been included within the current $13.5M National Science Foundation EPSCoR proposal. The Electrical Engineering department has plans to recruit 2 additional faculty members with expertise in the area of Biomedical Engineering, replacing retiring faculty. The plan is to develop a core of full-time BME faculty members while maintaining the participation of the large number of adjunct faculty members that reflect the inter-disciplinary nature of the field.
Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering  
Chemical Engineering Program

The focus of the Chemical Engineering program is to increase the number of students in our graduate programs.

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
Civil Engineering: Environmental Program

The CEE Department formed a Graduate Self-Study Committee during the 2005-2006 academic year to survey the current practices among the various sub-disciplines within the department at the graduate level. The committee made recommendations to streamline procedures in the graduate programs by adopting a set of guidelines which address issues such as the format and duration of the comprehensive and or qualifying examinations, the development and presentation of a research proposal, and the preparation and completion of a program of study. Once fully implemented, these guidelines should improve procedures within the graduate programs. The department is also preparing a graduate self-study report during Spring 2007 which will like lead to additional modifications and improvements.

College of Liberal Arts  
Department of Anthropology  
Anthropology Program

We are currently considering combining the Core graduate seminars in each of the four subfields of anthropology into two seminars, one in physical anthropology and archaeology, the other in cultural anthropology and linguistics.

Department of History  
History Program

We seek to expand our doctoral program in ways that meet student interests. Many of our doctoral students are attracted to our department because of the expertise of the faculty in cultural history and the geographic strength that we have in this area. We have faculty specialists in the cultural history of Latin America, Europe, United States, Asia and Africa. As a consequence of this trend we see among students, we are considering the institution of a special cultural history Ph.D. track. We also plan to continue the trend of funding student archival research and conference attendance. We successfully hosted a graduate student conference on campus that gave our students valuable experience presenting their research to an academic audience. We hope to organize other conferences in the future.

While these results are gratifying given the small size of our program, there is always room for improvement. The Department of History is presently in the process of re-evaluating its Graduate Program, and while we will concentrate in the near future on our MA program, we may wish in the future to consider speeding up our TTD for PhD's through such efforts as revising TAship availability and Comprehensive Exams.
Department of Judicial Studies  
Judicial Studies Program

The program will review the course evaluation to determine possible revisions to extract additional information from students.

Additional assistance from JS and CJS may be needed in locating local resource or directly assisting with conducting and analyzing their dissertation research. This assistance will come at a modest cost to the student.

Department of Political Science  
Political Science Program

For the Ph.D. program to develop there will need to be growth in the number of graduate assistantships. These additional assistants will be needed to handle increased class sizes due to increased undergraduate enrollment; increased faculty productivity, and joint faculty research projects; and enhance the ability of the department in placing doctoral students in teaching positions.

Department of Psychology  
Psychology: Behavioral Analysis Program

The Behavior Analysis Program continues to assess itself on a regular basis through the Total Performance System (TPS) and makes minor adjustments, as needed. The program does not anticipate making any major adjustments at this time.

Department of Psychology  
Psychology: Clinical Program

The program as implemented is generally successful at preparing students with the characteristics and skills described in our program plan. As resources become available, we would like to strengthen training in more advanced statistical techniques. The program as implemented is generally successful at preparing students with the characteristics and skills described in our program plan. As resources become available, we would like to strengthen training in more advanced statistical techniques.

Department of Psychology  
Psychology: Cognitive & Brain Science Program

We are not proposing any major modifications to the program at this time as we are still evaluating changes made last year in order to encourage student publications.
College of Science  
Department of Chemistry  
Chemistry Program

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plans. The chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore meet daily with our graduate students. For the PhD program we are proposing no new modification beyond (1) the new instruments now being used for annual evaluation by mentors, (2) a new 4-page evaluation rating instrument for student seminars and (3) the added charge to the Department's Curriculum and Assessment Committee to assume responsibility for assessment, with assistance from faculty mentors and graduate faculty.

Department of Geological Sciences  
Geo-Engineering Program

Integration of research-proposal writing, better mentoring to improve self-motivation skills, better mentoring to achieve the necessary contribution to state of knowledge in the field are indicated.

Department of Physics  
Physics Program

A new 700-level class on Plasma Theory was proposed in the summer of 2006. It may be offered in 2008. Also, the Physics Qualifying Exam will become a diagnostic examination with no pass/fail standard. Students may be required to add certain courses to their program of study based on the results of the examination, but will not be asked to repeat the examination. A new 700-level class on Plasma Theory will be proposed. The Physics Qualifying Exam may be modified, depending on the outcome of an assessment in progress by Physics Graduate faculty.

Interdisciplinary Degree Programs  
Department of Atmospheric Sciences  
Atmospheric Sciences Program

Students will be advised to participate in activities that require more communication (team learning; presentations at professional conferences; taking coursework in the language arts). Faculty will be asked to address more interdisciplinary topics in their courses.

In addition to the program modifications described in the M.S. Plan report (add more commutations assignments to the Graduate Seminar course; propose a new ATMS 610 course in dynamic meteorology; have the students be more directly involved in preparing their annual progress report; facilitate the establishment of a Student Chapter of the American Meteorological Society), we also plan to add an interdisciplinary, technical Special Topics course on "Measurement Methods for Atmosphere - Biosphere Interactions", which will be valuable for several graduate students in ATMS as well as other programs, especially doctoral students who are pursuing interdisciplinary research in the environmental impacts of air.
quality on and due to vegetation distribution. Our Special Topics courses, as well as some of our other 700-level courses, have had excellent enrollment of students from other disciplines such as Environmental Sciences & Health, Physics, Hydrology, Engineering, Geography, and Chemistry. This builds knowledge among the students of each other's disciplinary concepts and methods.

**Department of Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology**

**Ecology, Evolution, & Conservation Biology Program**

Although no modifications are proposed at this time, most students believe that the program should establish timetables for the completion of various requirements such as assembling a committee, taking comps and orals, and completion of research rotations. Furthermore they feel that the program director should inform them if these timetables are not being met. Students also need to publish more and to apply more for grants and contracts. These items will be discussed in a future faculty meeting.

**Department of Social Psychology**

**Social Psychology Program**

A lingering concern is that our graduates 2001-2006 have taken an average of 8 years to complete their degree. The fact that the median time-to-completion was also 8 years means that 50% of recent graduates took 8 years or more. This is troubling given that our curriculum, at least theoretically, enables our students to complete all requirements within the span of 4 years, and given that the majority of our students should be expected to complete their degrees within 6 years. The fact that currently 4 of the 6 most senior students in the program do not yet have a dissertation prospectus in place is particularly disquieting. We will continue to work on the issues that appear to slow our students down.

Whereas the program seems to work well for most students, there are a few instances in which improvements could be made, for instance, with regard to advisement.

(1) Informal interactions with students and faculty suggest that many individuals are not clear about the 2nd year research requirement. Potentially, educating students and faculty about the nature and scope of this requirement would facilitate its completion.

(2) There are at least two factors that may slow some early students from becoming quickly engaged in research generation and moving ahead toward degree completion. One factor involves the characteristics of research interests of students attracted to an interdisciplinary approach to social psychology. These students may have multiple interest areas and take some time to decide which of those interest areas to commit their research energies for their second year project. A second (and related issue) is that at present most students enter the program without having committed to a formal advisor, although at least 2 program faculty have indicated their willingness to work with each student at the time of admission. Because students enter with multiple interests, those 2 faculty members may also be focused in different areas of expertise, and commitment to an advisor would include some commitment to a subject area. Per default during the first year the program director is the advisor for those students, and students are expected to identify a faculty advisor no later than the beginning of their 2nd year in the program. The rationale for this arrangement is that students have an opportunity during their first year to get to know prospective faculty advisors, allowing them to make an informed choice by the beginning of their second year in the program. It appears that, at least in some cases, this practice (along with students' lack of readiness for commitment) delays progress as students are not involved in research early enough, as well as in a personal relationship with a faculty mentor. Thus, it stands to reason whether this long-standing practice should be changed. The
program has modified its research methods course (taken during 2nd semester of the first year) so that students are expected to connect to a faculty member for the purpose of writing a research proposal (which can later become the basis for the second year project) Thus, the present and last first-year cohorts have already gravitated toward the model of obtaining an advisor after their first semester. The program needs to follow the results to determine if students progress in their research and program completion more quickly with this model, or whether premature commitment delays progress by the student stopping and changing direction after beginning research. Further examination is warranted, followed by consideration whether some formal change in the program policy is desirable.

(3) Some students seem to have gathered extensive teaching experience at the expense of formal progress in the program and their dissertation research. Thus, it seems critical that the faculty agree on when it is appropriate for students to teach. That is, what requirements they will have to have completed at what point in the program etc. In addition, there a general discussion of how much teaching is necessary (i.e., the number of courses taught before graduation) would be helpful. Though the director reminds faculty of relevant guidelines, it is unclear to what extent faculty advisors of individual students are involved in student's decisions to focus their energies on teaching rather than on their own dissertation research. Some advisors (and faculty who employ those students as research assistants) require their approval before the student accepts an overload to teach, others do not have that requirement.
Program Changes Made: Bachelors Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Animal Biotechnology

Animal Science Program

Most students in the ASC 100 and 200 series courses met faculty expectations in demonstrating fundamental knowledge of modern production and management skills. Exit interviews were used to assess satisfaction and weaknesses of the program. The students asked for more hands-on experiences. Since we have increased the opportunities to gain more hands-on experience with large animals, we have received very positive feedback from undergraduates. There is a growing group of students, not interested in production agriculture or veterinary medicine that will find our new Animal Biotechnology option better serves their needs:

Classes Deleted From Curriculum:
ASC 307 Physiology of the Domestic Animal
ASC 412 Beef and Sheep Production
ASC 611 Techniques in Livestock Reproduction
ASC 629 Animal Biotechnology Laboratory
ASC 700 Statistical Methods
VM 413/613 Anatomy of Large Animals

New Classes Developed:
ASC 327 Animal Physiology: Cells to Systems - Chris Porada
ASC 387 Introduction to Equine Lameness - Mike Kirk
ASC 410 Sheep Management - Dale Holcombe
ASC 418 Beef Management - Ben Bruce
ASC 450 Equine Production - Al Cirelli
ASC 487 Application of Contemporary Technology to Quantify Equine Lameness - Mike Kirk
ASC 729 Advanced Biotechniques (replaces ASC 629)
ASC 788 Colloquium: Genetic Adaptation - Craig Beattie
ASC 789 Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology - Craig Beattie
VM 328 Applied Physiology and Anatomy - Dale Holcombe

Classes in Development Stages:
ASC 408/608 Rangeland Ecosystems - Barry Perryman
ASC 465/665 Livestock/Wildlife Management and Interaction - William Morrell
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology  
**Biochemistry Program**

Even though overall results indicate that students did an exceptional job with their writing skills, there were grumblings by students as to the amount of lecture and additional homework that was directed towards how to write a scientific paper. This year we will be cutting back on the number of discussion/assignment hours and determine if this has any significant effect on the writing skills of our students. Key points will still be covered, but with brevity. Also, additional assignments will be scaled back. The instructor of the course will still be available to help students who need additional support.

We have adopted a standardized test for major students after they take BCH 400 and the writing skills will be monitored as they do lab reports for BCH 406.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
**Ecohydrology Program**

A new program this year, but the faculty in the program were very involved in designing the assessment plan.

In response to assessments from preexisting majors, the Ecohydrology major was modified to incorporate a set of core courses in common with the three other majors under the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences. NRES 304 was modified to be NRES 295 (Principles of Ecohydrology), a course that is now taken by both non-majors and students majoring in Ecohydrology.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
**Environmental Science Program**

At the beginning of the year, Ecohydrology, which had been included as a Watershed Science option within the Environmental Science major, became a separate major. Consequently some majors switched to Ecohydrology. This was partially in response to the employer surveys and employment data from graduate surveys that indicated a demand for specialization in hydrology. Also, partially in response to previous assessments, a set of core courses were adopted for the Environmental Sciences major. In addition to these core courses, most other requirements were allocated to "pick lists". In addition, the faculty of the Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences Department have discussed the idea of extending this set of core courses to the Forest and Rangeland Management major and the Wildlife Ecology and Conservation major. Faculty committees met extensively to design and implement the assessment plan.
Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
Forest & Rangeland Management Program

In response to previous assessments, the use of a combination of field exercises, stand management reports and written papers will continue. In this year, a new set of tasks involving analyses of technical literature, oral presentations, written papers, and poster presentations was added to Forest and Range Quantitative analyses and written assignments will continue to be incorporated into classroom requirements. Students were taught how to identify plants by character in the field or after collection and dissection which will likely be more useful. Annual assessments are distributed and discussed. The current plan is working quite well.

Department of Natural Resource & Environmental Sciences  
Wildlife Ecology & Conservation Program

The WEC assessment plan was actively designed by the faculty; it is providing important information for updating and revising our program and it is fully implemented.

Department of Nutrition  
Nutrition Program

A number of changes have been made by individual instructors related to class mechanics. These involve mainly things such as different textbooks, increased discussion time, more exams with less information covered by each, etc. The Department will also restructure some courses to allow better sequencing in terms of semester offered (NUTR 422, 470, 480) and integration of material covered (419, 440). We are planning to provide a nutrition education/counseling class for three credits and to delete courses that are not being taught. The Nutrition Department has requested that it be moved to CABNR from HCS which will provide a climate more consistent with the science base for all nutrition studies. This will also, possibly, improve the climate for the growing number of nutritional science students, although we do not plan to change basic programmatic offerings of the Nutrition Department.

The survey conducted last spring is the basis for several changes the Nutrition Department has instituted. The results of that survey have been of much greater practical value for the department than the class evaluations, which are driven by the grading in the classes. We have, among other things, dropped the requirement of NUTR 470 for NTS majors, have increased the number of credits for NUTR 470 to better compensate for the time this class requires and have changed the class hour distribution for NUTR 426/427. We intend to do this survey on an annual basis. Strengths of the department as noted by students related to advisement, "caring" professors, the variety of science classes, and the usefulness of the information provided in classes. Things we can do better include more volunteer opportunities, more summer classes, offer more classes both fall and spring, offer more electives, etc. Many of these depend on additional resources/FTE which we hope to have now that we have moved to CABNR and that our enrollment has grown. Dr. Wilson has created two electives in the past two years, NUTR 240 and NUTR 325, and will submit an FYE success strategies class to begin, hopefully, fall, 2005. The overall quality of the program was rated at 3.4/5. The quality
of the courses was rated 3.6/5. Interaction with faculty was rated at 4.2. Twenty-one completed surveys were evaluated, 12 from dietetics option.

We are working with CABNR to promote the nutritional sciences track as a pre-professional major. We have made changes in NUTR 470 to address concerns of students and to consolidate management of the class by the instructor.

We are adding one credit each to NUTR 451 and 452 to provide more time for discussion and critical thinking. This may happen as well for NUTR 426/427 and NUTR 470. This would reduce elective credits by a corresponding amount. Two classes have used the "clickers" now found in education to "engage" students more and assess learning. Nutrition 110 - Success Strategies in Nutrition was offered for the first time this semester and we will have data to assess its value for the next report.

The department has developed and had approved a new class on Nutrients and Gene Expression to address the growing interest in the relationship between nutrient use and genetic variation. ADA and other professional agencies have suggested nutrition students need more information in this area. And this class will. The class will be offered for the first time in S08. There are different teaching assignments with different instructors in NUTR 370 and 470 this year. The department is attempting to devise an additional instrument for the evaluation of classroom teaching. The goal is to assess learning as well as customer satisfaction as currently done with the CIEQ instrument. The department has secured funding for a new nutrition research lab from local nutritional supplement companies. The lab will help provide research experiences for students, especially those in nutritional sciences. The department is also exploring internship possibilities for our students with ProThera, one of those companies.

We will this year put in place a third specialization to accommodate changes in ADA requirements and provide an additional option for students who do not intend to use their degree for careers in dietetics or the other health professionals that are commonly targets for the BS in Nutrition, e.g., medicine, dentistry, physical therapy, pharmacy, physician's assistant, etc. We will provide additional advisement sessions related to careers in nutrition. Students do occasionally expect the Department to assure them entrance in to the next step in their careers. We do not see that as our role.

Moving to CABNR has provided additional resources and the Nutrition Department has hired two new faculty members. This will reduce teaching loads for faculty members overall. It has also allowed for distribution of advising loads so that each faculty members has fewer students. We would hope this translates into improved access and more time for each student. We do remain a small department that has grown substantially in the last few years in terms of number of majors.

New courses: the FYE class has been approved and will be offered fall, 07. We expect it to solve some of the informational problems that students claim to have in understanding what the major is about and how to sequence classes and improve their opportunity for success. Changes in 470, including number of service learning hours will be submitted for approval. We will add additional credit hours for 451/452 to provide more time for discussion of the material covered. We will also submit a new course proposal; Nutrition and Genes, to address the growing interest nutritionists have in this area.

The department will have a meeting required of all students at the beginning of each semester to provide information related to the major and some social interaction between faculty and students.
We have completed a design for our assessment plan and fully implemented it. Assessment results have been reviewed yearly at our faculty meetings and changes have been made in response to the assessment results. Two examples of changes implemented in response to assessment results include: development of a new course Nutrition 460 "Nutrition and Genes" which was offered in the spring of 2008 in response to student demand for additional course in Nutritional Science area; removal of the Community Nutrition course requirement for Nutrition Science students as many in that track felt that the course was not necessary for their careers.

Department of Resource Economics
Agricultural & Applied Economics Program

Current curriculum maps for both majors are maintained on the departmental UG program website by the Department's UG Coordinator/ OA officer. The 2006 curriculum mapping exercise underscored a set of gaps and overlaps in our major curricula. It also highlighted that we were not making use of the core math prerequisite courses that so many of our majors need to take to be prepared to use calculus and linear algebra in the study of economics and statistics. Therefore, in fall 2007 we undertook an extensive restructuring of the BS-EPA major and all of our undergraduate course offerings, as well as adapting the BS-AAE and our minor curricula accordingly. For example, in the BS-AAE curriculum, we used to offer just one lower-division APEC course central to the major, but six upper division courses, taught on an alternate year rotations. We restructured to offer one major course every semester (four lower division, four upper division).

According to our graduating senior exit survey, we learned that career prospects are enhanced for BS-EPA graduates who augment their training in environmental economics with a natural science or engineering field specialty such as water, wildlife, forestry, or mining. Thus, we redesigned the BS-EPA major to no longer require an un-sequenced smattering of natural science courses (CHEM 121, BIOL 100 or 191, and NRES 345-Hydrology). Furthermore, we no longer limit our majors to 'policy analysis.' The new degree no longer requires the large number of generic political science courses (PSC 101, 210, 320). Instead, we now require students to minor in any field of their choice, preferably a life science field concerning fauna or flora, an earth science, or engineering. In the context of requiring a minor, we no longer specify electives. We have also revised RECO 250 - Applied Quantitative Methods and now require it earlier in the curriculum than the 300-400 level methods courses we used to offer. The redesign and change in the timing of this course gives students skills that can then be used in our 300 and 400 level courses, thereby deepening content and consolidating the students' skills. Finally, we gave a new name to the BS-EPA degree, pending approval during the summer of 2008. The need for the new name was identified through our graduating senior exit surveys. The name chosen is hopefully a better labeling of the skills acquired in the new degree program, and the skill sets of our graduates will be more easily recognized by potential employers.

The program modifications we have pursued are of two types: leverage our programs' strengths and ameliorate our programs' weaknesses. To leverage the strengths of our program, we revised the AAE and ERE major curricula to develop quantitative skills earlier in the bachelor's degree programs. We had been shifting all quantitative course work to the 400-level. Now we are re-emphasizing 200-300 level quantitative courses instead. A 300-level course we had basically abandoned has been reorganized as a 200-level math tools course. Shifting the quantitative courses down appears to have made 'make more room at the top' for topical and problem-solving courses. This appears to have deepened the critical thinking and analytical work done in the upper-division courses.
Based on OA findings, in the fall of 2007 we significantly revised our curricula by:

1. Significantly updating almost all the undergraduate courses we teach.
2. Changing the BS-EPA major to BS-Environmental and Resource Economics (BS-ERE).
3. Updating the BS-AAE major and our three minor degree curricula in-line with our revised courses.

Furthermore, at least three more of our undergraduate courses now require a term paper. And we will begin requiring the Senior Synthesis Project in APST 470 (Spring 2009). We believe that these repeated:

1. In order to improve students' performance with econometrics and statistics, we have begun to counsel students to take their math and statistics courses at the earliest possible time in their programs, and then to take APST470 as early as possible in their programs. For example, two second-year students will be taking APST470 next year. This compares with past years in which most students waited until their final year to take APST470. This modification will have two impacts. First, they will be better prepared when they take APST470. Secondly, they will then be able to use econometric concepts and methods from APST470 in their later coursework, thereby gaining a stronger foundation and more experience.

2. In assisting students to develop their writing skills, the program currently requires students to take a number of upper level communications and writing courses. Department coursework includes term papers, presentations and essays. We do not feel at this time that the department courses need to be modified to help those students who still need improvement in this area. But it is felt that we can do better at monitoring and reviewing individual student communication skills. This can be accomplished by having instructors note each semester which students received less than satisfactory scores on term papers, essays and presentations. This can be done via a memo to the undergraduate coordinator. If it is clear that an individual student seems to consistently struggle with his or her writing ability, they can be counseled to use some of their 30+ elective credits to strengthen skills in this area.

We do not feel at this time that the 15% or so students who are performing below expectations warrant any other significant changes within the department's courses. (3) In deciding how best to help students better understand basic concepts early on in the program, the department decided to reintroduce APEC-100, a course that uses concrete examples to provide an overview and rationale for the theory and methods. This course would minimize the jargon and details of methods, and focus instead on concepts. The course will use examples and case studies to demonstrate economic conflicts in resource use that should be well-known to residents of the west. This course is meant to be accessible to any student in the university and provide a thought-provoking introduction to the important questions and concepts that the discipline seeks to address. The course, as reintroduced, has also been newly adopted as part of the University core curriculum as fulfilling a social science requirement.

Department of Resource Economics
Environmental & Resource Economics Program

The program modifications we will pursue are of two types: leverage our program's strengths and ameliorate our programs' weaknesses.

Starting with leveraging strength: Based on OA findings, we have initiated a process of minor adaptations to the AAE and EPA major curricula to develop quantitative skills earlier in their bachelor's degree program. We had been shifting all quantitative course work to the 400-level. Now
we are re-emphasizing 2-300 level quantitative courses instead. A 300-level course we had basically abandoned is being reorganized as a 200-level math tools course. Shifting the quantitative courses down will 'make more room at the top' for topical and problem-solving courses. This will allow us to deepen the critical thinking and analytical work done in the upper-division courses. The changes we proposed are being processed to be reflected in the 2007-8 UNR Catalogue.

To enhance the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills among AAE and EPA majors, we are systematically engaging undergraduate students in our research, on payroll as well as for independent study credit. We also are supporting a very active student club, which a number of top awards in regional competition in 2006. Furthermore, at least three more of our undergraduate courses now require a term paper. We believe that Based on OA findings, in the fall of 2007 we significantly revised our curricula by:

1. Significantly updating almost all the undergraduate courses we teach.
2. Changing the BS-EPA major to BS-Environmental and Resource Economics (BS-ERE).
3. Updating the BS-AAE major and our three minor degree curricula in-line with our revised courses.

Furthermore, at least three more of our undergraduate courses now require a term paper. And we will begin requiring the Senior Synthesis Project in APST 470 (Spring 2009). We believe that these repeated opportunities to practice content-based writing and presentation skills should bear fruit.

1) In order to improve students’ performance with econometrics and statistics, we have begun to counsel students to take their math and statistics courses at the earliest possible time in their programs, and then to take APST470 as early as possible in their programs. For example, two second-year students will be taking APST470 next year. This compares with past years in which most students waited until their final year to take APST470. This modification will have two impacts. First, they will be better prepared when they take APST470. Secondly, they will then be able to use econometric concepts and methods from APST470 in their later coursework, thereby gaining a stronger foundation and more experience.

2) In assisting students to develop their writing skills, the program currently requires students to take a number of upper level communications and writing courses. Department coursework includes term papers, presentations and essays. We do not feel at this time that the department courses need to be modified to help those students who still need improvement in this area. But it is felt that we can do better at monitoring and reviewing individual student communication skills. This can be accomplished by having instructors note each semester which students received less than satisfactory scores on term papers, essays and presentations. This can be done via a memo to the undergraduate coordinator. If it is clear that an individual student seems to consistently struggle with his or her writing ability, they can be counseled to use some of their 30+ elective credits to strengthen their skills in this area.

We do not feel at this time that the 15% or so students who are performing below expectations warrant any other significant changes within the department's courses. (3) In deciding how best to help students understand basic concepts early on in the program, the department decided to reintroduce APEC-100, a course that uses concrete examples to provide an overview and rationale for the theory and methods. This course would minimize the jargon and details of methods, and focus instead on concepts. The course will use examples and case studies to demonstrate economic conflicts in resource use that should be well-known to residents of the west. This course is meant to be
accessible to any student in the university and provide a thought-provoking introduction to the important questions and concepts that the discipline seeks to address. The course, as reintroduced, has also begun.

**College of Business Administration**

**Department of Accounting**

**Accounting Program**

Our revised ACC 401 class will commence in its modified form in fall 2008. This course will now contain extended record keeping elements which have proved weaker than desired in the past. This course will also introduce a computerized practice set which will help students in three areas - record keeping, report preparation and use of accounting technology. We have also move the accounting systems analysis to earlier in the program. This knowledge is needed in a wide range of courses and it was felt that it was at too advanced a stage in the previous degree structure. All students will now have a mandatory auditing class. This will again reinforce analysis skills and accounting systems understanding.

We will continue to emphasize the research skills by having cases in both ACC 402 and ACC 403 in addition to ACC 410 tax cases. This continues to be an area of greater focus. We will redefine our objectives relating to financial analysis and the use of technology for the performance of accounting tasks. These will become specified elements monitored in the degree program.

We will seek to ensure that we get adequate external feedback on our program from alumni. If the university's alumni surveys do not provide the required data, we will perform our own in-house developed surveys. We will also receive better feedback from a newly implemented advisory board from spring 2009.

We will transfer measurement of basic communication and technology skills to the new College Core Assessment process although we will consider whether we wish to continue to monitor these items on a major program basis due to their importance.

**Department of Managerial Sciences**

**Managerial Science: Marketing Program**

The Principles of Marketing Mkt 210 and Intermediate Marketing Management Mkt 316 courses have been restructured to ensure that potential marketing majors know that Marketing Management is based on a solid knowledge of accounting, algebra, statistics and calculus. The skills needed for analysis, planning.
In fall 2007, changes were put into place in both the elementary and secondary programs. In the elementary program, students took a content pedagogy course in both science (EDEL 443) and in math (EDEL 433) and a practicum course in both science (EDEL 443p) and in math (EDEL 433p). Students no longer were required to take a course in assessment or in classroom management.

In the secondary program, students were no longer required to take a course in communication or in philosophy (except in the science major). Students were now required to take a course in ESL and Teaching Reading in the Content Areas.

The faculty has taken steps to look at its curriculum and program structure. One area that has been ignored from the secondary program is literacy, especially literacy in the content area. The secondary faculty have revised their program to include this course through Educational Specialties, once the process has been approved at the university curriculum level.

Another area that has received important attention is in helping pre-service teachers develop awareness and strategies in working with English Language Learners. The elementary faculty have addressed this area in their courses in science, mathematics, and social studies as well as in the assessment course. The secondary team has added this as a course that is also in the final stages of acceptance at the university curriculum level. The secondary education program has continued work to reduce problems with the practicum experiences. In the secondary first time licensure program, a manual has been developed and posted on the department website for the required course that contains a school practicum. Copies of the manual are also provided to building principals and teachers at the assigned practicum sites. Meetings have also taken place with the local school district with the assistant superintendent for high schools to structure the placements for all secondary courses that require a practicum. The district has established a contact person at each middle and high school practicum site. The practicum list is available in excel spreadsheet on the COE server and is made available to department instructors and the director of the Office of Field Experiences. Based on the direction of the legislation of No Child Left Behind, the department has also added curriculum on parent involvement to both the elementary and secondary program. Parent involvement speakers as well as supporting material on parent involvement has been infused into the introductory and methods

We are pleased with the use of assessment. Elementary faculty work closely with students as they use an artifact per course in math, sciences, social studies and literacy.

Changes include:

Added ESL courses.

More parent involvement throughout the program.

Added Reading in Content Area course.
Department of Education Specialties
Education Specialties Program

We use the data to take a program-wide view of our students (vs. course-to-course). We have made several changes in the program and engaged in faculty development activities.

Through examination of performance assessment data (portfolio I and internship assessments) the EDS Undergraduate Program Committee recognized some weaknesses in the curricula for ECE and instituted two changes that will take effect in fall of 2006. (1) A course in characteristics of exceptional children will be added to the curriculum to help majors identify and more effectively work with children with disabilities and developmental delays. (2) An additional course in literacy methods has been added. Since these future teachers are licensed to work with children from birth through grade two, it was determined that the early literacy course should emphasize pre-school literacy and be followed by a primary level literacy methods course. In addition, discussions with faculty in the department of HDFS are leading to different types of field experiences so that ECE majors spend more time in school settings prior to the internship experience. Integrated Elementary/Special Education Major. The first group of students to fully complete the newly designed program in its entirety finished the program in December of 2006, although formative assessment data has been reviewed for the past 4 semesters. We are pleased that the design of the program, particularly the field experiences, seems to be effective in preparing teachers.

Changes to our previous program specifically addressed four focus areas that were identified as needing improvement. (1) Field experiences include an exploratory practicum and three extended and supervised practicum/seminar courses to allow for observation and demonstration of teaching and classroom management skills. (2) The program contains a foundational course in assessment and further integrates assessment skills into methods courses. (3) The program also includes a course on working with families that students take early in their studies. (4) At the end of the program, students take a course on case management that also includes family involvement with special education issues. As we have phased in the new design for the elementary/special education program, we have conducted anonymous surveys of students to determine the effectiveness of each program phase (block of courses) in meeting their stated goals. These results are shared with the faculty teaching the courses.

Department of Human Development & Family Studies
Early Childhood Education Program

Given the findings of last year's assessment and feedback received from faculty of the College of Education, who are also involved in teaching the ECE students, discussion of Student Learning Samples (required of students during their student teaching) has been added to several courses in the HDFS department, and assignments have been modified. This year, also as a result of last year's assessment, we added 2 new courses to the program to shore up students' knowledge related to teaching literacy and working with children with special needs.

In an effort to increase publicity and enrollment in the ECE program, a student was hired during the fall semester to present information on the program to high school seniors. Several modifications have been made to the program. Starting in fall 2006, ECE students will be required to take an additional reading/literacy class. In addition, students will take another new course, from a menu of possibilities, related to working with young children with disabilities. Requirements for preparation of
Portfolios and guidance provided to students in this process have also changed. Students are given more explicit information about Portfolio preparation and are provided with relevant learning experiences in their preparation in several classes. In addition, students are helped to develop research skills that are useful in designing Student Learning Samples, as part of student teaching, in the research methods course they take. It should also be noted that this year, the department of HDFS has experienced several transitions (including, but not limited to the transition to a new College). Given these circumstances, some minor modifications to the ECE program may be considered in 2009, in addition to the changes made to forms and procedures for students that were implemented in 2008.

The major change made this year was the addition of the ECE program coordinator as an assessor of the ECE majors' portfolios. This has resulted in more consistency between the program and the assessment of its students. It is expected that this change will continue to be implemented in 2008.

Design - A new assessment plan was recently introduced to align better with desired program outcomes. In response to assessment data, the program has changed in terms of course requirement (addition of another early literacy course and a course on children with disabilities) and an earlier experience in elementary classrooms.

**Department of Human Development & Family Studies**

**Human Development & Family Studies Program**

How assessment has led to changes: This past year we added a pre-major screening process to improve the quality of our majors and computer enforced pre-requisites so that students are now taking required courses in the appropriate sequence. We are also continuing to revise the course materials and strategies used to teach the internship course, are looking for ways to provide a consistent experience for students, and have devised an improved measurement instrument for assessing student outcomes. Students have requested that the internship be offered for a letter grade instead of S/U, and this change is likely to be implemented next year. In addition, one of the HDFS faculty members has taken responsibility for updating and teaching HDFS 202 on a regular basis, in order to maintain quality control.

The faculty also put considerable effort into mapping the HDFS 231, the practicum, continues to be restructured to include an online component with self paced modules and videos. Students will be required to take three credits instead of two, and a web page, standardized syllabus and objectives for the course have been developed. We are still in the process of finding appropriate videos for the web page. HDFS 470, the internship, is now being taught by a faculty member rather than an LOA, and we are in the process of changing the course from S/U to a letter grade. Student concerns about the way that a particular course has been taught are being addressed by considering reassigning the course to the core faculty member who developed it (concerns have only surfaced since the original instructor stopped teaching it). For the first time, a statement about program and student learning outcomes has been added to HDFS syllabi, with information about how specific objectives of the course support each learning outcome.
Student feedback from the focus groups indicated that they have been given inconsistent and sometimes incorrect information about the CFLE from their advisors. In response, the director of the HDFS undergraduate program conducted a workshop with faculty and staff to update them on the latest information and requirements for certification in spring 2007, and future assessments will determine whether this has had a positive effect on students' introduction to the CFLE earlier in the program.

We are in the process of developing a strategic plan for the instructional programs, in response to students' concerns, which will include revisiting the areas of emphasis in the program, some further curriculum mapping to correct overlaps in courses, forging stronger connections with the college's Associate Dean for Workforce Development, and a concerted effort to develop relationships with potential employers, improve career advising, and promote workforce development. The need for better career advising also has been a consistent theme in the focus groups, and faculty have responded with a careers handout for students and advisors, and we are redesigning our recruitment materials, advising materials, and department home page to focus more on career planning.

Finally, assessment of advising was added to the assessment plan this year. Nearly 90% of HDFS students met with their advisor during spring 2007. Initial findings from 74 responses to a one page anonymous questionnaire suggest that all students rated their advising as either excellent (87.8%) or good (12.2%) overall. Typical comments were: "I am very happy with the advising I am receiving!" and "It was great!" There were no negative comments about any of the advising that students had received. Student concerns about the quality of teaching by LOAs and TAs is being addressed by faculty mentoring, student teaching evaluations, faculty classroom observations, and monitoring course objectives and syllabi.

College of Engineering
Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering
Chemical Engineering Program

The design of a comprehensive assessment program was done for ABET. Efforts have been made to streamline the assessment process. Efforts are made to implement feedback from courses for their improvement.

Following is a list of actions taken in response to assessment of our progress to meeting the program outcomes. Each includes a description of what was done, when it was done, and why it was done.

1) The use of ChemCAD was implemented in ChE 485 (Separation Processes) in 2002. Prior to this class, students have been introduced to process simulation in ChE 245 (Comp. Appl. in ChE), but have had only limited opportunities to use it. In our most immediately previous assessment meeting, we discovered that they were weak using it in their capstone design project.

2) In 2003, we decided to add a focus on the use of MatLab in ChE 245 (Comp. Appl. in ChE), since students had essentially no experience in the use of structured programming. We also implemented its use into ChE 361 (ChE Thermo) and ChE 451 (Process Control), so that students would have a chance to practice the skill. Now, when students have computational problems, they are generally directed toward MatLab.

3) Chemical engineering students have been required to complete a safety workshop for
several years. For the past four years, students enrolled in ChE 102 (Intro. to ChE II) design, construct, and optimize a chemically powered car, early in the curriculum. After repeatedly observing dangerous practices, we scheduled the workshop during ChE 102, as a part of the regularly scheduled class, in 2003. Starting in 2005, all designs were required to be approved by EH&S before construction. This has resulted in greatly improved safe practices.

4) During the past three years, we have discussed several times the lack of preparation exhibited by students in the thermodynamics class, ChE 361. We have concluded that students are coming into the class with insufficient preparation to complete the ambitious list of topics, including first- and second-law analysis, phase equilibrium, and reaction equilibrium. We have considered the possibilities of splitting the class into two sequential classes, of requiring the mechanical engineering thermodynamics class as a prerequisite, and of reviewing and revising the student preparation in Chem 421. In the spring of 2005, we formally changed a prerequisite for ChE 361 from Chem 421 to Chem 421 or MECH 311, the class was renamed from "Thermodynamics" to "Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics", and the catalog description was rewritten to more closely reflect the appropriate content. These changes were approved by the UNR course and curriculum committee May 2, 2005, and will be published in the 2006-07 general catalog. We also plan a meeting with the chemistry department faculty for the summer, 2005, to discuss how we might better prepare our students for ChE 361.

5) In the fall of 2003, we decided to change the text used in ChE 373 (Transport Phenomena I) from the text by Geankoplis. At our meeting of December, 2003, we concluded that students’ understanding of transport phenomena, particularly of fluid mechanics, was inadequate, as evidenced in the capstone design course. Dr. Coronella selected a text by Wilkes, and it was used in the fall of 2004. The short-term analysis is that students didn't care for the new text at all, which by itself, seemed to hinder the learning process.

6) During the 2004-05 academic year, we discovered that there has been little if any instruction in statistical design of experiments. This came about during a seminar on that topic given by Dr. Allen Gates, when not a single student in the audience could remember even hearing the term previously. Also, we learned from the UNR assessment office that two out of seven respondents disagreed that their educational experience at UNR prepared them to design experiments or to resolve questions experimentally (Q3 in Table B2.1 above on page 7.) We have concluded that the topic of statistical design of experiments should be introduced in the Unit Operations Lab courses, ChE 441 and 442, and Dr. Gecol has agreed to ensure this happens during the next year. We have also considered introducing the topic in ChE 245 (Comp. Appl. In ChE), but have not yet implemented that tactic.

7) At several of our spring assessment meetings, we have discussed the frustration experienced by students in the capstone design project when they encounter what appears to them to be a new challenge, unrelated to previous course work. We have concluded that this indicates a developmental stage in Bloom's taxonomy, somewhere between the analysis stage and the synthesis stage, and reflects a problem in critical thinking, program outcome #3. After several years of both student frustration and faculty dissatisfaction, the faculty have established a new strategy for the next year's design project. In 2005-06, Dr. Fuchs will introduce a design in two stages, first requiring analysis and optimization of an existing product or process, and second requiring synthesis of a new design, with constant coaching of how and when to use which tools from the chemical engineering toolbox. Assessment matrix update procedure. Our assessment process is reevaluated for effectiveness and efficiency, and when appropriate, changes are made.
In our most recent assessment meeting (May 4, 2005), we made a few adjustments. For example, outcome #8 (students recognize that engineers value itemized "soft skills") will be deleted, since it is redundant with the previous outcomes, and is difficult to measure.

**Department of Chemical & Metallurgical Engineering  
Materials Science & Engineering Program**

The design of a comprehensive assessment program was done for ABET. Efforts have been made to streamline the assessment process. Efforts are made to implement feedback from courses for their improvement.

**Department of Computer Science  
Computer Information & Engineering Program**

A direct assessment methodology has been adopted where each SLO is directly evaluated by using metrics specific to each course. Questionnaires for the Advisory Board have been developed that allow us to better understand what our graduates need in order to be successful as CIE professionals. A significant benefit is the potential to provide a useful and timely feedback mechanism before receiving the course evaluations at the end of the semester.

**Department of Computer Science  
Computer Science Program**

A direct assessment methodology has been adopted where each SLO is directly evaluated by using metrics specific to each course. Questionnaires for the Advisory Board have been developed that allow us to better understand what our graduates need in order to be successful as CIE professionals. A significant benefit is the potential to provide a useful and timely feedback mechanism before receiving the course evaluations at the end of the semester.

**Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
Civil Engineering: Environmental Program**

Instructors of freshman and junior year courses will incorporate brief review sessions and/or assignments that emphasize the importance of sound knowledge of fundamental science and mathematics. More emphasis on ethics will be incorporated into several 400-level courses in the B.S.Env.E. curriculum.
Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering

Electrical Engineering Program

We have started using a Course Assessment form to be completed at the end of the semester by the instructor for each course. The form provides curriculum mapping information that indicates the level of coverage of the a-k criteria. It also made instructors examine the contents of their classes more closely. A final benefit is that it provided a means of checking the information provided by the instructors on their syllabi.

The coverage of ethical and social issues has been strengthened in the freshman class in EE 191. The course objectives include:
1. Promote ethical practices and demonstrate an awareness of social effects of engineering projects.
2. Each student has to sign a "Student Contract" that lists his duties and responsibilities and which includes a section on academic honesty.

The College of Engineering will be offering a new social science and diversity course ENGR 308 Impact of a Global Economy. The course will remedy a deficiency in our curriculum which currently has little coverage of engineering economics. Although outcome (g) is not specifically targeted, the course will include reading and report writing which will improve students' written communication skills. Outcome (e) is specifically targeted by the course.

Program assessment data have recently been utilized as a part of and to support our ABET accreditation process. All program weaknesses and concerns have been addressed and resolved. The program is fully ABET accredited.

Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering

Engineering Physics Program

We are following the same assessment plan implemented by the EE program.

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Mechanical Engineering Program

Program Modifications:
Based on similar data from previous years, early in 2005, a significant change to the curriculum was made:
- ME 402 Computational Methods in Engineering was renumbered and re-titled ME 303 Numerical Methods for Engineers and offered in the spring of the Junior year,
- MathCad, MatLab, and Excel will be required throughout the curriculum,
- MSE 250 Elements of Materials Science was made a prerequisite to ME 351 Mechanical Design,
- ME 343 Dynamics of Machinery was made a prerequisite to ME 351 Mechanical Design,
- English 301 Engineering Communications content and delivery method was modified to provide more capability in oral and written communications, particularly laboratory reports,
- ME 322 Instrumentation was increased to a 4 credit course with design of experiments added to the content. In order to accommodate 3 extra credits and keep the total credit required to 129, the diversity and fine art requirements were allowed to be satisfied by a single course rather than
requiring 2 separate courses. Faculty have modified course content and delivery. In particular, ME 451, Mechanical System Design (a capstone course) course content was modified to focus the design project on a combined thermal and mechanical system. Linear programming and six sigma content was added to increase familiarity with linear algebra and statistics. Transient performance analysis as well as detailed thermal and mechanical analysis was required to confirm the design adequacy.

Significant software tools have been added to the ECC. Conversion from ProEngineer to SolidWorks with COSMOS - computer aided engineering, • Minitab - statistical analysis, Decision Capture - engineering design, • VISSIM - MathCad add-on for dynamic system design and analysis, • EES - thermal system design and analysis.

In order to strengthen the design experience in Mechanical Engineering, the faculty has restructured the undergraduate curriculum. Starting in 2006 a new course, Dynamics of Machinery (2 cr), will be required at the beginning of the junior year to provide a better analytical background for the follow-on course, Mechanical Design (ME 351, 4 cr).

The experimental content of the curriculum has also been strengthened (starting in spring 2007) by boosting the number of credits in ME 422 Instrumentation from 3 to 4. It is expected that the added time will be used to enhance student exposure to statistical methods and error analysis in general. College-wide, there is a strong desire among three Departments to modify the introductory core computational course CS 135. The CEE and ME faculty in particular feel strongly that sophomores must learn how to use applications-oriented software such as Excel, MathCad, MatLab and SolidWorks early in their program.

In order to strengthen the design experience in Mechanical Engineering, the faculty has restructured the undergraduate curriculum. Starting in 2006 a new course, ME 343 Dynamics of Machinery (2 cr), is required at the beginning of the junior year to provide a better analytical background for the follow-on course, Mechanical Design (ME 351).

The experimental content of the curriculum has also been strengthened (starting in spring 2007) by boosting the number of credits in ME 322 Instrumentation from 3 to 4. It is expected that the added time will be used to enhance student exposure to statistical methods and error analysis in general.

College-wide, there is a strong desire among three Departments to modify the introductory core computational course CS 135. The CEE and ME faculty in particular feel strongly that sophomores must learn how to use applications-oriented software such as Excel, MathCad, MatLab and SolidWorks early in their college careers if we wish to "modernize" later aspects of our curricula.
College of Liberal Arts
Department of Anthropology
Anthropology Program

The department added two Student Learning Outcomes:
1. Students participate in and are able to evaluate the assumptions, purposes, methods, and results of anthropological research and scholarship;
2. Students who graduate with a BA in Anthropology from UNR should understand the four subfields of Anthropology and their relevance to the discipline as a whole.

As a result of assessment, the BA in anthropology curriculum was modified and implemented at the beginning of the 2008 fall semester. Changes in the anthropology core courses include the addition of ANTH 281 (Introduction to Language) and a research methods course, either ANTH 438 (Ethnographic Field Methods) or ANTH 493 R (Analytical Methods and Research Design in Anthropology). Three previous anthropology core courses were deleted and moved to anthropology elective course status: ANTH 201 (Peoples and Cultures of the World), ANTH 480 R (Anthropological Linguistics), and ANTH 402 R We are redefining our Student Learning Outcomes.

Department of Art
Art: Studio and Art History Program

Art History:
The Department has secured a phenomenal 20th Century Art Historian who is in the process of redesigning the contemporary art history courses, realigning context and content toward "movement" rather than "artist" and moving much of what has been somewhat fragmented into survey-based material. Dr. Van Hoesen's joining the Department Faculty will result in some major changes which will dictate the area of specialty of the next Art Historian recruiting which will occur as the Department is awarded its next new position. The Department is continuing its active search to recruit additional qualified part-time Art History instructors to teach much-needed survey art sections.

Independent Study:
The Department of Art Undergraduate Adviser has been largely successful in insuring that prerequisites are completed and that consistent contact between student and faculty oversight is met thereby affecting the greatest degree of success possible. In doing this, the enrollment in these courses has seen a small reduction from which it should recover in the next several semesters.

Scholarships:
We have recently posted all scholarship application forms and guidelines on the department's web site. We will also be furthering our efforts to get the information to all art majors through departmental postings, email announcements and faculty in-class announcements.

Independent Study:
The Department of Art Undergraduate Advisor is undertaking the coordination of Independent Study classes to insure that prerequisites are completed and that consistent contact between student and faculty oversight is met thereby affecting the greatest degree of success possible.
Department of Criminal Justice  
Criminal Justice Program

As a result of Assessment we have made the following curriculum and pedagogy changes:
* CRJ289: Law & Justice has been broken into two smaller sections in order to facilitate student understanding and performance on 4 and 5;
* Professor Monica Miller has made special writing sequences available for all students in order to enhance SLO 5;
* Two of the old SLOs have been deemed duplicative and a new assessment plan for 2009 is being prepared.

As a result of 2006 assessment activities the Community Orientated Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS) major track and the CRJ minor were dropped. It was recognized that the department had inadequate resources to maintain those programs. For the remaining semester of 2007 the department plans to hone its Senior Survey for December 2007 graduates. Particular attention will be paid to more specific assessment of ILO 4, Ethics and Humanistic Growth. We have spent a lot of time on this. The assessment we created last year using exit surveys in senior seminars. We have already made some changes as a result of this data.

Department of English  
English Program

We knew there was a problem with English 297, so we had developed a new course, 298, which we began teaching this fall. Also working with Admissions and Records, we placed registration "blocks" on the foundation courses, e.g., 298 must be taken before 303, and 303 before the 400-level courses. This will ensure that our students are properly prepared for their upper division coursework and that they enter these classes with approximately the same critical skills and foundation material. To better meet the needs of our students, this year we redesigned the language and linguistics major option so it more accurately reflects contemporary work in the field, and we created three new minor options--language and linguistics, teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), and literature and environment. These new majors/minors will be in the curriculum fall 2005. Currently the Undergraduate Committee is looking closely at the goals and outcomes of English 303, and the Literature Committee is re-evaluating the required courses for the literature option in an attempt to strengthen the program. They hope to present their recommendations.

Based on previous evaluations, we had noted some disappointing outcomes regarding the foundation courses (specifically 297 and sometimes 282), so the Undergraduate Committee designed a new course 298 to replace 297. This course is designed specifically for our English majors and minors and serves as an introduction to the field. We have been teaching it for a year, and anecdotal evidence from both instructors and students indicates that it is meeting our goals and preparing our students much better for the 400-level. We defined more clearly and with greater rigor, the goals for the foundation courses. We also created a new foundation course, English 298, to replace the former requirement, 297. This course will better introduce students to literary study and the discipline of English. Finally, we developed a questionnaire to assess our foundation courses and an exit interview, given at the end of the student's program, to assess the entire program. Some specialties have designed entrance/exit tests for early-level course, too soon for results. Online guidelines and SLOs. The department has set goals for core courses in the major. Some first steps in assessing whether those goals have been taken. As a result of assessment, course goals for the core
courses have been more standardized and made more explicit than they used to be. Among faculty there is little understanding and considerable suspicion of outcomes based assessment. My perception is that progress is slow but continuing. In one sense, we get what we pay for. It's possible, however, to learn from past efforts. We have been working on assessment instruments for individual courses and the program overall, including more regular discussion and communication of results and plans for future improvements. Little planned and implemented that will achieve benefits beyond appeasing the process. SLOs have been articulated and a portfolio assessment has been piloted. Plans are being developed for the next steps - design assessments for courses beyond the foundation.

**Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures**  
**Foreign Languages & Literatures: French Program**

This fall (2006) we are offering our French Conversation course for three credits for the first time. By increasing the credit limit in this course by one we hope to give students more exposure to the spoken language and more time to express themselves orally. This is especially important for those students who are not able to go on a study abroad program. French 309 (conversation) was changed from two credits to three credits because we determined, through assessment, that students needed more practice speaking.

A new textbook has been selected for the first three semesters of French which is better suited to prepare students for the four skills in language learning: reading, writing, speaking and listening. It also emphasizes the fifth skill - culture.

We have already added a Business French and a French Translation course to our curriculum in order to give students a wider variety when choosing courses for their major. The Business French course requires a great deal of writing each week but it is based in cultural, economic and political facts. It may be fruitful, therefore, to include an SLO for other "types" of writing.

**Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures**  
**Foreign Languages & Literatures: German Program**

Given the small size of our program, it is difficult to accumulate enough relevant data. We had several revisions to make it more useful. Although we will pay more attention to whether or not students who have fulfilled requirements for the major abroad do or do not perform as well on assessment in the future as students who have done all the coursework at UNR. Indicated what was working in the third and fourth year, we will not be making significant changes at this time.

**Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures**  
**Foreign Languages & Literatures: Spanish Program**

We have made changes to the 305-306 course sequence, but assessment doesn't really seem to affect this type of decision within the section. The program has become more efficient in collecting writing samples to be used in the assessment (writing samples from a 400-level course have already been collected for next year). The Spanish section agreed to implement two new texts (a grammar textbook and a reader containing literary sections) for the SPAN 305/306 Spanish Composition courses.
This new emphasis on grammar and literary interpretation in SPAN 305/306 should improve Student Learning Outcomes in the areas identified as weaknesses. The Spanish undergraduate advisors will continue to encourage Spanish majors and minors to study abroad with USAC to improve their Spanish skills.

In 2007 the Spanish section agreed to implement two new texts for the SPAN 305/306 Spanish Composition sequence (starting spring 2008). In 2005 the Spanish section revised the major requirements by eliminating a 200-level culture course (3 credits, taught in English) as well as a conversation course (2 credits), and reducing the number of 300 or above electives credits (from 13 to 6); the proposed change incorporates, in their place, a second composition course (3 credits), a 300-level culture course (3 credits, taught in Spanish), and two 400-level literature courses (6 credits). New courses created include SPAN 309 (Conversation) as a 3 credit elective (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), SPAN 322 Culture of Latin America, SPAN 323 US/Latino Culture, SPAN 357 Masterworks of US/Latino Literature. In 2004 the Spanish section approved changing the majors so that now students are required to take 6 credits at the 400-level in literature. The culture course requirement for majors/minors was changed to SPAN 321 (previously it was SPAN 221 or 222). The section expanded course offerings by creating three new courses.

In an effort to improve the overall results, the Spanish faculty had evaluated the existing program and had established new requirements for the major. While the total number of credits remains the same (30 credits), all required credits will be at the 300-level or above, with all courses conducted in Spanish. The change consists of eliminating a 200-level culture course (3 credits, taught in English) as well as a conversation course (2 credits), and reducing the number of 300 or above electives credits (from 13 to 6); the proposed change incorporates, in their place, a second composition course (3 credits), a 300-level culture course (3 credits), and two 400-level literature courses (6 credits). New courses and changes to existing courses are as follows:

- Span 309 (Conversation) is eliminated as a required course. It changes to an elective for the major, to Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory, and increased to 3 credits.
- Span 322 (Culture of Latin America). New 3 credit course, taught in Spanish.
- Span 323 (US/Latino Culture). New 3 credit course, taught in Spanish.
- Span 357 (Masterworks in US/Latino Literature). New 3 credit course, taught in Spanish.

The primary benefit of this change will be to raise the level of competency and improve the literary, linguistic, cultural, and intellectual qualifications of our graduating seniors. Secondary benefits include reducing enrollment pressures on 200-level culture courses and on 300-level elective courses, while increasing enrollments in 400-level literature courses. Lastly, the new requirements will make better use of the talents of our graduate faculty in Spanish and, therefore, will increase synergism between teaching and research. These curriculum modifications will lead to a better overall education in Spanish language.

The Spanish section approved changes to the major and minor is Spanish. All majors will now be required to take 6 credits at the 400-level in literature. The culture course requirement for majors/minors has been changed to SPAN 321 (previously it was SPAN 221 or 222). The section is expanding its offerings by creating three new courses: a 200-level US Latino culture course, a 300-level US Latino literature survey course, and a 300-level culture course.
Department of General Studies  
**General Studies Program**

To improve advising we will place advising holds on transfer students declaring general studies as their major.

Department of History  
**History Program**

The modifications we have made and are making are described in the body of the report above and in the 2006 report. We anticipate no significant modifications in 2008. Building on the SLO-based curriculum goals adopted by the department in 2001, it has adopted two required courses leading to an undergraduate thesis required of all history majors. The department decided in 2005-06 to use the two courses to determine how well our majors are achieving this SLO identified by "the pre-selected skills set." The two courses are History 300, research and writing and History 499.

Department of Interior Design  
**Interior Design Program**

Exercises will continue to be developed for application throughout the curriculum to address specific areas identified for further improvement. Students have responded positively to entering design competitions and this will continue to be encouraged as a measure of program effectiveness compared to other schools and as an objective, professional evaluation of student performance. Teamwork assignments will continue to be implemented, but with equal emphasis on individual work. The new class developed for the preparation of senior portfolios resulted in an overall improvement in the quality of portfolios. Further refinements are planned for next year. A new class on senior portfolio development has proven to be very successful.

The quality of portfolios has improved significantly over the last two years. The course continues to be refined. An increase in prerequisites for upper division courses has both clarified and raised performance expectations with progression through the curriculum. Current faculty have received additional training to use technology to a greater degree in course delivery. Faculty need more opportunities to interact, share course content and philosophy, and become familiar with the checklist of accreditation/Nevada registration standards so they can better articulate the overall curriculum intent to students.

Department of Music & Dance  
**Music Program**

New components have been added to the department of music's piano proficiency exams, based on the assessment of previous years' exams. These changes are a direct result of reviewing and discussing needed changes, based on students' performance within the exams. The music faculty is implementing "barrier" exams for all music majors and is also looking at ways to better improve evaluation of each student (i.e., particular instruments, Bachelor of Arts in music as compared to bachelor of music in performance as well as bachelor of music education).
A continuation examination (MUS 300) has been added to the degree requirements to assure competency of all transfer and continuing students in basic musicianship and sight-singing skills taught in 211,212,311.

New components have been added to the department of music's piano proficiency exams, based on the assessment of previous years' exams. These changes are a direct result of reviewing and discussing needed changes, based on students' performance within the exams.

A "continuation exam" has been added to the degree requirements to assure competency of all transfer and continuing students in basic musicianship skills taught in our 211,212,311 and 312 classes.

All barrier exams for the bachelor's degree plans are in place, including junior and senior recitals, the newly approved continuation exams and piano proficiency.

**Department of Music & Dance**

**Music Education Program**

Pre-recital auditions are now required of all Bachelor of Music Education majors and will be heard by the recital committee members at least two weeks prior to the scheduled recital date.

Implementation of new courses is currently happening within the music education degree plan for those students recently entering the course of study (2005-2006 & 2006-2007). Further revisions to the course of study will occur in the 2007-2008 academic year.

Implementation of new courses is currently happening within the music education degree plan for those students recently entering the course of study (2005-2006 & 2006-2007). Further revisions to the course of study will occur in the 2007-2008 academic year.

Continuation exams, newly revised piano proficiency exams and senior recitals are all used to assess the program. Student teaching observations also directly assess student performance.

**Department of Philosophy**

**Philosophy Program**

We have:

- Added PHIL 409/609, Recent French Philosophy (to close gap in our teaching of 20th c. philosophy) (began fall 2006).

- Added PHIL 438/638, Problems in the History and Philosophy of Science, to the Group B requirements for the major (thus expanding offerings in philosophy of science). Added a section of PHIL 101, Introduction to Philosophy, focusing on Asian Philosophy (scheduled to be taught for the first time in spring 2009).

- Devised and began requiring both PHIL 315, 20th Century Anglo-American Philosophy, and PHIL 314, 20th Century Continental European Philosophy, of our majors.

Additionally, the department agreed to add some current emphasis on history and philosophy of science, especially by one member playing a central role in the development of a science studies program.
consortium on campus, thus bringing philosophy and various programs in the College of Science closer together, creating synergy in teaching and research as well as higher class enrollments across the colleges.

**Department of Political Science**

**Political Science Program**

The most recent edition to the PSC undergraduate program has been the addition of a renewable energy course (PSC 110) which is cross-listed with ENGR 110. We anticipate playing a leading role in the approval of a new interdisciplinary minor in renewable minor.

**Department of Psychology**

**Psychology Program**

Last year we planned to improve the assessment of SLO1 by the use of pre- and post-test questions in both the self-paced and lecture based general psychology courses; to use supervisor assessment in direct learning experiences for tracking the accomplishment of SLO2; to assess writing and oral communication in additional classes for SLO3; to examine the preparedness for graduate school to assess SLO4; and to assess students' knowledge of diversity in capstone and gender diversity courses for SLO5. Good progress was made in all of these areas, but we will continue to refine these assessment areas next year.

Last year we planned to improve the assessment of SLO1 by the use of pre- and post-test questions in both the self-paced and lecture based general psychology courses; to use supervisor assessment in direct learning experiences for tracking the accomplishment of SLO2; to assess writing and oral communication in additional classes for SLO3; to examine the preparedness for graduate school to assess SLO4; and to assess students' knowledge of diversity in capstone and gender diversity courses for SLO5. We have done so this year by collecting ratings of students by faculty as well as student's own ratings. Good progress was made in all of these areas, but we will continue to refine these assessment areas next year. We also planned last year to develop a survey to be administered by the advisor as students declare psychology as a major, enter, and exit the program with an ultimate goal to automate these surveys. Progress has been made in this area, and we were able to report those findings in this report. As noted in last year's report, we planned additional assessment of advising with routine student evaluations of advising appointments, and that data has been made available here also. As planned, we also and used our undergraduate research day to Those assessment findings have been used to revamp our Assessment Plan, including our Mission Statement, Student Learning Outcomes, Student Learning Expectations. One key modification will concern our ability to separately track Psychology students who are pursuing a degree in psychology as the basis for a solid liberal arts education and are poised for success in life beyond UNR, as well as undergraduates, who in addition to gaining a solid liberal arts foundation, are also interested in pursuing an advanced degree.

A significant improvement in the assessment of SLO1 will be the use of the same pre- and post-test questions in both the self-paced and lecture based general psychology courses. The supervisor assessment sheets for tracking of the understanding of psychology to everyday human affairs as part of SLO2 will be formalized and used in the majority of direct learning experiences. Tracking the
supervisor sheets over time, as students complete multiple direct learning experiences may be helpful in understanding the best design and timing of direct learning experiences. SLO 3 will be enhanced by collecting iterative writing samples in additional classes. We will also focus on preparedness for graduate school and eventual careers in psychology, SLO4. SLO5, assessing psychology students' knowledge of diversity, will be a focus of the next assessment plan. The notion will be to carefully assess the students in capstone and gender diversity courses already taught in the department. This will be accomplished by concentrating on developing an entrance survey to be administered by the advisor as students declare psychology as a major. This survey will focus on assessing their expectations as they enter the program. Subsequently, an exit survey will be developed using these input data in order to assess students' views as to whether or not their entering

We have continued to improve objective assessment of learning measures and are interested in factual data that can be applied to the curriculum. Faculty continue to try to meet assessment needs. In spite of good progress, only a few faculty are actively involved in assessment.

Department of Sociology
Sociology Program

As a result of the findings we updated the SLOs to be in line with the reality "on the ground". The present results are based on the perspective of the learner, i.e., the student. Whereas this perspective is important to evaluate the success of an academic program, it is not the only one. In the future we intend to include additional data concerning the nature and quality of the academic training provided by the department.

We devised and refined SLO’s are engaged in an ongoing discussion regarding data needed for assessment methods re: SLOs. We conducted a survey in fall 2006 and are in the process of implementing results of the survey.

Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
Speech Communication Program

1. Train new TA's in the revised course plan for COM 113. Last year's assessment led to restructuring the basic course. We reduced emphasis on public speaking and increased activities in interpersonal/small group settings. In other words, we discovered that this basic course is not instrumental in achieving several of our SLO's, and we are letting dedicated 200-300 level public speaking courses achieve them instead. Informal observation of TA instruction and new COM 113 syllabuses showed that transition by experienced TA's to the revised learning objectives was do-able, but difficult. The methodology of "interpersonal communication" content and activities is much more challenging than public speaking activities. Accordingly, we will ask new TA's to sit in on a summer course in COM 113 and get mentoring from an experienced instructor. The new TA's can then prepare their course outlines and set up learning activities before the fall semester begins.

2. Add a new course in listening and interpersonal skills. The need in last year's assessment report to "create a new course . . . for skills practice in interpersonal communication events" was further confirmed in 2005 data. Our students demonstrate cognitive but not behavioral competence in interpersonal communication strategies. We have now created and gotten approval for a new course
COM 311: Listening and Interpersonal Skills. It will be offered in spring, summer and Fall 06. While not required, we believe it will be taken by virtually all COM majors and most minors. In 2006, we will attempt to assess whether our students improve in interpersonal competence.

3. Revive an inactive course, COM 212 Communication Research. Once a requirement for COM majors, this course was deactivated due to insufficient faculty numbers and increasing demand for other courses. But two consecutive assessment years have shown that our students are not achieving in the "theory and research" area of the communication discipline. When we recovered a faculty position last year, we hired someone who specialized in communication research methods. In response to our disturbing student performance noted in SLO #7, the new faculty member re-instituted COM 212, created new course activities appropriate to lower-division majors and taught the class in Fall 05. We now are returning that course to "required" status for COM majors.

4. Require COM 400 Communication Theory for all majors. Last year's report noted the same poor performance in "theory competence" that we observed in 2005. We decided that the inactive COM 400 course be offered again; in fall 2005, it was. We could not require it unless we could be assured of available faculty to teach it. New LOA instructors for this challenging upper-division course are being sought to offer more sections than are possible with existing full-time faculty. We are prepared to submit COM 400 for C&C approval as a new requirement for our majors.

Curriculum Revision: We will make major changes based on the principle that upper-division courses should be taught by tenure-track faculty. Several 300-level performance-based courses will be moved to the 200 level and will be taught by non-tenure track or LOA instructors.

COM 113, previously not required for our majors nor a part of our assessment process, will become the new first course for COM majors. It will be taught in a new format--mass lecture by a full-time faculty member with TA-staffed discussion (laboratory) sections. Our previous "first course", COM 216, which became a convenient service course for other departments, will be eliminated. Other lower division requirements-- COM 213-217 and COM 212--will be retained.

We will initiate "sequencing". For the first time, students must complete the 100-200 level courses before beginning upper-division work. This sequencing will include new pre-requisites for most 200-400 level courses. Those pre-requisites may include "Majors Only" for some courses.

We revised SLOs in 2006 to focus on the key outcomes we think are essential. We have eliminated assessment of Com 113 - not really a part of or BA degree. Assessment results have led to curriculum revisions (Com 311, 313, 212 and 395) to elicit more student performance and practice in behavioral and cognitive competence.

Department of Speech Communication & Theatre
Theatre Program

A curriculum committee has been formed within the department to address a revamp of the theatre curriculum. The committee has been charged to restructure the curriculum in ways that still provide some freedom, but which will also provide a more focused and shaped set of experiences within the curriculum by reducing the number of electives and increasing the number of required courses. They will also investigate the potential for classes taken outside the department. Movement could be supplemented by courses offered in dance or physical education. Vocal production could be supplemented by courses taught in Music. Human figure and life drawing classes could be used to
supplement visual intelligence. We anticipate the work of this committee and the curricular revisions that follow it will span the next year.

We have taken greater control over the decisions that get made about student designers in main stage and student productions. Students are no longer allowed to design major production elements without successfully completing courses in that discipline. These decisions have already resulted in higher enrollment in design courses. Students are increasingly encouraged to select an area of emphasis (either performance or design) thereby providing in-depth experiences commensurate with national standards in theatre programs. We believe these changes will soon lead to more intensive immersion in both performance and design tech.; Students will receive both a general education in the various disciplines of theatre (performance, costumes, and scenery.

SLO #1. In our recent search for a new technical director, we maintained an awareness of the ways we could improve student experiences in design and technical fields. Our recently retired TD was a) in a classified position and b) developed his knowledge in-house and was limited in his knowledge of recent developments in the design/technology fields. We were able to have this vital position reclassified as academic faculty and have now hired a person with an MFA in technical direction and experience in a wider range of technologies and skill sets that he can train students in through coursework and hands-on experience. This also will allow our faculty designers and directors to explore avenues for production designs (even play scripts selected) that would not have been feasible in the past. This will give our technical students a much broader experience in these areas.

SLO #2. We have modified our curriculum to divide our Lab: Acting course into intermediate and advance levels to provide students with more variety of skill training and more opportunity to study a wider range of theories and styles of acting. This change will also group students of similar experience levels together rather than combining the students just out of beginning acting courses with the very advanced students. As our faculty changes due to retirement, etc. we are focusing on bringing in new faculty who will offer different yet complementary approaches to actor training.

SLO #3. We have clarified the lines of authority for any changes to production assignments. We are working to insure that this information is communicated to all stage managers and their assistants. In addition, our newly hired technical director is versed in and will take more responsibility for training students in stage management practices common to the university, college, and professional theatre industry.

Department of Women's Studies
Women's Studies Program

Because the major has changed and students no longer have to complete the thesis, our assessment needs to be changed somewhat. Specific questions about feminist theory and about race/class and gender will be included in the exit interview with graduating students. The program was modified based not so much on assessment findings, but on the realization that, given career plans, some of our students would benefit more from an increased number of classes instead of completing a thesis.
Those students who plan to continue on in law school or professional school will still be strongly encouraged to pursue the thesis. Student assessment will occur more frequently throughout the semester. Our experience in summer school reveals the value of frequent opportunities to write and present information. These findings led to a reorganization of the WMST Plan. We collect exit interviews and senior essays and will further implement the plan when the director returns.

College of Science
Department of Biology
Biology Program

1. BIOL434, Mammalogy has changed pre-requisites to BIOL192, which will allow students who have completed General Biology sequence (BIOL190+191+192) to enroll in this upper-division class. Previously, the students had to have completed BIOL314 or 316 to be able to enroll in Mammalogy.

2. BIOL 394 - Laboratory in Ecology and Population Biology - change in pre-requisites to include statistics and make BIOL 314 (Ecology) a pre- OR co-requisite rather than a pre-requisite; BIOL 192A - Principles of Biological Investigation - AP - adding this specific section was needed so that the high school students can enroll without having to get special exceptions for the pre-requisites that are being enforced for our regular BIOL 192 course.

3. To increase student contact time and to give them opportunity to study biology in small groups, optional study sessions have been introduced this year for the first time in lower-division Biology core classes (both sections of BIOL190 in fall 2008). These optional sections are being facilitated by undergraduate students who have previously successfully completed the course. We plan to continue offering this experience to students taking BIOL190 and hope to expand this practice to other lower-division courses.

4. A lot of our students try to follow a rather narrow path when taking upper division courses. Most of them, who are geared toward a career in the medical field, tend to take courses in cell and molecular Biology only. To offer our students a greater variety of upper division elective courses in Biology, broaden their perspective on Biology in general, as well as to meet the needs of those interested in ecology and evolution field, we have added two new courses to our curriculum; BIOL 321 (Marine Biology), and BIOL 488 (behavioral Ecology). Both will be taught in 2009 for the first time.

5. The following pre-requisites/course sections have been added/modified this year based on recommendations of the instructors of the courses and on the student feedback.

6. For the purposes of summative evaluation of our students’ content knowledge as they complete the program, a new 0-credit Senior Seminar course has been approved by the University Curriculum Committee Technical Skills: This analysis has provided faculty members with an idea of the competencies of general biology students in various quantitative and mechanical skills. This information provided instructors of upper-division courses with knowledge they would not otherwise have had and allowed them to know in what areas students required additional attention. Changes in the general biology course have also been implemented in order to strengthen student skill sets in areas that have shown weakness.

7. A series of surveys will be conducted in BIOL 190 and BIOL 191, the first Biology courses our
majors take, starting with the fall 2007 semester, to assess their attitudes towards the program, the curriculum, and to obtain information on their future career goals. Faculty were advised to clarify/specify written assignments using primary library sources.

**Department of Chemistry**  
**Chemistry Program**

Assessment is an evolving process and continues to remain on a 4 cycle track of annual evaluations, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications that have been made, based upon assessment of our curriculum include:

1. Two new minors were created and approved;
2. A new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II);
3. A new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and encourages early participation in research.

Implementation plan responsibilities were modified to reflect revised departmental committee structure for 2003-2004. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is now responsible for assessment, with assistance from the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies committees.

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications were made, however, based upon assessment of our curriculum: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered in 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new advisement protocols have been instituted.

Several key findings became apparent by the end of the first 4 years of assessment following at the Chemistry Department Assessment Plan: (1) graduates or near-graduates are doing very well; (2) achievement at all levels is appropriate for cycle four of our annual evaluation process; (3) with an expected enlarged data pool over the next few years statistically more meaningful data can be expected to be obtained following completion of the second 4-year cycle of evaluations. In 2008 we complete the planned first 4-year cycle of evaluations. A comprehensive review of the four 4-cycles of assessment comprises our 2008 report, and serves as the first "base line" data set as we proceed into a 2nd 4-year cycle of assessment. In 2009, alterations in the plan may be expected, especially in view of the curriculum changes mandated by the American Chemical Society for certification. Please see the Comments section below.

Assessment is an evolving process and continues to remain on a 4 cycle track of annual evaluations, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications that have been made, based upon assessment of our curriculum include: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new student advisement protocols have been put into place, correlated with DARS. With the curriculum revisions proposed by the American Chemical Society (see below), more changes can be expected in the next few years.
Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Environmental Program

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications were made, however, based upon assessment of our curriculum:

1. Two new minors were created and approved;
2. A new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II);
3. A new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved.

Implementation plan responsibilities were modified to reflect revised departmental committee structure for 2003-2004. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is now responsible for assessment, with assistance from the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies committees. Assessment is an evolving process and continues to remain on a 4 year cycle to track annual evaluations, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Very briefly, chemistry program modifications that have been made, based upon assessment of our curriculum include: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new student advisement protocols have been put into place, correlated with DARS. With the curriculum revisions mandated in 2009 by the American Chemical Society for degree certification, more changes can be expected in the next few years. Please see the Comments.

Assessment remains on track, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications were made, however, based upon assessment of our curriculum: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research. All this is described below, under Comments.

Department of Chemistry
Chemistry: Professional Program

Implementation plan responsibilities were modified to reflect revised departmental committee structure for 2003-2004. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is now responsible for assessment, with assistance from the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies committees.

Assessment is an evolving process and continues to remain on a 4 cycle track of annual evaluations, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Chemistry Program modifications that have been made, based upon assessment of our curriculum include: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new student advisement protocols have been put into place, correlated with DARS. With the curriculum revisions proposed by the American Chemical Society, more changes can be expected in the next few years. Please see the Comments.
Assessment is an evolving process and continues to remain on a 4 year cycle to track annual evaluations, with as yet few modifications of the basic plan. Very briefly, chemistry program modifications that have been made, based upon assessment of our curriculum include: 1) two new minors were created and approved; 2) a new organic chemistry course was created and has been offered since 2004-2005 (Chemistry 241-2, Organic I and II); 3) a new freshman/sophomore course (Chemistry 292) was approved and should encourage early participation in research; 4) new student advisement protocols have been put into place, correlated with DARS. With the curriculum revisions mandated in 2009 by the American Chemical Society for degree certification, more changes can be expected in the next few years. Please see the Comments.

Department of Geological Sciences

Geological Engineering Program

The geological engineering B.S. degree program has been modified in 2008 as follows:

1. Chemistry: requirement changed from CHEM 201 and 202 only, to CHEM 201 and 202, or CHEM 121 and 122. Reason for change: instructional quality in CHEM 201 and 202 deteriorated.
2. GEOL 451: summer field geology. The GE programs at the University of Missouri-Rolla and the University of Wisconsin-Madison removed summer field geology as a requirement; taking this as a sign that our ABET accreditation would not be jeopardized by a similar curriculum change, we have removed summer field geology as a required course.
3. Communications: changed from ENGR 301 to either COM 113 or ENGR 301; a prerequisite change in ENGR 301 prompted this change to increase flexibility for students.
4. Core social science: changed from ECON 102 or 103 to allowing students to choose from any course accepted by UNR for satisfying this requirement. This change was made to enhance students' satisfaction with their degree program and to enhance flexibility for class registration.
5. Geology: changed from GEOL 202 to GEOL 202 OR GEOL 203, due to GEOL 202 requiring too much outside classroom work.
6. Engineering fluid mechanics: changed from MECH 367 or MINE 350 to MECH 367, MINE 350, or GEOL 414; reason for change: MECH 367 is too theoretical; MINE 350 is not offered regularly and instructional quality has deteriorated.

GE 480/680, Engineering Geology, is being changed to GE280, Urban Geology, to better reflect the level at which it is taught, moreover how students are presently allowed to enroll in this course. This change is also sought to improve our ABET accreditation review regarding how students are advised on course sequencing.
Several undergraduate students in geological engineering received failing grades in CEE 442, soil mechanics, last spring, 2006 semester. That course established a different grading scheme for those students (CE majors) taking the class for 4 credits to include a weekly lab, versus those students (GE majors) taking the class for 3 credits without the lab. The faculty in geological engineering, because of the fall, 2006 ABET re-accreditation review, had already decided to require the CEE 442 course for 4 credits instead of 3. Given the Modifications in advisement have been implemented. Because instructional quality in Chem 201 and Chem 202 has adversely affected student performance the past several years, Chem 121 and Chem 122 are now accepted as alternatives. As noted in the discussion of SLO, MINE 448 is now an acceptable alternative to CEE 442. Also noted in the SLO is the issue of communication; COM 113 is now accepted in lieu of ENGR 301. All of these advisement changes have been implemented to improve student success through the GE undergraduate program.

Department of Mathematics & Statistics
Mathematics & Statistics Program

In response to our assessment findings, we have put in place a "bridge course" to pave the way into Math 310. This course is a modification of Math 373 and we are making it a suggested pre-requisite for Math 310. We hope that higher expectations in Math 310 will translate into better performance in 311, thus helping achieve the desired learning objective of being able to write clear and coherent proofs. We intend to monitor student performance during calendar 2009 to ascertain whether this is the case.

Besides the addition of the bridge course for the upper level curriculum for our majors, we have made several assessment driven changes to the foundational courses taken by our majors as well as science and engineering students. As fiscal pressures have required us to teach calculus courses (Math 181 and Math 182) in large lectures, we have performed an extensive assessment of the effectiveness of the large lecture/recitation format. Based on this assessment data, we have altered the class format to a 4+0 format to a 3+2 (3 lectures, 2 hours of recitation, for 4 credits) format and changed our use of graduate teaching assistants to ensure the teaching is as effective as the smaller class format. We have also changed our placement exam structure for incoming students, based on university wide changes (computerized enforcement of prerequisites), curriculum realignment between different courses in our 100 level offerings, and the need to conduct ongoing assessment of the correlation between our placement cutoffs, our course learning outcomes, and the cutoffs of other NSHE institutions. More information about these changes is available.

Current program modifications include:

Implement a "bridge course". (Students moving from lower division to upper division mathematics courses often have difficulty because they have never been exposed to formal logic and proofs.) Plans are now being made to do this.

Include the capstone course Math 420 or a similar course in all degrees and options. (Under consideration by the departmental Curriculum Committee.)

Study possible changes to the curriculum that will promote "computer literacy". These have been recommended and partially implemented in MATH 283, 285 and 330.

Coordinate lower division courses.
Introduce a two-semester alternative MATH 126-127 to the five credit MATH 128.

Require a pre-requisite course grade to be a C- or better.

**Department of Physics**  
**Physics Program**

This year's planned program modifications build on those implemented following previous years' assessments. The program has been improved in recent years by offering more honors sections, improving undergraduate laboratory courses, and increasing recruitment, to have a critical mass of students in the program. The progress in the undergraduate laboratories has included new experiments, a new computer network, updated lab manuals, rubrics for more rigorous grading, and better synchronization of labs with lectures.

The senior thesis is playing a very important and valuable role in the program, with most students spending longer than the nominal single semester working on an in-depth research experience. We are considering adding an additional optional semester to the senior thesis, as the Chemistry and Biology programs have.

The physics B.Sc. Program has identified a need to improve the undergraduate laboratory courses to improve students' basic understanding of fundamental physical laws and skills in reporting results. The introductory laboratory courses are being improved by developing new experiments, implementing a new computer network, updating lab manuals, and improving the synchronization of labs with lectures.

**Division of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Health Ecology**  
**Health Ecology Program**

In the spring of 2004, based on our assessment results up to that time, we conducted a major over haul of our undergraduate curriculum. We refined and focused our requirements to respond to those results, decreasing the number of required credits from 78 to 54. As a consequence, we have increased: the ability of our majors to complete their degrees in a more timely fashion, the number of elective credits they have to explore other areas of interest to them, and the opportunity to realistically consider a minor to enhance their college careers. We implemented our new curriculum in the fall of 2005, and plan to evaluate its success next year. Further refinements of the curriculum may follow that evaluation. In the spring of 2004, based on our assessment results up to that time, we conducted a major overhaul of our undergraduate curriculum. We refined and focused our requirements to respond to those results, decreasing the number of required credits from 78 to 54. As a consequence, we have increased: the ability of our majors to complete their degrees in a more timely fashion, the number of elective credits they have to explore other areas of interest to them, and the opportunity to realistically consider a minor to enhance their college careers. We implemented our new curriculum in the fall of 2005, and plan to evaluate its success next year. Further refinements of the curriculum may follow that evaluation.
**Department of Nursing**  
**Nursing Program**

We will be implementing a curriculum support program that will assist students to learn critical thinking, test taking skills and gain theory knowledge. This program will start with the fall 2003. We began developing a more comprehensive assessment plan in summer 2008.

**Department of Social Work**  
**Social Work Program**

1. In response to student feedback, we have doubled the amount of theory instruction by adding a course to the human growth and development sequence.
2. We have also added a methods course to insure adequate coverage of instruction about intervention with communities.

1. The rise in student ratings of the program has supported the changes that have been implemented in the program. However, the improvement in student ratings is based on a small sample size (n-24). Thus, we will continue to systematically follow student ratings to assess the improvement over time.
2. The data used in the program report has been administered in seminar classes which are taught by a variety of instructors. Additionally the survey has been administered at the very end of the semester when students are completing several assessment instruments. As a result, we have questions about the validity of the data. Thus, we are developing a plan of administration in which the survey will be administered uniformly by a representative from the program evaluation committee before the semester ends.
3. The results reported are taken solely from self-report data from the students. We will develop avenues of obtaining evaluative feedback about the program from other constituencies as well.

Due to accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education, the School of Social Work has a five year evaluation plan which, in the second year, is up to date and current. The School, due to faculty involvement in the evaluation process, has decided for this academic year to review the social work practice sequence. Additionally, the evaluation committee has instituted evaluation efforts on internship field evaluation along with student self-efficacy outcome results. This has not occurred previously in other School's of Social Work. Additionally, the program evaluation team has developed and recently sent out a survey to practicing social workers to give feedback to the School on practice related issues.
School of Medicine  
Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology  
Speech Pathology Program

Students enroll in these pre-professional classes who are not well prepared for a demanding academic experience. The program has therefore, sought and received approval to require a GPA of 2.75 or greater for entry into the program and for continued enrollment. Based on assessment findings, the minimum GPA to matriculate and remain in the program has been increased to 2.75. Elements of the UNR assessment protocol have been integrated into our assessment for national accreditation.
Masters and Specialist Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

Biochemistry Program

The following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years. New course offerings now include: BCH 706 - Functional Genomics, BCH 719 - Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry, BCH 707 - Protein Structure & Function, BCH 794 - Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, and Plant Biochemistry). Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Second, a new graduate director has been appointed to improve communication with the graduate students regarding program requirements, guidelines for the formation of graduate student committees and comprehensive examination, and liaison with the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars. Third, the following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. The graduate director developed a Biochemistry Graduate Student Handbook that is now given to every new student and all previously enrolled students in the program. The Handbook contains the following useful information to ensure that the Graduate Students are properly informed about all aspects of the graduate program:

1) Oral and Written Comprehensive Exams
2) Curriculum for Masters and Doctoral Programs
3) Frequently asked questions
4) Timeline
5) Important Dates
6) ePAWS Functions and Features
7) Graduate Progression Forms
8) Graduate Students with Assistantships Handbook
9) Tuition and Insurance Costs 2007-2008
10) Drug Free Workplace Memo
11) Research Best Practices
12) Graduate Student Survival Handbook
13) Graduation Procedures
16) Masters Thesis Forms

The following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years. New course offerings now include: BCH 706 - Functional Genomics, BCH 719 - Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry, BCH 707 - Protein Structure & Function, BCH 794 - Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, and Plant Biochemistry). Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Second, a new graduate director has been appointed to improve communication with the graduate students regarding program requirements, guidelines for the formation of graduate student committees and comprehensive examination, and liaison with the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars. Third, the following changes are
being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years. New course offerings now include:

- BCH 706 - Functional Genomics (currently an elective course)
- BCH 719 - Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry (currently an elective course)
- BCH 707 - Protein Structure & Function (currently a REQUIRED course)
- BCH 794 - Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, Plant Biochemistry).

The Biochemistry Graduate Student Handbook that is now given to every new student and all previously enrolled students in the program is revised annually.

**Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology**

*Biotechnology (Dual Degree) Program*

SLO1: We will do a better job tracking student research performances prior to graduation through the use of questionnaires and written comments from research mentors.

**Department of Nutrition**

*Nutrition Program*

Assessment plan revised; there are now only 3 outcomes per the Plan. The Director of the Graduate Program and the Nutrition Department have gone to unusual lengths to promote the program and recruit students using standard means such as web links like graduateschool.com, etc. The department has sent flyers to a large number of other schools and students listed on web sources and in selected departments, especially in the Western U.S. This has increased enrollment to four students and we expect to have one to three new students next fall.

**Department of Resource Economics**

*Resource & Applied Economics Program*

As mentioned under the first SLO, the APEC 710 and APEC 720 microeconomic sequence has been substantially changed: new instructors have been assigned to both courses and these instructors are working closely together to coordinate the topics covered. The research methodology course, APEC 740, has been revised to require a student project. This project must use a statistical or econometric technique and the estimation results must be evaluated and interpreted.

The graduate committee is developing a set of guidelines that will pertain to the expectations regarding theses and professional papers so as to underscore the degree of analytical and problem solving skills requisite to a successful research project. MS program modifications address the main key finding of this assessment: that a set of MS courses be made accessible to MS students who are not prepared to the same coursework as the PhD students who are preparing for their qualifying exams. The new requirements for the MS core coursework include the PhD sequence, but also allow alternative options. Because the department is limited in the number of graduate courses that it can offer, we have collaborated with the Economics Department in the School of Business to rationalize
our graduate course offerings across the two departments. The Economics Department offers MS
courses that we now include in our MS program options. 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. While the format for APST 714 and APST 715 remained essentially unchanged in 2003/04,
APST 750 ("Quantitative Methods") underwent major revisions this past year. For the first time, this
class was taught as a mathematical programming course with emphasis on non-stochastic tools (such
as linear programming) with equal weight on methodology and applications.

The overall learning results flowing from this specific course were mixed. On the positive side, this
course provided students with key tools and skills needed for the type of research conducted by some
faculty in the Department, who, naturally, welcomed the enhanced research capabilities of students
emerging from this course. At the same time, this course made transparent certain shortcomings in the
mathematical and quantitative training of incoming graduate students, much like the theory sequence
had highlighted in 2003/03 with respect to groundwork in economic theory. The Department now has
a better understanding of the type of skills students will need to bring to this particular course, and
admission-related screening and advising will be adopted accordingly.

Program modifications have been implemented to address the economic theory and
analytical/problem-solving areas of concern. In the first case, our core microeconomic theory
sequence has been revamped both in terms of instructors and text. In the second case, there search
methodology course and the seminar course have been oriented to better integrate types of problems
that enhance analytical and problem solving abilities.

As mentioned in last year's assessment report, the structure of the principal courses relevant to this
SLO was revised. The level of rigor of APEC 710 and APEC 720 was enhanced by the adoption of a
new advanced microeconomic theory text. Thus students are exposed to an integrated, modern
treatment of the economic principles underlying producer and consumer behavior and consequently
achieving a better level of understanding. This change also was in response to the alumni survey
results which showed 25% of those surveyed felt that their training did not put enough emphasis on
economic theory.

While the extent of a revision of the micro-theory core courses will largely depend on the outcome of
current efforts to hire new faculty, the Department has already taken steps to increase awareness of
incoming students as to the requirements and challenges to be expected in theory courses.
Specifically, the Department’s Graduate Coordinator has started to send letters to admitted students
with detailed suggestions as to how to prepare for the first semester in the Program. The Department
will enhance efforts to assure students’ development of adequate communication and presentation
skills, primarily through one-on-one advisement during independent studies and thesis work.
As a result of the EBI exit surveys, we have started to offer a series of new courses to broaden the curriculum of MBA program.

They are:
1. A new course in ethics and leadership that will be taught by Professor Beekun as a seminar on Leadership and Ethics every spring semester. The course provides an in-depth coverage of research and practice of leadership and ethics in business. As part of the future curriculum changes of the program, the plan is to require the course to become a required course for the MBA program.
2. As part of the continued effort to offer new courses in finance, a whole new set of graduate-level courses in finance are now available to MBA students: (1) BADM 745, Commercial Bank Management and BADM 746, Corporate Treasury Management were offered in Spring 2007, (2) BADM 742, research methods in finance, and BADM 744, securities analysis and portfolio management, will be offered in Spring 2008, and (3) a new course on value creation and measurement, BADM 794, will be offered in Spring 2008.
3. Given the popularity of the special topics course, BADM 791, on intellectual property, taught by Bob Ryan in the MBA program, and on leadership and organizational change, taught by Dick Bostdorff, we now continue to offer these courses on a regular basis in the fall semester.

Evening advisement is now provided by the MBA Office during the Fall, Summer, and Spring registration. A one-day mandatory orientation is now organized for the new MBA admits. The MBA Office now closely works with the COBA Office of Career Services to provide a better career counseling to MBAs. There are now regular meetings of the Director of the MBA program with the MBA faculty to talk about the assessment. Evening advisement is now provided by the MBA Office during the fall, summer, and Spring registration. A one-day mandatory orientation is now organized for the new MBA admits. The MBA Office now closely works with the COBA Office of Career Services to provide a better career counseling to MBAs. There are now regular meetings of the Director of the MBA program with the MBA faculty to talk about the assessment results as applied to their courses. New elective courses are now being offered.

As a result of the EBI/AACSB exit surveys, we have started to offer a series of new courses to broaden the curriculum of MBA program. They are:

1. A new course in ethics and leadership that will be taught by Professor Beekun as a seminar on Leadership and Ethics every spring semester. The course provides an in-depth coverage of research and practice of leadership and ethics in business.
2. The College of Business Administration has worked with Research Ventures Inc. (RVI) and the UNR/DRI Technology Transfer Office to initiate a fellowship program for MBA students to examine the commercial application of new technologies developed at UNR and DRI as an independent study, BADM 793. The real value of this program is that students will work with advisors from RVI to learn about real-world issues involved with evaluation of new technologies. The RVI Fellowship is offered every semester.
3. As part of a new graduate program, MS in Finance, a whole new set of graduate-level courses in finance are now available to MBA students. Two of these courses will be offered in spring
2007: BADM 745, Commercial Bank Management, and BADM 746, Corporate Treasury Management.

4. Given the popularity of the special topics course, BADM 791, on intellectual property, taught by Bob Ryan in the MBA program, we now have two new courses on intellectual property offered in sequence in the fall semester.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Counseling Program**

As a result of our analysis of scores on the CPCE, faculty are supplementing their homework assignments in career development and multicultural classes aimed at improving knowledge and scores in those key content areas. We have changed our Career Development course so that it is now online, and our hope is that this information will be more easily digested as a result. Currently, the Department is identifying new performance assessments in counseling skills and outcome assessments to be implemented Fall, 2005.

**Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology**

**Educational Psychology: MS Program**

There is no major modification for the program. However, with the rapid development in the field of information technology in education, we have continually updated our existing technology courses. We also developed four new courses that students can take as electives. While the existing courses provide the foundation of the required knowledge and skills in the field, these four new courses will teach student more advanced and current technology applications in the field:

- CEP 425/625 Design of Online Teaching and Learning
- CEP 426/626 Advanced Web Design in Education
- CEP 485/685 Advanced Methods of Technology Integration
- CEP486/686 Design of Digital Visual Applications for Instruction

We have also revised some questions in the comprehensive examination to match the course updates.

We provided the faculty member teaching Career Counseling and Technology course a counseling GA who coordinated periodic face-to-face contacts to augment the counseling dimensions of this online course. We also had the faculty member require student attendance at a web conference on career counseling.

The faculty member teaching the Multicultural Counseling course is putting more emphasis on "cultural competency."

The instructors teaching the Appraisal courses (CEP 642a; CEP 642b) are now placing more emphasis on the history of testing and types of tests counselors can use.
Department of Curriculum Teaching & Learning  
Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Program

The most significant change has been the discontinuation of the formal comprehensive exams as an advanced assessment tool. At this time, all students will complete their advanced assessment in one of three ways: a portfolio demonstrating the advanced set of competencies outlined in the department approved set of six domains outlined with NCATE criteria; an action research project which reflects the six domains; or a thesis. All materials to support this assessment process are available on the department homepage and included in the M.Ed. and M.A./M.S. manuals also available in download format on the

Our assessment plan has been significantly revised.

The department has moved away for using comprehensive exams as the final assessment for the master's program. The department uses the six domains of the conceptual framework for COE in order to rate the students' outcomes in their final assessment.

Department of Education Specialties  
Literacy Studies Program

We have rearranged some courses in the program to help students with the quality of applied projects. This seems to already be paying off. As of 2008-2009, EDUC 771H is used to help students get started on their projects and, in the following semester, they will complete their projects in EDS 795.

Department of Education Specialties  
Special Education & Disability Studies Program

We have added expectations for the students to add substantive child data, with an explanation of how they use the data, to their final projects if they are doing the advanced portfolio option. We are bringing this to their attention during the supervised field experience and reinforce it in their courses.

Department of Education Specialties  
TESOL Program

In order to respond to the needs of the field, the TESOL program is being modified to offer two emphasis areas: 1) K-12 teaching and 2) Adult TESOL. In addition, some program requirements have been modified to provide consistency with the Department of Educational Specialties.

Department of Educational Leadership  
Educational Leadership Program

The EL Department has changing the way that our student interns are supervised and is exploring methods that on-site internship supervisors are "trained." Weakness in the internship experience for
some students is a concern. The EL Department is changing the way that our student interns are supervised and initiating changes in the way that on-site internship supervisors are "trained." Weakness in the internship experience for some students is a continuing concern. The program will be/is being modified so that students who appear to not grasp key SLO's received additional attention/mentoring. We have instituted a new exit survey using an on-line survey system. The first results of this approach will be reported next year.

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

Human Development & Family Studies Program

This year, HDFS faculty members have started a curriculum revision process that includes mapping of the undergraduate curriculum. One of our goals is to free up existing resources to invest in the development of the graduate program, and to invest time and energy in revision of the graduate program next year. In addition, the Graduate Program Director has started a monthly graduate student forum to provide a platform where students’ progress and concerns can be addressed. She is also developing a process for organizing key data and tracking the progress of active graduate students so that we can start mid-program reviews of students in 2005. As indicated by the findings of this year's assessment, we need to address student's lack of expertise in research methods/statistics and we need to consider raising admission standards for the program.

College of Engineering

Department of Biomedical Engineering

Biomedical Engineering Program

1) Course offerings to include virtual instrument development tools. As a result of assessing student projects and their technical needs, it was determined that there were no course offerings in the field of advanced virtual instrumentation. Thus, a course Biomedical Interfacing and Instrumentation was developed and initially offered as a Special Topics (BME 793) course. This course focused on the tools to develop virtual instruments with hands-on examples. The first time it was offered, 10 graduate students (including from other graduate programs) were officially registered in the course. On a scale of 5, student assessment (100% response) averaged 4.9 for the instructor, 4.8 for the course itself and 4.7 on all assessment questions. There has been a research focus at UNR in the field of biomedical and environmental sensor technologies, particularly biosensors. This has been a direct result of an EPSCoR center of excellence funded by the NSF. EPSCoR research activities have resulted in 7 graduate students currently conducting research associated with the fundamental transduction mechanism and (software/hardware) development of biosensing instrumentation. As a result of this interest in the nascent field of biosensing, a new 400/600-level course was developed: Biomedical Instrumentation Sensors. In the past year, this course was offered for the first time.
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  

Civil Engineering Program  

The Graduate Committee in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering completed a review of the graduate programs for the four different sub-disciplines and focus areas within civil engineering. This review indicated that different sub-disciplines often have different requirements for completing a graduate degree. As a result, the committee recommended the implementation of uniform guidelines across the various sub-disciplines within the department. For example, for students completing Plan B (Non-thesis) degrees, the structure, content, format, and duration of both the written and oral examinations will now be standardized within the department. Various changes were considered and discussed among the faculty during department meetings in Fall 2006 and will be fully implemented during Fall 2007.

Department of Computer Science  

Computer Engineering Program  

There have also been several changes based upon the program assessment:  
The Department has adopted new assessment tools for faculty evaluation of individual courses to provide a more formal documentation of the student outcomes for the course.  
We have increased the advising time allotted for each student based upon feedback obtained from student focus groups and the graduating-senior exit surveys.  
Numerous changes have been made to existing courses.

Department of Computer Science  

Computer Science Program  

a. There used to be a computer engineering track in the CS program. This has been removed from the program. More discussion regarding this can be found in the Departmental changes.  
b. This change has prompted the transfer of some courses from Electrical Engineering and the creation of several new courses including Robotics, Computer Vision, and Computer Security.  
c. There has been more of a focus on design. This now begins in CS 135 (Computer Science I) and continues throughout the curriculum.  
d. There has also been a growth of peer evaluation of programming. This has been used in a variety of courses (Math of Computer Science, Computer Graphics, Parallel Computation, and several others) and was introduced to CS 135 this past year with good results.  
e. There has been an emphasis on presentations in several courses culminating with several presentations in Software Engineering and Senior Projects capstone courses.  
f. There has been an emphasis in undergraduate research resulting in a dramatic growth in undergraduate research. This has mainly been centered on Software Engineering and Senior Projects courses where over the past 3 years there have been 25 refereed publications in a variety of locations including one in Springer Verlag’s Lecture Notes in Computer Science.  
g. Linear Algebra, Math 330, has become a required course for the program.  
h. More technical electives have been added to the program requirements. Technical electives were increased from 9 credits to 15 credit hours.  
i. ABET engineering criteria three, a-k has been adopted for the program. This has resulted in
several changes, including developing and revising course objectives.

j. Advisement appointments have also been standardized to 20 minutes each. This is an increase from the 15 minutes they used to be, and was prompted by student input.

k. Pre-requisite enforcement has improved. The Department has adopted new assessment tools for faculty evaluation of individual courses to provide a more formal documentation of the student outcomes for the course.

We have increased the advising time allotted for each student based upon feedback obtained from student focus groups and the graduating-senior exit surveys. Numerous changes have been made to existing courses. A first year course (CS 105) for both the Computer Science and Computer and Information Engineering programs was created. The course has been run on a trial basis for the past two semesters with success and the department recently voted to require it for both undergraduate programs in the department.

College of Liberal Arts
Department of English
English Program

The year's major effort at graduate program assessment occurred in association with our department's Program Review, which is being done for the first time in more than a decade. As part of the Program Review we have drafted a 130-page (DS) self-study document, of which a full 40 pages is devoted entirely to a description and assessment of our graduate programs. This detailed analysis of our graduate program's goals, accomplishments, and challenges is as thorough and useful a self assessment as has been done since the mid-1990s, and we expect that a number of program modifications will result from it once the full Program Review process is complete.

A major initiative in 2007 was the piloting of the Graduate Mentoring Program, a new advisement system designed to improve the mentoring and guidance of graduate students in their first and second years of study. In the 2007 launch of the program, all new graduate students were paired with a team of two graduate faculty members within their program emphasis. The faculty members met with the students to discuss a variety of issues related to course selection, committee formation, program planning, and professionalization. The program is a success so far, and will be expanded in 2008 to include more faculty participants, and to ensure that all incoming graduate students will receive mentoring through the program.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty and to initiate dialogue regarding issues related to graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in early December to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. The result of this meeting will be a revision to the department's "Graduate Advisement Procedures" document, which in turn will be used in the coming year to articulate best practices in graduate advisement within the department.

We have continued to improve our (still relatively new) Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which features a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, and negotiations. This year the series was adjusted to fit the needs of the few students who were actively on the job market.
In 2007 the DGS began meeting individually with new faculty members for the specific purpose of reviewing policies and procedures related to graduate education and mentoring in the department. To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships, and to continue them at the increased pay we were able to offer in 2007. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

To support the professional development of our M.A. students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships (many of which are likely to go to M.A. students). Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research. We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students and has thus helped to make them more successful in their job searches and in their applications to pursue advanced graduate studies.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department’s graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. This was a productive meeting that recently-hired faculty found especially helpful, and that resulted in a series of initiatives that were An English Graduate Organization (EGO) has been formed to further enhance a sense of community among our graduate students by hosting readings of student work as well as critical essays, and even participating in intramural sporting events.

In order to provide our graduate students with the opportunity to gain experience in various academic fields and to help prepare them to undertake their own future research projects, we have launched a program of summer graduate research assistantships in which students work with individual faculty members on specific projects. We offered nine of these in the summer of 2004 and are increasing the number to twelve in 2005.

To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships. Indeed, our tentative budget for 2007 contains an allocation to increase the pay students receive for their participation in this program. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students and has thus helped to make them more successful in their job searches and in their applications to pursue advanced graduate studies.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. This was a productive meeting that recently-hired faculty found especially helpful, and that resulted in a series of initiatives that were referred to other standing committees in the department. It has also been decided
that, beginning in 2007, the DGS will have a meeting with each new faculty member to review policies and procedures related to graduate education and mentoring in the department.

In order to address concerns about the advisement of graduate special students, the DGS has created a contact list (which will be kept updated) of all graduate specials, and has created a listerv by which information that will be especially helpful to graduate special students may be disseminated. The DGS has also begun a system of contacting each graduate special student to suggest an advisement meeting. The results of this approach have so far been positive, but the DGS is now working with Admissions and Records.

1. My assistant and I have developed an Excel spreadsheet with each MA student's name on it, that student's entry date, graduation due date (with an assumption of a two-year MA program), absolute 6 year graduate due date, mentor (and date of acquisition), chair (and date of acquisition), due date for graduate credit transfer evaluation form, due date for program of study (2nd semester of MA study), due date for 795 exams, and due date for thesis completion (if applicable). We are building time alarms into the database that will alert both my assistant and me to a missed deadline. We are hoping that by such means we can then alert chairs and students of missed deadlines and thus improve time to degree averages.

2. I have met with all new graduate faculty in 2008; however, I will be presenting workshops on graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees throughout 2009.

3. I currently meet with all new graduate students early in the semester in which they first enter the program and in that meeting these issues are explained. However, I will invite all graduate students to the workshops on graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees throughout 2009.

4. We have expanded the mentoring program from members of the Graduate Committee to all other members, as appropriate, of the graduate faculty. The mentoring program stipulates that in the first semester new students meet twice with their mentors, this in addition to the initial one-hour meeting with the DGS.

5. In fall 2008, in consultation with the English Graduate Student Organization (EGO), I organized five job workshops:
   1. Introduction;
   2. Vita, application letters;
   3. Job interview demonstration;
   4. ABD colloquium talk;
   5. ABS colloquium talk. The final three workshops were new to the series in fall 2008 and were specifically the suggestions of leaders of EGO. The ABD series will continue through the spring as well.

6. The Literature and Environment Committee redesigned the checklist and the Web descriptions to make clearer the relationship between literature courses and literature and environment courses.

7. Starting in fall 2009, the Graduate Committee in cooperation with the planning committee has developed a draft two-year rotation schedule for 700-level seminars.

8. Starting in spring 2009, the Graduate Committee reviews at the end of the semester the enrollment in 600-level courses to determine whether there are MA or PhD students enrolled in 600-level courses when there are 700-level courses that the students should rather be enrolled in. If such enrollments are found, a member of the Graduate Committee contacts the student to provide advice to enroll in 700-level rather than 600-level courses.
As mentioned above, the English Department is currently considering whether or not to continue offering the M.A.T.E. degree. Following are program modifications that address all M.A. and M.A.T.E. programs in the English Department.

The year's major effort at graduate program assessment occurred in association with our department's Program Review, which is being done for the first time in more than a decade. As part of the Program Review we have drafted a 130-page (DS) self-study document, of which a full 40 pages is devoted entirely to a description and assessment of our graduate programs. This detailed analysis of our graduate program's goals, accomplishments, and challenges is as thorough and useful a self-assessment as has been done since the mid-1990s, and we expect that a number of program modifications will result from it once the full Program Review process is complete.

A major initiative in 2007 was the piloting of the Graduate Mentoring Program, a new advisement system designed to improve the mentoring and guidance of graduate students in their first and second years of study. In the 2007 launch of the program, all new graduate students were paired with a team of two graduate faculty members within their program emphasis. The faculty members met with the students to discuss a variety of issues related to course selection, committee formation, program planning, and professionalization. The program is a success so far, and will be expanded in 2008 to include more faculty participants, and to ensure that all incoming graduate students will receive mentoring through the program.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty and to initiate dialogue regarding issues related to graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in early December to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. The result of this meeting will be a revision to the department's "Graduate Advisement Procedures" document, which in turn will be used in the coming year to articulate best practices in graduate advisement within the department.

We have continued to improve our (still relatively new) Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which features a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, and negotiations. This year the series was adjusted to fit the needs of the few students who were actively on the job market. To continue to support the professional development of our masters students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students in ways they have generally found helpful. In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department’s graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement.
To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships. Indeed, our tentative budget for 2007 contains an allocation to increase the pay students receive for their participation in this program. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research. We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students in ways they have generally found helpful.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. This was a productive meeting that recently-hired faculty found especially helpful, and that resulted in a series of initiatives that were referred to other standing committees in the department. It has also been decided that, beginning in 2007, the DGS will have a meeting with each new faculty member for the specific purpose of reviewing policies and procedures related to graduate education and mentoring in the department.

In order to address concerns about the advisement of graduate special students, the DGS has created a contact list (which will be kept updated) of all graduate specials, and has created a listerv by which information that will be especially helpful to graduate special students may be disseminated. The DGS has also begun a system of contacting each graduate special student to suggest an advisement meeting. The results of this approach have so far been very positive, but the DGS is now working with Admissions.

An English Graduate Organization (EGO) has been formed to further enhance a sense of community among our graduate students by hosting readings of student work as well as critical essays, and even participating in intramural sporting events. In order to provide our graduate students with the opportunity to gain experience in various academic fields and to help prepare them to undertake their own future research projects, we have launched a program of summer graduate research assistantships in which students work with individual faculty members on specific projects. We offered nine of these in the summer of 2004 and are increasing the number to twelve in 2005.

**Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures**

**Foreign Languages & Literatures Program**

The department of Foreign Languages and Literatures hired a new faculty member in Colonial Latin American Literature, Dr. George A. Thomas.

Due to financial constraints, the Latino Research Center had to eliminate the RA-ship. The MA reading list in Spanish was revised in the spring and implemented in the F08 semester. The major modification to the list is the incorporation of Chicano/Latino literature into the curriculum. The F08 semester is also the first time that a 700-level graduate course is being offered in this field. New written comprehensive examination guidelines were approved in April 2003 by the Spanish graduate faculty.
As of F04, Graduate Teaching Assistants teach 3 instead of 2 courses every 2 semesters. The new Latino Center, which reports to the chair of our department, will have at its disposition 2 Graduate Research Assistantships beginning in S05.

Spanish graduate faculty plans to meet on written Spanish proficiency of examinees and to review difficulties posed by written examination formats for possible modifications. The Spanish section adopted a new M.A. Written Comprehensive Examination Results form. Due to financial constraints, the Latino Research Center had to reduce the number of RAships it can support from two to one RAship.

Department of History

History Program

The Department of History has tightened its enrollment qualifications for graduate students particularly those in the Master's of Arts fields. We also have introduced thesis study groups and workshops to help prepare students who are about to take comprehensive examinations.

Department of History

History: Teaching History Program

Steps taken in response to assessment of the MATH program so far:
1. Establishment of an Advisory Committee consisting of graduates of the MATH program, current students, and the UNR Department of History Graduate Advisor. Annual meetings are planned, with an extra meeting in June 2008 to initiate the Committee's activities. The purpose of this Committee and its meetings will be to strengthen the community of highly qualified K-12 History teachers in the region, and to improve the MATH program experience for students in the program through mutual support and advice. These meetings will be sponsored by the Teaching American History program in Washoe County for the first year or two, and then other sources of funding will need to be found.
2. Collection and placement of final MATH Unit Plans in the History Department library of graduate theses and dissertations. A website may be created at the Teaching American History site to post these unit plans.
3. Kathy Obenchain of the School of Education, already a major component of the MATH program, has agreed to offer an annual one-hour session on teaching history K-12 and on preparation of a Unit Plan in History 600, the introductory course for all incoming graduate students. This will benefit both MATH and traditional graduate students who may go on to K-12 teaching.
4. The MATH web site at the Department Graduate web site has been upgraded and edited for clarity and improved links.
Department of Judicial Studies
Justice Management Program

We are continuing to diversify and enhance our online delivery, i.e. adding audio lectures, videos, and more interactive assignments.

Student course evaluation forms have undergone a few revisions to gather additional information.

Department of Music & Dance
Music Program

We have chosen to keep the masters degree in musicology under the general masters degree umbrella. A review of each graduate student’s background, experience, and competency in music theory and music history is now assessed prior to entrance into their degree plan. Remedial course work is recommended, and each graduate student is allowed to take each entrance exam up to three times to pass the requirement.

A review of each graduate student’s background, experience, and competency in music theory and music history is now assessed prior to entrance into their degree plan. Remedial course work is recommended, and each graduate student is allowed to take each entrance exam up to three times to pass the requirement.

Department of Philosophy
Philosophy Program

- Added PHIL 409/609, Recent French Philosophy (to close gap in our teaching of 20th c. philosophy) (began fall 2006).

- Added PHIL 438/638, Problems in the History and Philosophy of Science, to the Group B requirements for the major (thus expanding offerings in philosophy of science).

- Created a committee to explore adding a 'value track' to our M.A. program.

- A number of faculty increased their teaching in value theory--e.g. by adding a value theory component to classes (e.g. an axiology component in our 400/600 level theory of knowledge class).

- We have made an effort to increase the number of our M.A. students who actually come in for advisement (2008). We have more aggressively advertised our courses within and without the department (2008).

- We have been somewhat more selective in M.A. admissions and advisement and will want to monitor this in the future to make continued progress.

Department of Psychology
Psychology: Behavioral Analysis Program

While no modifications in the masters program are anticipated, the Behavior Analysis Program has adopted a mentorship model for admissions and advisement as of 2008.

This last year we have made the clerkship optional with the substitution of a summer scholar series of seminars. However the one student clerkship undertaken has been completely successfully completed.
We are standardizing the professional performance definitions within our TPS program wide monitoring system to better evaluate appropriate and professional performance within our practicum and stipend positions within our program.

We have introduced a specific Masters level research methods course to assure that basic research design and appropriate analysis and measurement skills are acquired by our Masters students.

We are conducting a survey of our Masters students regarding employment and career development.

**Department of Sociology**

**Sociology Program**

As part of the annual assessment process, in December 2006 the sociology assessment committee conducted a focus group with M.A. students during which actual and potential concerns were addressed. This meeting provided new insights in existing problems, but also provided a multitude of solutions. We hope to conduct such a focus group meeting at least once a year. As a result of the assessment process, starting in fall 2007 we have established stable student-advisor relationships, thus removing ambiguities that existed previously. At this point the effects of this new policy cannot yet be assessed, but we hope that it will address a number of the communication issues that our M.A. students raised.

**Department of Speech Communication & Theatre**

**Speech Communication Program**

1. Assure breadth of content in seminars. In last year's report, we committed to a discussion of the topical breadth of seminars. In that discussion, we concluded that 700-level courses must serve the need for broad subject-matter competence. Even if students are permitted a personal and unique research focus for seminar projects, all students should be exposed to basic content areas. The seminars should thus have broad outline and substantial textbook and reading component. For example, in COM 720, Interpersonal Communication, the course cannot focus, say, on "family" or "marital" communication, but a graduate student could make that area the focus of his or her individual research. Within the past 3 semesters, the four seminars have used this breadth of content approach with a strong textbook and comprehensive syllabus.

2. Assure emphasis on research methods in other seminars. We no longer want COM 700 to stand alone as the "research course" in a candidate's program.

3. Abandon "communication skills" as a direct learning outcome. We have no specific coursework in either written or spoken communication skills. The competence levels we observe cannot be linked to specific classroom methodologies. Entering communication skills vary widely. We will have to assume that whatever communication skill we see in written and oral projects is an indirect outcome of graduate work.

One modification will be made immediately. It is based on our observation that achievement is higher and more observable in a seminar than in a 400-600 course. We will now offer 2 seminars per semester. Graduate students will be required to take both. This addition will permit more candidate practice on the outcomes we seek.

1. Many program modifications resulted from both assessment and the Self-Study and Program Review from spring, 2008. Additionally, the current budget situation has provided an impetus for some as well. Our original plan from last year was to offer additional graduate seminars for our students. Given our two vacant positions this is not possible for at least the next two years. We
have decided to take advantage of the 400-600 level courses as a way to ensure our students have the necessary course offerings by rotating at least two 400-600 courses into the night schedule for graduate students (each semester) in addition to the 3 graduate seminars (offered over two years).
2. We are also finding an increased interest in working on research projects with faculty and publishing opportunities. Some of these projects will provide independent study or internship opportunities for our graduate students, as well as publication/presentation opportunities.
3. This change applies only to those graduate students on a teaching assistantship. We have reorganized the basic course to decrease the level of TA responsibility for the course sections; giving them a few lab sections instead of stand-alone sections. This model creates a better environment for them to learn from the basic course coordinator. It also lets the students have more time to dedicate to their own coursework in lieu of planning for courses they teach.

**College of Science**
**Department of Biology**
**Biology Program**

Exit survey forms for graduating Masters' students are being revised and modified forms will be implemented in 2009.

**Department of Chemistry**
**Chemistry Program**

It became clear during the early stages of assessment that it would be valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis MS degree. This was created by the faculty and recently approved and is now in the 2005-2006 catalog. The clientele include H.S. teachers and others who need an MS degree absent advanced laboratory training. Full implementation and assessment of this new degree await further evaluation based on (1) At the M.S. and Ph.D. -level, in 2006-2007, the organic division implemented a program of study for organic students wherein a full year of graduate organic synthesis is accommodated in the first year of study. This was designed to strengthen the students knowledge of the reagents, synthetic transformations and design. (2) It became clear during the early stages of assessment that it would be valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis M.S. degree. This was created by the faculty approved and appeared in the 2006-2007 catalog. The clientele include high school teachers and others who need an M.S. degree absent advanced laboratory training. Full implementation and assessment of this new degree await further evaluation based on enrollees. (3) A modified evaluation form was created for use by faculty mentors in their annual evaluation of graduate students. (4) A four-page rating/evaluation instrument was created for student seminars.

What changes, if any, will be made to the program based on assessment results? It became clear during the first assessment cycle that it would be appropriate and valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis MS degree. This was created by the faculty and approved during the cycle 2 of our assessment program; it is now in the 2006-2007 catalog. The clientele include H.S. teachers and others who need an MS degree absent advanced laboratory training. Full implementation and assessment of this new degree await further evaluation based on enrollees. We have relatively few MS students in our grad student pools. Approximately 10% are MS and 90% Ph.D. The Chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the
decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore meet daily with our graduate students. Each spring, all faculty are required to evaluate their mentored graduate students in writing. These evaluations are then discussed at a general meeting of the chemistry graduate faculty. Recent curriculum revisions based in part on Assessment include:

1. At the M.S. and Ph.D. level, the organic division is implementing a program of study for organic students wherein a full year of graduate organic synthesis is accommodated in the first year of study. This is designed to strengthen the students’ knowledge of the reagents, transformations and design.

2. It became clear during the early stages of assessment that it would be valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis M.S. degree. This was created by the faculty and recently approved and is now in the 2005-2006 catalog. The clientele include high school teachers and others who need an M.S. degree. Implementation plan responsibilities were modified to reflect revised departmental committee structure for 2003-2004. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is now responsible for assessment, with assistance from the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies committees. It became clear during the first assessment cycle that it would be appropriate and valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis MS degree. This was created by the faculty and approved during the cycle 2 of our assessment program; It was entered in the 2006-2007 catalog, and continues in the 2007-2008. The clientele include H.S. teachers and others who need an MS degree absent advanced laboratory training. Full implementation and assessment of this new degree await further evaluation based on enrollees. We have relatively few MS students in our grad student pools. Approximately 10% are MS and 90% Ph.D.

The Chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore meet daily with our graduate students. Each spring, all faculty are required to evaluate their mentored graduate students in writing. These evaluations are then discussed at a general meeting of the chemistry graduate faculty.

Recent curriculum revisions based in part on Assessment include:

1. At the M.S. and Ph.D. level, in 2006-2007, the organic division implemented a program of study for organic students wherein a full year of graduate organic synthesis is accommodated in the first year of study. This was designed to strengthen the students’ knowledge of the reagents, synthetic transformations and design.

2. It became clear during the early stages of assessment that it would be valuable to add a new (Plan B) non-thesis M.S. degree. This was created by the faculty and recently approved and appeared in the 2006-2007 catalog. The clientele include high school teachers and others who need an M.S. degree absent advanced laboratory training. Full implementation and assessment of this new degree await further evaluation based on enrollees.

3. A modified evaluation form was created for use by faculty mentors in their annual evaluation of graduate students.

4. A four-page rating/evaluation instrument was created for student seminars.
Program Modifications to the MS in Geography are threefold:

First: We have significantly changed the course content for GEOG 700, the required introduction to graduate studies in Geography. Previously the course addressed both the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of the discipline, as well as introduced students to the practicalities of graduate work, i.e., how to conduct research, write a thesis proposal, etc. Now, the course focuses solely on the history and nature of geography.

Second: As a complement to changes in GEOG 700, we are in the process of creating a new course, GEOG 702, which will focus on the practicalities of graduate work on how to conduct research, write grant proposals, present research at professional meetings, etc. This course will be required of all PhD students; but, MS students in Geography will be encouraged strongly to take this course, as well.

Third: We have implemented a second option to the MS degree as a non-thesis option, which seems to be appropriate for those students for whom the MS is a terminal degree. The non-thesis option requires graduate students to complete a larger number of coursework credits. Students undertaking the non-thesis option are still required to complete annotations under the direction of their graduate committee, and to go through a comprehensive examination that can verify the accuracy of their annotations and the quality of their reading. The exact approach taken in the non-thesis option has some latitude: It can be a paper manuscript suitable for publication in a specified journal. It can be a review essay, analyzing an existing body of literature or an approach to a problem in sufficient depth to demonstrate mastery of that material. The professional paper can be an explication of a map that the student prepares, or a set of maps or GIS coverage, or analysis of remotely-sensed material. Or, for teachers, it would not be inappropriate to offer a course module, amounting to five or six classroom lesson plans all turning about a common theme. What in any case must be demonstrated in the written and oral work, and in the defense, itself, is command of the material demonstrating adequate mastery.

Demonstrated ability to develop a consistently advanced level of scholarly research in a prolonged M.S. thesis project. Modifications have been made in the last year in this SLO. Students can now complete a pair of publishable papers in the MLUUP degree program, and the department is still in discussion about the appropriateness of this for the MS Geography program. In essence, the difference turns over the degree of literature survey and background information that might be considered normal in a thesis, but which is not expected in a professional paper. Because a somewhat larger proportion of students in the LUPP program are already practitioners, the publishable papers option was considered desirable to add. With only 10% of students in the two programs completing their theses in the last year, the degree of success might be questioned. But keep in mind that 14 students came into the program. Of the three who finished, one had completed a PhD the year before, and even then, completed the MS program in geography in three years, total. The other two, however, were rather long-standing students, and their movement toward a degree was halting. That they have finished is good news. At least one of the incoming three students from 2003-2004 has moved toward a two-year completion cycle; the other two are also making substantial progress. The net effect of this is a conclusion that suitable research is clearly possible and timely completion also possible, even if it is not the rule, yet, for graduates in either field.

At this point, apparently, our modifications have worked, so we will continue in this vein for the foreseeable future.
Department of Geography

Geography: Land Use Planning Program

The Land Use Planning and Policy (LUPP) program underwent major curriculum changes that were fully implemented Fall of 2008. The curriculum changes reflect the evolving field of planning and the need to accommodate student desires to become certified planners. Along with curriculum changes, the program as a whole was overhauled and a new planning director appointed to facilitate stronger ties with local and regional planning agencies.

Changes to the curriculum included the addition of eight new courses. A 300, two 400/600, and five 700 level courses were all added to increase the diversity of courses offered and to focus the requirements for the LUPP degree. Plan A and Plan B options still exist with a centralized core offering of classes that all students must take with a more detailed course requirement list presented for the Plan B option. Plan A students must complete a total of 31 credits inclusive of thesis and comprehensive exam credits. Plan B students must complete 42 credits including an exit examination. The Plan B option is considered to be a terminal degree with students entering the workforce to become practicing planners. Students following the Plan B option must enter an advisor approved emphasis area in Environmental Planning, Growth Management or Historic Preservation. The changes to the LUPP program have been supported by the University at all the necessary levels. Currently, all program changes have been implemented and appear to be well accepted by the current and newly enrolled students. No changes are envisioned in the near future.

Modifications have already taken place. The previous director of LUP has left the program and we have hired two new planners, who are working to restructure the curriculum and attend to the needs of current LUP grad students.

Department of Geological Sciences

Geology Program

The faculty voted in spring 2006 to no longer require the MS-GL comprehensive exam. Students entering before spring 2006 are bound to the old policy.

Department of Physics

Physics Program

The Physics Qualifying Exam will become a diagnostic examination with no pass/fail standard. Students may be required to add certain courses to their program of study based on the results of the examination, but will not be asked to repeat the examination. Also, a new 700-level class on Plasma Theory was proposed in the summer of 2006. It may be offered in 2008.

A process for notifying MS students of lack of progress is implemented.

This year's planned program modifications build on those implemented following previous years' assessments. The program has been improved in recent years by modifying the Physics Qualifying Exam and by proposing a new 700-level class on Plasma Theory, which was approved by the Courses and Curriculum Committee.
To provide more instruction on advanced topics, there is a 700-level class on Inertial Confinement Fusion in fall 2008, and the new 700-level class on Plasma Theory is scheduled to be offered in spring 2009. In addition, a 700-level class on Plasma Spectroscopy will likely be offered in fall 2009.

To build a bigger student cohort, the program is increasing its effort to recruit students.

A process to create a modified qualifying exam for MS students has been put in motion.

**Division of Health Sciences**  
**Department of Health Ecology**  
**Public Health Program**

Implemented more community-based learning opportunities throughout the curriculum and now require an internship for all MPH students. We revised the students' culminating project committee composition to include a community member. We increased guest lecturers from public health professionals. We revised courses. We updated instructors. Expanded curricular options including areas which train students in skills requested by employers. To address concerns about writing and research skills, faculty offered a 1-credit writing workshop in spring 2008 and will offer a 1-credit research methods workshop during wintermester 2009.

**Department of Social Work**  
**Social Work Program**

A Web CT on-line survey has been developed for both graduate and undergraduate students for input on progress being made based on their perceptions regarding school of social work outcomes. These will be reported in next year's school assessment.

**Interdisciplinary Degree Programs**  
**Department of Atmospheric Sciences**  
**Atmospheric Sciences Program**

We have used an Annual Student Progress report for the second year now, and it is helping in establishing common ground between the students and faculty members about learning objectives for the coursework and research. We introduced a new Graduate Seminar in spring 2005 for Atmospheric Sciences students, and this has provided new focus on communications, professional development and scientific ethics.

As outlined in the Plan Report from 2003, the Atmospheric Sciences Curriculum Committee and additional ATMS faculty used the results of the past year's assessment process to develop program modifications on courses offered, curriculum requirements, student recruitment and student advisement. Several changes have been implemented. In order to improve student communications skills and provide students with an opportunity to explore the broader applications of their science to societal issues, we have added a new Graduate Seminar course (ATMS 790). In the past, we did not
have an ATMS graduate seminar class and we have had our students take PHYS 790. The new ATMS course will allow the students to focus on seminar topics specifically related to atmospheric sciences applied research topics. In addition, this course will be follow a format that addresses several aspects of professional development such as presenting lectures, preparing a resume, composing a conference poster, and developing research proposals.

We also designed and implemented the student/advisor progress report form that specifically addresses the Learning Outcomes of the program. This has been a successful addition to our annual assessment methodology, and contributes significantly to student advisement. Another change that we are implementing in our graduate curriculum (starting 2005) is to remove our previous "three-track" specialization options (Meteorology; Atmospheric Physics; Atmospheric Chemistry) to permit a more flexible, interdisciplinary curriculum for atmospheric science professions in the nation and world today. The new curriculum guidelines allow the student and advisor to develop a degree plan that can link more substantially with other disciplines such as engineering, hydrology, geography, public health and even humanities (political sciences, journalism, education) -- to provide experience and training that will help meet professional opportunities related to climate change impacts, air pollution pressures, water resource management and environmental policy.

Department of Hydrologic Sciences
Hydrogeology Program

The Program is implementing an exit interview for all graduating students. This interview will include a brief survey to aid in the assessment process and to acquire future contact and employer information.

Department of Hydrologic Sciences
Hydrology Program

The Program is implementing an exit interview for all graduating students. This interview will include a brief survey to aid in the assessment process and to acquire future contact and employer information.

School of Medicine
Department of Speech Pathology & Audiology
Speech Pathology & Audiology Program

In our most recent program review, it was decided that we need to include more training in report writing along with a more structured training sequence in SPA 659/759. No changes were made to course sequencing or pre-requisites.
Doctorate Degree Programs

College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Sciences
Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

Biochemistry Program

The following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years. New course offerings now include: BCH 706 - Functional Genomics, BCH 719 - Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry, BCH 707 - Protein Structure & Function, BCH 794 - Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, and Plant Biochemistry). Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Second, a new graduate director has been appointed to improve communication with the graduate students regarding program requirements, guidelines for the formation of graduate student committees and comprehensive examination, and liaison with the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars. Third, the following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years.

New course offerings now include:

- BCH 706, Functional Genomics (currently an elective course)
- BCH 719, Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry (currently an elective course)
- BCH 707, Protein Structure & Function (currently a REQUIRED course)
- BCH 794, Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, Plant Biochemistry).

The Biochemistry Graduate Student Handbook that is now given to every new student and all previously enrolled students in the program is revised annually. The Handbook was organized into three parts to properly inform our graduated students about all aspects of the graduate program.

The following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty member in the last three years. Second, a new graduate director was appointed in 2005 to improve communication with the graduate students regarding program requirements, guidelines for the formation of graduate student committees and comprehensive examination, and liaison with the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars. The graduate director developed a Biochemistry Graduate Student Handbook that is now given to every new student and all previously enrolled students in the program. The Handbook contains the following useful information to ensure that the Graduate Students are properly informed about all aspects of the graduate program:

1) Oral and Written Comprehensive Exams
2) Curriculum for Masters and Doctoral Programs
3) Frequently asked questions
4) Timeline
5) Important Dates
6) ePAWS Functions and Features
7) Graduate Progression Forms
8) Graduate Students with Assistantships Handbook
9) Tuition and Insurance Costs 2007-2008  
10) Drug Free Workplace Memo  
11) Research Best Practices  
12) Graduate Student Survival Handbook  
13) Graduation Procedures  
16) Masters Thesis Forms

The following changes are being made as a result of the initial assessment results. First, more courses are being offered due to the ability of the department to hire three new faculty members in the last three years. New course offerings now include: BCH 706 - Functional Genomics, BCH 719 - Plant Molecular Biology & Biochemistry, BCH 707 - Protein Structure & Function, BCH 794 - Colloquium (Proteomics, Bioinformatics, and Plant Biochemistry). Planning is also underway to revise the basic curriculum to offer an integrated graduate level biochemistry course and to add additional specialty course offerings. Second, a new graduate director has been appointed to improve communication with the graduate students regarding program requirements, guidelines for the formation of graduate student committees and comprehensive examination, and liaison with the graduate school, and office of international students and scholars. Third, a plan to physically unify the department into a new building has been developed.

**Department of Resource Economics**  
**Economics Program**

We have modified the PhD program to screen for students who would need additional coursework to prepare for the core PhD coursework. These students would take the core courses over the first two years with the additional courses, and then take the qualifying exam after the second year. We believe that with better preparation for the core course sequence, we may retain students in the PhD program who would have ended up transferring to the MS program at the end of just one year.

We have renamed all the core doctoral theory and methods courses so that they are more consistent with mainstream doctoral programs. We have revised the statistical packages used in RECO 714 and RECO 715 (Econometrics I and II). Instead of developing the canned stat package STATA and the programming language GAUSS, we have decided to use only one statistical programming language, MATLAB. This is because MATLAB has largely supplanted GAUSS for statistical computations. We have developed several new courses to flesh out our doctoral program: RECO 765 Decision Theory, RECO 770 Experimental Economics, RECO 777 Bayesian Data Analysis, RECO 772 Rural Development Economics, and RECO 761
College of Education
Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology
Educational Psychology Program

We developed six new courses in Information Technology in Education as electives. The courses are:

- CEP 720 Instructional Design in Information Technology
- CEP 725 Assessment in Information Technology
- CEP 425/625 Design of Online Teaching and Learning
- CEP 426/626 Advanced Web Design in Education
- CEP 485/685 Advanced Methods of Technology Integration
- CEP 486/686 Design of Digital Visual Applications for Instruction

Department of Education Specialties
Education Specialties Program

We have added a mid-program review for doctoral students to look at their progress and give them feedback. We need to be sure the students, especially the international students, make good progress on their degrees. Recruitment is also an issue that we will be addressing in the next year.

Department of Education Specialties
Literacy Studies Program

We have added a mid-program review for doctoral students to look at their progress and give them feedback. We have a lot of part-time doctoral students and need ways of keeping them connected to the program and making good progress on their degrees. Recruitment is also an issue that we will be addressing in the next year.

Department of Education Specialties
Special Education & Disability Studies Program

We continue to look for means of keeping our part-time doctoral students connected to our program and making progress toward degree completion. We have instituted a special education doctoral seminar that will be taught on a semi-regular basis (depending on program enrollment). We have also planned outside activities (poster sessions and research-sharing in social settings) to provide an opportunity for students at various phases of the program to meet and develop a better sense of community.
Department of Educational Leadership
Educational Leadership Program

The new system assists doctoral students in identifying and beginning work on their dissertation research project. This deviates from our former system in that the Educational Leadership members of the student's examination committee meet with the student (not later than the end of their second year) to assist in identifying and defining the dissertation problem and comprehensive examination project. Historically, these meetings were between the student and major advisor and happened over a long time frame.

This is the department's effort to ensure student involvement in the research process earlier in the program and provide as much guidance possible for the student to ensure a higher completion rate.

College of Engineering
Department of Biomedical Engineering
Biomedical Engineering Program

The following modifications have been (or in the last case, are being) made:

1) Conflict between research project planning and grade assignment - An initial solution to this problem is to insist that students submit (to their committee and to the Director of the program) an initial set of specific aims for the grant-writing exercise before they are allowed to enroll. If assessment feedback shows this to be insufficient, then students will be required to submit an initial draft proposal before enrolling. This situation will be closely monitored in upcoming semesters.

2) Course offerings to include virtual instrument development tools - As a result of assessing student projects and their technical needs, it was determined that there were no course offerings in the field of advanced virtual instrumentation.

Thus, a course Biomedical Interfacing and Instrumentation was developed and initially offered as a Special Topics (BME 793) course. This course focused on the tools to develop virtual instruments with hands-on examples. The first time it was offered, 10 graduate students (including from other graduate programs) were officially registered in the course. On a scale of 5, student assessment (100% response) averaged 4.9 for the instructor, 4.8 for the course itself and 4.7 on all assessment questions.

There has been a research focus at UNR in the field of biomedical and environmental sensor technologies, particularly biosensors. This has been a direct result of an EPSCoR center of excellence funded by the NSF. EPSCoR research activities have resulted in 7 graduate students currently conducting research associated with the fundamental transduction mechanism and (software/hardware) development of biosensing instrumentation. As a result of this interest in the nascent field of biosensing, a new 400/600-level course was developed: Biomedical Instrumentation Sensors. In the past year, this course was offered for the first time.
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
Civil Engineering Program

The CEE Department formed a Graduate Self-Study Committee during the 2005-2006 academic year to survey the current practices among the various sub-disciplines at the graduate level. The committee made recommendations to streamline procedures in the graduate programs by adopting a set of guidelines which address issues such as the format and duration of the comprehensive and or qualifying examinations, the development and presentation of a research proposal, and the preparation and completion of a program of study. Once fully implemented, these guidelines should improve procedures within the graduate programs.

Department of Computer Science  
Computer Science & Engineering Program

a. There used to be a computer engineering track in the CS program. This has been removed from the program. More discussion regarding this can be found in the Departmental changes.
b. This change has prompted the transfer of some courses from Electrical Engineering and the creation of new courses including Robotics, Computer Vision, and Computer Security.
c. There has been more of a focus on design. This now begins in CS 135 (Computer Science I) and continues throughout the curriculum.
d. There has also been a growth of peer evaluation of programming. This has been used in a variety of courses (Math of Computer Science, Computer Graphics, Parallel Computation, and several others) and was introduced to CS 135 this past year with good results.
e. There has been an emphasis on presentations in several courses culminating with several presentations in Software Engineering and Senior Projects capstone courses.
f. There has been an emphasis in undergraduate research resulting in a dramatic growth in undergraduate research. This has mainly been centered on Software Engineering and Senior Projects courses where over the past 3 years there have been 25 refereed publications in a variety of locations including one in Springer Verlag’s Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
g. Linear Algebra, Math 330, has become a required course for the program.
h. More technical electives have been added to the program requirements. Technical electives were increased from 9 credits to 15 credit hours.
i. ABET engineering criteria three, a-k has been adopted for the program. This has resulted in several changes, including developing and revising course objectives.
j. Advisement appointments have also been standardized to 20 minutes each. This is an increase from the 15 minutes they used to be, and was prompted by student input.
k. Pre-requisite enforcement has improved.

College of Liberal Arts  
Department of Anthropology  
Anthropology Program

As a result of assessment, we eliminated separate written Qualifying Exams in the doctoral program and replaced them with embedded exams in each of the core graduate seminars.

Finally, the Anthropology Graduate Student Handbook was created and distributed to new students in the doctoral program during the year; it will be revised annually.
As indicated above, the Center made significant changes to its assessment program plan during 2006. No further changes are anticipated at present.

To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students and has thus helped to make them more successful in a competitive job market.

To address suggestions that the department work to strengthen and formalize our academic job placement mechanisms, the DGS collaborated with the Graduate Committee and with a number of other faculty to create a formal Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which featured a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, negotiations, etc.

An English Graduate Organization (EGO) has been formed to further enhance a sense of community among our graduate students by hosting readings of student work as well as critical essays, and even participating in intramural sporting events.

In order to provide our graduate students with the opportunity to gain experience in various academic fields and to help prepare them to undertake their own future research projects, we have launched a program of summer graduate research assistantships in which students work with individual faculty members on specific projects. We offered nine of these in the summer of 2004 and are increasing the number to twelve in 2005.

To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships. Indeed, our tentative budget for 2007 contains an allocation to increase the pay students receive for their participation in this program. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

We have also chosen to maintain support for graduate student travel to professional conferences at $300 per annum (an increase over the $175 we offered as recently as 2003). This substantial support has nurtured the professional engagement of our students and has thus helped to make them more successful in a competitive job market.

To address suggestions that the department work to strengthen and formalize our academic job placement mechanisms, the DGS collaborated with the Graduate Committee and with a number of other faculty to create a formal Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which featured a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, negotiations, etc.
other faculty to create a formal Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which featured a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, negotiations, etc. Now in its second year, the series has been expanded and revised to address students' evolving concerns about how best to position themselves in a difficult job market.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty members and initiate dialogue regarding various aspects of graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in November to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. This was a productive meeting that recently-hired faculty found especially helpful, and that resulted in a series of initiatives that were referred to other standing committees in the department. It has also been decided that, beginning in 2007, the DGS will have a meeting with each new faculty member for the specific purpose of reviewing policies and procedures related to graduate education and mentoring in the department.

In order to address concerns about the advisement of graduate special students, the DGS has created a contact list (which will be kept updated) of all graduate specials, and has created a listerv by which information that will be especially helpful to graduate special students may be disseminated. The DGS has also begun a system of contacting each graduate special student to suggest an advisement meeting.

1. My assistant and I have developed an Excel spreadsheet with each PhD student's name on it, that student's entry date, graduation due date (with an assumption of a five-year PhD program), absolute 8 year graduate due date, mentor (and date of acquisition), chair (and date of acquisition), due date for graduate credit transfer evaluation form, due date for program of study (3rd semester of PhD study), due date for 795 exams, and due date for dissertation completion. We are building time alarms into the database that will alert both my assistant and me to a missed deadline. We are hoping that by such means we can then alert chairs and students of missed deadlines and thus improve time to degree averages.

2. I have met with all new graduate faculty in 2008; however, I will be presenting workshops on graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees throughout 2009.

3. I currently meet with all new graduate students early in the semester in which they first enter the program and in that meeting these issues are explained. However, I will invite all graduate students to the workshops on graduate school rules, programs of study, and requirements for degrees throughout 2009.

4. We have expanded the mentoring program from members of the Graduate Committee to all other members, as appropriate, of the graduate faculty. The mentoring program stipulates that in the first semester new students meet twice with their mentors, this in addition to the initial one-hour meeting with the DGS.
5. In fall 2008, in consultation with the English Graduate Student Organization (EGO), I organized five job workshops:
   1. Introduction;
   2. Vita, application letters;
   3. Job interview demonstration;
   4. ABD colloquium talk;
   5. ABS colloquium talk. The final three workshops were new to the series in fall 2008 and were specifically the suggestions of leaders of EGO. The ABD series will continue through the spring as well.

Starting in fall 2009, the Graduate Committee in cooperation with the planning committee has developed a draft two-year rotation schedule for 700-level seminars.

Starting in spring 2009, the Graduate Committee reviews at the end of the semester the enrollment in the year's major effort at graduate program assessment occurred in association with our department's Program Review, which is being done for the first time in more than a decade. As part of the Program Review we have drafted a 130-page (DS) self-study document, of which a full 40 pages is devoted entirely to a description and assessment of our graduate programs. This detailed analysis of our graduate program's goals, accomplishments, and challenges is as thorough and useful a self assessment as has been done since the mid-1990s, and we expect that a number of program modifications will result from it once the full Program Review process is complete.

A major initiative in 2007 was the piloting of the Graduate Mentoring Program, a new advisement system designed to improve the mentoring and guidance of graduate students in their first and second years of study. In the 2007 launch of the program, all new graduate students were paired with a team of two graduate faculty members within their program emphasis. The faculty members met with the students to discuss a variety of issues related to course selection, committee formation, program planning, and professionalization. The program is a success so far, and will be expanded in 2008 to include more faculty participants, and to ensure that all incoming graduate students will receive mentoring through the program.

In order to provide better information about graduate advisement strategies to recently-hired departmental graduate faculty and to initiate dialogue regarding issues related to graduate advisement, the department's graduate faculty met in early December to review procedures, offer reminders about policy, and discuss areas for the improvement of departmental graduate advisement. The result of this meeting will be a revision to the department's "Graduate Advisement Procedures" document, which in turn will be used in the coming year to articulate best practices in graduate advisement within the department.

We have continued to improve our (still relatively new) Academic Job Placement Workshop Series, which features a series of 90-minute workshops (each conducted by the DGS and several other faculty members) on various aspects of the job search process, including an overview of the job search process, preparation of application materials and dossiers, interviews, and negotiations. This year the series was adjusted to fit the needs of the few students who were actively on the job market.

In 2007 the DGS began meeting individually with new faculty members for the specific purpose of reviewing policies and procedures related to graduate education and mentoring in the department.
To continue to support the professional development of our doctoral students, we have chosen to continue to offer a full 12 summer research assistantships, and to continue them at the increased pay we were able to offer in 2007. Students have clearly found valuable the opportunity to collaborate with faculty on substantial research projects, and have often used their collaborations to inspire or direct their own research.

**Department of Psychology**  
**Psychology: Behavioral Analysis Program**

The Behavior Analysis Program continues to assess itself on a regular basis through the Total Performance System (TPS) and makes minor adjustments, as needed. The program has adopted a traditional mentorship model as of 2008 for admissions and advising of Doctoral students. All Doctoral students without a recognized MA degree must now complete a Master’s Thesis on the way to the Ph.D.

**Department of Psychology**  
**Psychology: Cognitive & Brain Science Program**

We have added two new graduate courses: Psychology 709 (a comparative sensory processing course) and Psych 780 (a graduate human electrophysiology Lab.). We have also added a new undergraduate course: Psychology 404 (a human electrophysiology lab).

Program faculty met several times during the fall semester to review the program. As a result of this review it was decided to revise the curriculum to place more emphasis on methods courses, including a new requirement for a programming course and the development of more lab courses. The thesis and dissertation formats were also revised to encourage and facilitate publication of the students' research and to better prepare them to present their work at conferences and job talks.

**College of Science**  
**Department of Chemistry**  
**Chemistry Program**

Assessment Driven Changes to the Chemistry Graduate Curriculum:
During the past 5 years of assessment, structural changes were made to the PhD curriculum, while maintaining as designated research areas: inorganic, organic, physical, and chemical physics.

1) Acting within graduate school requirements, the structure of the preliminary written qualifying exam (cumulative exams) was streamlined with the objective of more rapid completion of the requirement.
2) The physical chemistry graduate course offerings were streamlined, with the deletion of courses no longer taught.
3) The graduate organic course offerings were strengthened by a new 2-semester requirement in organic synthesis. This one-year sequence is designed to strengthen students' knowledge of
reagents, synthetic transformations, strategy and design.

4) Annual evaluations of graduate students by faculty were assisted with the implementation of a new survey/rating form.

5) Faculty assessment of student seminar performance was strengthened by the addition of a new evaluation rubric.

During the past 5 years of assessment course content and teaching have been modified:

1) The new organic synthesis sequence focuses on methods of organic synthesis (CHEM 740) a survey of reactors of value in synthesis, to include transition metal catalyzed reactions, olefin metal thesis, etc. This is followed by (CHEM 745-Strategy of Organic Synthesis) concepts for planning and evaluating multi-step synthesis of complex molecules, natural products and pharmaceuticals.

2) In the graduate spectroscopy course (CHEM 643) a special emphasis was placed on applications of NMR spectroscopy, and this was supported by the same in the accompanying structure laudation lab (CHEM 644) where students used sophisticated 400 MHz NMR techniques to solve structures of natural products, inter alia.

3) In the physical chemistry offerings, the first-graduate course (CHEM 650) content was revised to emphasize mathematical rigor and increase physics depth, which was support by a change of text to Levine’s "Quantum Chemistry". The molecular spectroscopy course (CHEM 754) focused on the gas phase: vibrational and rotational spectroscopy, group theory. The statistical thermodynamics course emphasized thermodynamics with some (mainly) equilibrium statistical mechanics and (lesser) non-equilibrium.

What changes, if any, will be made to the program based on assessment results? Some have been put into place already. A comprehensive evaluation will take place in 2008, following the completion of our 4-year cycle of reviews, as specified in the Assessment Plan. Assessment remains on track, and is inevitably a "work in progress" with as yet few modifications of the basic plans. The chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore meet daily with our graduate students, and each year each faculty member is asked to provide an "annual evaluation of progress" for students mentored. These evaluations are then discussed by all faculty at a general meeting of the chemistry graduate faculty.

For the PhD program we have implemented the following modifications in the curriculum: (1) The organic division implemented a program of study for organic students wherein a full year of graduate organic synthesis is accommodated in the first year of study. This is designed to strengthen the students’ knowledge of reagents, synthetic transformations and design. With the completion of the 4-year cycle of reviews, we will evaluate new modification beyond (1) modified instruments now used for annual evaluation by mentors What changes, if any, will be made to the program based on assessment results? Some have been put into place already. A comprehensive evaluation will be made in 2008 following the completion of our 4-year cycle of reviews, as specified in the Assessment Plan. Assessment remains on track, and is inevitably a "work in progress" with as yet few modifications of the basic plans. The chemistry graduate program by its very nature has, since its beginning, developed a strong assessment element and modified it over the decades. Graduate students take all of their courses and conduct all of their dissertation laboratory work within research
groups housed in research laboratories within our building. We therefore meet daily with our graduate students, and each year each faculty member is asked to provide an "annual evaluation of progress" for students mentored. These evaluations are then discussed by all faculty at a general meeting of the chemistry graduate faculty.

For the PhD program we have implemented the following modifications in the curriculum: (1) the organic division is implementing a program of study for organic students wherein a full year of graduate organic synthesis is accommodated in the first year of study. This is designed to strengthen the students’ knowledge of reagents, transformations and design. We are proposing no new modification beyond (1) modified instruments now used for annual evaluation by mentors, (2) 4-page evaluation rating instrument for student seminars and (3) the added charge to the Department's Curriculum and Assessment Committee to Implementation plan responsibilities were modified to reflect revised departmental committee structure for 2003-2004. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is now responsible for assessment, with assistance from the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies committees.

Department of Physics
Physics Program

A process to modify the PhD qualifying exam has been implemented.

The Plasma Theory course proposed received University approval.

The new 700-level class on Plasma Theory will be offered in spring 2009. Also, there is a 700-level class on Inertial Confinement Fusion in fall 2008, and a 700-level class on Plasma Spectroscopy will likely be offered in Fall 2009. The Graduate Committee will look into ways the department can offer additional electives and increase the forward planning of them, so students can better plan for them. To increase the uniformity of administration of the oral component of the Physics Comprehensive Exam, the graduate faculty plan to write guidelines for faculty Comprehensive Examination committees. To build a bigger student cohort, and increase the fraction with research support, the program is increasing its effort to recruit students.

A process for notifying PhD students of lack of progress is implemented.

Interdisciplinary Degree Programs
Department of Atmospheric Sciences
Atmospheric Sciences Program

We have used an Annual Student Progress report for the second year now, and it is helping in establishing common ground between the students and faculty members about learning objectives for the coursework and research. We introduced a new Graduate Seminar in Spring 2005 for Atmospheric Sciences students, and this has provided new focus on communications, professional development and scientific ethics. Program modifications that have been spurred by the assessment process include the addition of ATMS 790 (Graduate Seminar) and updated degree requirements that allow more flexibility for interdisciplinary studies. As outlined in the Plan Report from 2003, the Atmospheric Sciences Curriculum Committee and additional ATMS faculty used the results of the past year's assessment process to develop program modifications on courses offered, curriculum requirements, student recruitment and student advisement. Several changes have been implemented.
In order to improve student communications skills and provide students with an opportunity to explore the broader applications of their science to societal issues, we have added a new Graduate Seminar course (ATMS 790). In the past, we did not have an ATMS graduate seminar class and we have had our students take PHYS 790. The new ATMS course will allow the students to focus on seminar topics specifically related to atmospheric sciences applied research topics. In addition, this course will be follow a format that addresses several aspects of professional development such as presenting lectures, preparing a resume, composing a conference poster, and developing research proposals.

Another change that we are implementing in our graduate curriculum (starting 2005) is to remove our previous "three-track" specialization options (Meteorology; Atmospheric Physics; Atmospheric Chemistry) to permit a more flexible, interdisciplinary curriculum for atmospheric science professions in the nation and world today. The new curriculum guidelines allow the student and advisor to develop a degree plan that can link more substantially with other disciplines such as engineering, hydrology, geography, public health and even humanities (political sciences, journalism, education) -- to provide experience and training that will help meet professional opportunities related to climate change impacts, air pollution pressures, water resource management and environmental policy.

**Department of Cell & Molecular Biology**

**Cell & Molecular Biology Program**

We have established an Admissions/Recruitment committee that will attempt to ensure a steady stream qualified students. We also have established a Student Assessment Committee to track progress.

**Department of Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology & Physiology**

**Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology & Physiology Program**

With the fall of the MCB umbrella interdisciplinary graduate program, the CMPP program which was created approximately 15 years ago was resurrected in 2004. The program was completely restructured in 2005 with the implementation of new guidelines and procedures in accordance with the Graduate School bylaws, and an extensive revision of the curriculum. Eight new graduate students were admitted in the program this year. We should be able to assess the impact of these program modifications in a few years.

**Department of Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology**

**Ecology, Evolution, & Conservation Biology Program**

We have developed a data base to track our students, which we update each semester. EECB has also adopted a small grants program to encourage research and professional activity by our students.
I have rewritten the Assessment Plan with more realistic learning outcomes and performance indicators. The EECB secretary will compile the data on the performance indicators for each student in each entering cohort, starting with the 2005 cohort. At the end of the 2005-06 academic year these data will be examined by the Program Director and the Curriculum Committee for possible further modification. After a few years meaningful cross-cohort comparisons will be possible.

**Department of Hydrologic Sciences**  
**Hydrogeology Program**

The Program is implementing an exit interview for all graduating students. This interview will include a brief survey to aid in the assessment process and to acquire future contact and employer information.

**Department of Hydrologic Sciences**  
**Hydrology Program**

The Program is implementing an exit interview for all graduating students. This interview will include a brief survey to aid in the assessment process and to acquire future contact and employer information.

**Department of Social Psychology**  
**Social Psychology Program**

The program has modified its research methods course (taken during 2nd semester of the first year) so that students are expected to connect to a faculty member for the purpose of writing a research proposal (which can later become the basis for the second year project). Thus, the present and last first-year cohorts have already gravitated toward the model of obtaining an advisor after their first semester. The program needs to follow the results to determine if students progress in their research and program completion more quickly with this model, or whether premature commitment delays progress by the student stopping and changing direction after beginning research. Further examination is warranted, followed by consideration whether some formal change in the program policy is desirable.
Appendix 3I

Core Curriculum Assessment

Core Writing Program

Assessment in the Core Writing Program has been continuous since 2000. Currently, assessment is taking place for ENG 101, the first of two required Core Writing courses. Artifacts were gathered from students in ENG 101 during the Fall 2008 semester. The data are in the process of analysis and a full report is expected in May 2009. The remaining discussion on assessment in this report is a chronology of events since 2000 for the Core Writing Program.

First portfolio program assessment: In Spring 2000, the Core Writing Program collected 200 portfolios from a random sample of students enrolled in ENG 102, the second of two required Core Writing courses (Exhibit 2.2i). The faculty wanted to see what students leaving the first-year writing program were able to do in areas like sentence construction, focus and development, reflective thinking, and use of sources. The assessment was designed to closely examine fifteen features of writing via the use of a rubric. Trained readers scored the student portfolios. The study revealed that the majority of the students were performing competently or more than competently in most of the areas being assessed. However, areas of weaknesses were also identified; these areas included critical thinking, critical reading and interpretation, use of documented sources of information, and conclusions.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Establishment of ENG 102 Orientation for instructors
- Curriculum alignment for ENG 102 courses
- Establishment of Follow-up Assessment Committee

Follow-up assessment project: After reviewing the original assessment report, the Core Writing Program director with the support of the Core Writing Center Committee decided to pursue a smaller follow-up portfolio assessment (Exhibit 2.2j), focusing on three of the areas of weakness identified in the 2000 assessment project. In spring 2001, The Core Writing Program collected 100 portfolios from a random sample of students enrolled in English 102. Trained readers scored the portfolios using a revised rubric. Students showed improvement in all evaluated areas. Marked improvement was documented for the areas of “critical thinking” and “incorporation and documentation of sources.” The Core Writing Center Committee believes that the increased attention paid to reading and research practices in 2001 (as a result of curriculum alignment and instructor training) may have contributed to the improved student learning outcomes.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Continuation of ENG 102 Orientation for instructors
- Focused critical reading objectives for ENG 102
- English 102 Colloquia for instructors

ESL program assessment: In AY2001-02, the department of English, with support from the Office of Instructional Enhancement and the Office of the Core Curriculum, and under the guidance of the Core Writing Program director, conducted an assessment of the English as a Second Language core
courses, ENG 113 and ENG 114. The assessment is a detailed descriptive study of the abilities of entering students in ENG 113 and exiting students in ENG 114 (Exhibit RE2.2k). Two scoring rubrics were developed for each course and a random sample of student writing assignments were collected from all course sections offered during Fall 2001 and Spring 2002. In addition to assessing students’ work, students were asked to submit self-reflexive comments about their development as writers over the course of the semester.

Students’ writings were assessed in the areas of content, organization, word choice, language use, documentation, mechanics and development as writers. The assessment showed that students exiting ENG 114 achieved a very high level of competence in all the assessment features. (An average overall achievement score of 5.08 out of 6 is documented for ENG 114 students.)

The assessment of ENG 113 students demonstrated that students are entering the class with varying levels of ability in different areas. While “mechanics” and “content” ranked highest, it is not surprising that the areas of “vocabulary” and “fluency” showed the lowest level of achievement. (An average overall achievement score of 2.44 out of 6 is documented for ENG 113 students.)

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Review of ENG 113 placement procedures with the Intensive English Language Center (IELC)
- Curriculum re-designed to focus on areas of weakness identified in the assessment

Continuation of the assessment cycle: The Core Writing Program—once again with support from the Office of Instructional Enhancement and the Office of the Core Curriculum—completed another portfolio-based assessment project in 2006 (Exhibit 2.2a). The purpose of the assessment was to focus on the evaluation of critical thinking skills and to fine-tune the ENG 102 course objectives by delving into what Core Writing instructors value and how they express those values. The assessment process, begun in Fall 2004, took nearly two years to complete, involved quantitative and qualitative components, and required extensive staff training (of assessment readers) to ensure consistent valuation of student work.

Trained readers used a rubric to evaluate the portfolios gathered from students in ENG 102. The assessment readers scored student portfolios that included final, polished drafts with the students’ best work. Not surprisingly, students were competent or more than competent in the areas of sentence and word level matters (known commonly as “grammar”). Students also showed mastery in critical thinking skills including identification of a problem and its complexities, rhetorical awareness and integration of supporting detail or evidence. Students showed some difficulty in the evaluation of others’ perspectives and assumptions, evaluation of own perspectives and assumptions and the use of documentation or citation. The assessment readers commented that the main reason why students showed weakness in the use of documentation or citation was difficulty with form (missing works cited pages, incomplete or incorrectly formatted information, etc.). Readers described this oversight as “losing track of the finer details” of these particular conventions rather than having no knowledge of attribution.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Increased and focused attention in both ENG 101 and ENG 102 on critical thinking as it relates to reading college-level texts and the critical reading required while doing researched writing (Exhibit 2.2h)
• Professional development (instructor training) on teaching the proper format of scholarly writing (Exhibit 2.2h)
• Professional development (instructor training) on how particular kinds of assignments might elicit more substantive critical response to sources as well as reflective critique (Exhibit 2.2f)
• Curriculum alignment with K-12 faculty to review alignment of learning outcomes associated with high school and college writing programs.

In sum, the Core Writing Program has completed various assessment cycles and continues to conduct assessment on an ongoing basis. As a result of the assessment process, the Core Writing Program has implemented changes in pedagogy, modified course content to ensure curriculum alignment, offered professional training for its program faculty and TAs, and developed a contextually-valid assessment tool. Furthermore, the Core Writing Program Director and colleagues have presented their research findings at several national conferences in the field of rhetoric and composition (Exhibit 2.2l).

Core Mathematics Program

Assessment in the Core Mathematics Program has been strong since 2005. Currently, the Core Mathematics Program is piloting an early warning system for students at risk (described below) while other assessment projects remain in place. Taken as a whole, the assessment activity in the Core Mathematics Program has resulted in a significant restructuring of the Core and pre-Core curriculum (Exhibit 2.2b). The results of these assessment activities form the basis of this report section.

Restructuring the Core Mathematics Program: During Summer 2005 the Core Curriculum Office and the Mathematics and Statistics Department made the decision to establish a formal Core Mathematics Program and a new position—a Core Mathematics Director. The director would lead the program and be an effective liaison between the Department and the Office of the Core Curriculum. This position was modeled to some extent on that of the Core Writing Director in the English Department. The motivation behind this decision was multifold. First, there would be structure and guidance, both directly and indirectly, for the various temporary instructors teaching the lower division mathematics courses. Second, this structure and support would help improve curricular alignment throughout the pre-calculus series. Finally, each of these steps is consistent with the goals of the Office of the Core Curriculum of providing students with a common experience across the numerous sections of the Core Math courses thereby giving students the best opportunity to master the expected learning outcomes.

Initial stages of the assessment cycle: Beginning in Fall 2005, the Core Mathematics program has administered a series of assessments focused on student engagement, placement, and success issues. A novel ClaSSE (in-Class NSSE/FSSE) survey was conducted (Exhibit 2.2m). Faculty was asked to identify “expected behaviors for success” and students were surveyed regarding their participation in learning activities. The ClaSSE then was used to identify the degree of alignment between faculty expectations and reported student behavior. The results of the survey indicated that the student behavior and faculty expectations were fairly well aligned.

Another early assessment project also conducted in 2005 involved syllabus analysis and formulation of student learning outcomes in MATH 096, 120, 124, 127, 128, 176, and 181 and in Stat 152 (the entire pre-Core and Core Math curriculum). At the time of the assessment, each Core Math course was taught in many small (35 student) sections, by a few lecturers, along with numerous part-time instructors and teaching assistants. Initial analysis of different instructors’ syllabi, exams and pass rates indicated widely varying content and levels of rigor in the different sections. Coordinators were appointed for each Core Math course and the coordinators facilitated a discussion between instructors
leading to the creation of a common syllabus. Furthermore, the coordinators began monitoring the exams for uniformity.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Establishment of Core Math course Coordinators
- Syllabus and course content alignment (Exhibit 2.2b)

Curriculum alignment assessment: With well-defined syllabi in hand, the Core Mathematics Program began the next phase of assessment, which was an examination of alignment of the curriculum in the prerequisite sequence MATH 096, MATH 124, MATH 128, as well as analysis of student success rates in these courses. It was determined that the MATH 124: College Algebra course overlapped significantly with the pre-requisite course, MATH 096: Intermediate Algebra, and also overlapped significantly with MATH 128: Pre-calculus. In addition, the pass rate in the 5 credit MATH 128 course was quite low. Based on this information, and armed with a clearer description of the curriculum in each of these courses, the Core Mathematics Program eliminated MATH 124 in Fall 2006, and instead began offering a two-semester alternative, MATH 126 and MATH 127, which together bring a student from MATH 096 level algebra skills to a mastery of MATH 128 material. The MATH 126/127 sequence (initiated in Fall 2007) is now used by over 80% of the students who need this preparation, and the success rate has improved significantly over the old MATH 128 success rate. This process of assessment, syllabus analysis, and curriculum reform setting the stage for further, more refined assessment was reported by two Core Math faculty at the 5th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference (Exhibit 2.2n).

With the curriculum realigned, and with the coordination structure for Core Math classes in place, the Core Mathematics Program was in a position to fully define the student learning outcomes for all courses in the Core sequence examined during this phase of assessment. The Program made the student learning outcomes available to all instructors. Additionally, the student learning outcomes were made available on the Core Math Web site (http://www.unr.edu/math/core/index.html) and shared with K-12 educators in Nevada. Furthermore, common final exams (written by the course Coordinator, and graded by all the instructors at a post-exam grading session under the guidance of the Coordinator) were instituted in all the pre-calculus sequence courses, allowing objective assessment of the achievement of learning outcomes across multiple sections (see Exhibit 2.2b).

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Elimination of MATH 124
- Creation of MATH 126/127 sequence
- Definition of student learning outcomes for all Core Math courses
- Posting and/or dissemination of Core Math student learning outcomes to various constituencies
- Establishment of common final exams

Large and small class assessment: In Fall 2006, an assessment of student success in large (150 student) and small (45 student) sections of the same classes was conducted (Exhibit 2.2b). The target courses were MATH 126 (Pre-calculus I) and MATH 181 (Calculus I). The assessment suggested that success rates in large sections could be greater than in the small sections. As a result of the assessment the Mathematics and Statistics Department moved forward, with some confidence, with plans to deliver Core and pre-Core Math classes using large lecture sections. Student input was used to aid in the design of the recitation sessions, in terms of quantity and format. Core Math faculty also examined a comparison of student pre-test and post-test performance. Success rates, measured in terms of “ABC” and “DFW” percent continue to be encouraging. The findings of this assessment
activity were reported by another Core Mathematics faculty at the 5th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference.

Through the use of large lectures, led by tenure-line or lecturer faculty, with recitations assisted by TAs, all students are exposed to instruction by full time instructors with Masters or Ph.D. degrees. Teaching assistants are given special training pertaining to their duties in the recitations (see Exhibit 2.2g), and all new TAs and instructors participate in a Core Mathematics Orientation to ensure that they understand the placement structure, departmental expectations, and learning outcomes pertaining to their course.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Creation and establishment of Recitations for large lecture courses
- Professional development (instructor training) for Core Math faculty

Accuplacer test assessment: The Department of Mathematics and Statistics has also introduced new placement policies. All prerequisites are now enforced and initial placement into Core and pre-Core Math courses is based on ACT and SAT math scores. Also, in Spring 2008, the department added a new placement vehicle, the Accuplacer placement test. This test allows the Core Mathematics Program to compare its prerequisites to those of other NSHE campuses, and to leverage nationwide data on what mastery levels of student learning outcomes correspond to certain placement scores. To ensure that the Core Mathematics Program placement cutoffs are effectively placing students into the right courses, the Program carried out an assessment in Fall 2008 to measure the success rates of students placed into MATH 126 via Accuplacer versus students placed there by other means. The success rate of both student cohorts was comparable, so the department has confidence that the placement cutoff is appropriate to ensure student success.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Enforcement of all Core Math pre-requisites
- Use of Accuplacer placement test

Current projects on assessment: The Core Math Program, in a joint effort with the office of Student Success Services and the support of the Office of the Core Curriculum, is piloting an early warning system for students at risk. Beginning in Spring 2009, the system will identify students at risk around the third or fourth week of classes and again after the first exam. The aim is to target students at risk well before the university-wide mid-semester warning system and the course drop deadline, giving the students more time to take advantage of student support resources and allowing various student services groups to follow-up to increase the changes for student success in Core Math courses.

Finally, using pre- and post-tests, specific alignment of the pre-Core class, MATH 096 Intermediate Algebra, and the College Algebra course, MATH 126 Pre-calculus I, has been assessed. During Fall 2008, an assessment project was undertaken to examine how well the MATH 096 course serves students as preparation for MATH 126. Two-hundred students in a MATH 126 class were given a pre-test. The test scores were compared with scores from students that had completed MATH 096 and students entering MATH 126 directly via the placement tests. Surprisingly, the post-MATH 096 students were more likely to withdraw from MATH 126 at the beginning of the semester, but of those that stayed in the course, the pass rate was very high. This assessment points out the need for further assessment to find out what characteristics of the post-MATH 096 students make them at greater risk of withdrawal, and how the Core Mathematics Program can best support these students.
Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Institute plan to identify students at risk earlier in the semester
- Develop new assessment tool to predict student withdrawal

Development of new Core Math course: A new course, MATH 131, was added to the Core Curriculum in 2008. The course emphasizes quantitative reasoning skills, mathematical thinking and abstraction; it requires the application and interpretation of real world data. A course assessment tool, designed by the Core Mathematics Director, will be used to measure student performance and content mastery. The results of the assessment process will be used to improve future implementations of the course. Specifically, assessment results concerning model formulation and interpretation, abstraction and mathematics appreciation will guide which kinds of applications are used in the future and how the class time is allotted to the different topics and activities. The assessment of student learning of algebra techniques and key concepts will allow the faculty to better tie these techniques in with prerequisite material. Feedback on the use of spreadsheet technology will allow faculty to improve the types of spreadsheet lab activities used to familiarize the students with the technology.

In sum, the Core Mathematics Program is engaged in a continuous process of assessment. As a result of the assessment process, the Core Mathematics Program has implemented changes in pedagogy, modified course content to ensure curriculum alignment, offered professional training for its program faculty and TAs, and developed various assessment tools. Furthermore, the Core Mathematics Program developed new core courses (MATH 126, 127, and 131) to better address the needs of students. Finally, the Core Mathematics Program Director and colleagues have presented their research findings at regional conferences on assessment (Exhibit 2.2n).

Natural Science

The Office of the Core Curriculum offers individual support to faculty in the Natural Sciences. Because faculty who teach Core courses are found among numerous university departments, assessment is not led by a “Director” as is the case with the Core Writing and Core Mathematics programs. Instead, a Natural Science Sub-Committee is charged with the evaluation of common elements found across the Natural Sciences Core courses, such as the requirement of a laboratory experience.

Since the 2007 Accreditation visit, the Natural Sciences faculty has been asked to clearly outline the student learning outcomes for each Core course and to develop assessment plans. To support these efforts, a request for proposals was sent to all Core Natural Science faculty in May 2008. Summer stipends were offered to faculty to support activity developing assessment plans for courses taught in Fall 2008 (Exhibit 2.2o). All proposals received were funded by the Office of the Core Curriculum.

Assessment has been conducted in physical anthropology, biology, environmental studies, and psychology. In addition, the Core Mathematics and Natural Science Sub-Committee has been evaluating the required natural science laboratory experiences. The goal is to refine the expected student learning outcomes associated with the laboratory component of these classes.

Course-specific information:

Anthropology: A review of ANTH 102: Introduction to Physical Anthropology, was conducted by the Department of Anthropology, with the assistance of the Office of the Core Curriculum. The purpose of the review was twofold: 1) To determine to what extent the course met the core curriculum objectives and 2) To determine to what extent students were aware of the core skills and objectives.
being met through this course. The review took place in Fall 2006 and Fall 2008. The documents included in the course review included the course syllabus, homework assignment descriptions, and a sampling of student assignments and exams.

The review of Fall 2006 course materials showed that students were required to effectively complete a task that may have involved one or more of the Core Curriculum objectives. However, the language used in the assignment descriptions did not explicitly describe the skill or objective(s) being practiced. While some key terms were used in the course materials, the specific instructions for each course assignment did not always tie the homework assignment to a particular Core skill or student learning objective.

For Fall 2008, the instructor included clearly defined student learning objectives in the course syllabus and course assignment instruction pages. The objectives outline the various concepts and principles students should master at the completion of the course.

The main instructor for ANTH 102 attended an assessment workshop in Summer 2008 to develop an assessment tool for this course. Data were collected in Fall 2008 and continue to be reviewed. As a result of this assessment activity, the instructor and course TAs took a course on “Clickers” and have begun using this application regularly in class. “Clickers” allow the professor to immediately measure the level of student comprehension of course material.

Changes made as a result of assessment:
- Redesign of course syllabus to include student learning outcomes
- Development of clearly articulated course assignment language
- Curriculum alignment to more effectively tie lecture and homework material to student learning outcomes
- Use of “Clickers” in the classroom

Biology: The department of biology continues to develop an assessment tool for BIOL 100: Biology: Principles and Application. The process, begun in Summer 2008, has included the development of student learning objectives with the corresponding modules and performance indicators. A pre-test was administered in Fall 2008 to students enrolled in BIOL 100. The faculty is making changes to the pre-test survey because it believes that the pre-test assessment tool needs modification to better assess the student learning objectives. A concept mapping exercise was also administered to students to further address additional student learning objectives. These data are still being reviewed.

In an effort to make course learning objectives more transparent to biology students, the course objectives are now listed on the course syllabus. Also, grading rubrics for journal writing assignments clearly show students how well they are meeting each course objective.

Changes made as a result of assessment:
- Redesign of pre-test assessment tool
- Redesign of course syllabus to include student learning outcomes
- Development of clearly articulated course assignment language

The biology faculty is working to improve the course evaluation document for BIOL 100. The currently required document includes questions that are generalized for the entire department. An effort is being made to add course-specific questions that will specifically address student learning
objectives and provide rich information regarding student’s self-assessment of their achievement in meeting the course objectives.

The biology faculty will adopt a new text beginning in Fall 2009. The reason for the change in text is the publisher’s offering of an online pre- and post assessment tool. Instructors who participate in this assessment exercise are able to view and compare data from students enrolled in similar courses nationwide. In addition, instructors are able to compare their own course data across time.

A new course, BIOL 125 was designed and is being reviewed by the Core Board for approval into the Core Curriculum. At this time, the Core Board has tentatively approved the course to be offered to honors students only.

Planned change:
- Modification of BIOL 101 course evaluation document
- Adoption of new text for BIOL 101
- Offering of BIOL 125 to the general student population

Environmental Studies: Since 2005, pre- and post assessment of student knowledge level attainment has been conducted in ENV 100: Humans and the Environment. The primary instructor responsible for this course uses an online assessment tool called the SALG, the Student Assessment of Learning Gains. Students respond to the statement “I have a good understanding of (science topic)” for each of the topics covered in ENV 100 (scientific method, science communication, biogeochemical cycles, biomes, evolution, ecology, human population growth and impacts, agriculture and the environment, toxicology, the atmosphere, air pollution, global climate change, water issues, biodiversity, nonrenewable energy sources, renewable energy sources, and watersheds). Students assess their own knowledge level about each topic and respond with “strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.” The MANOVA P-values have shown overall statistically significant change in self-assessed knowledge levels. As a result of this assessment, the instructor modified the laboratory exercises to include a more rigorous writing and calculation component. Furthermore, the instructor shared the success of her experience using this assessment tool at the 6th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference.

Changes made as a result of assessment:
- Redesigned laboratory exercises

Psychology: The Department of Psychology concluded a Program Review Self Study in Fall 2008 (Exhibit 2.2p). One of the purposes of the Self Study was to review the department’s contribution to the university’s Core Curriculum.

Assessment in PSY 103: Introduction to Psychology as a Natural Science, has been underway since 2007. Student learning outcomes are assessed through the use of a pre- and post Knowledge Survey. Using a three-point scale, students assess their own knowledge level about a range of topics including: the scientific study of behavior, biology and psychology, sensation and perception, psychology across the lifespan, and psychological disorders. In 2007, students showed gains in all categories (e.g. from 14.9% to 24.9% gains were reported for each category measured). The data for 2008 are in the process of being evaluated. As a result of the assessment, the psychology faculty had
added observational assessment of instructor’s skills. However, the faculty is not ready to make additional changes or course modifications until all the assessment data are analyzed.

**Changes made as a result of assessment:**

- Observational assessment component added

**Social Science**

The process of assessment in the Social Sciences is similar to the Natural Sciences. The Office of the Core Curriculum offers individual support to faculty in the Social Sciences. Because faculty who teach Core courses are found among numerous university departments, assessment is not led by a “Director” as is the case with the Core Writing and Core Mathematics programs.

Since the 2007 Accreditation visit, the Social Sciences faculty has been asked to clearly outline the student learning outcomes for each Core course and to develop assessment plans. To support these efforts, a request for proposals was sent to all Core Social Science faculty in May 2008. Summer stipends were offered to faculty to support activity developing assessment plans for courses taught in Fall 2008 (Exhibit 2.20). All proposals received were funded by the Office of the Core Curriculum.

Assessment has been conducted in cultural anthropology, psychology, resource economics, sociology, and women’s studies.

**Course-specific information:**

**Anthropology:** Instructors of Core courses in cultural anthropology attended an assessment workshop in Summer 2008. At this workshop, faculty discussed the development of assessment tools, implementation of data collection, and assessment reporting requirements. The conversation started in the summer was continued and augmented in Fall 2008. Assessment of core courses formed part of the agenda at the department’s monthly faculty meetings. These discussions culminated in a presentation by the Office of University Assessment staff on curriculum mapping.

In Fall 2008, assessment data were collected for ANTH 101: Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. The data included a pre-Knowledge Survey where students were asked early in the semester to show their skill level on key course objectives. Other assessment activities conducted later in the semester included responses to common test questions and a post of the Knowledge Survey.

An initial review of the assessment data showed that there were some inconsistencies in data collection. Also, there was some confusion by students regarding the language on the Knowledge Survey. The faculty has agreed to develop a common scoring rubric so that the data collected in future semesters are uniform. To further assure consistency in the data collection process, the faculty will develop an “Instructor Assessment Packet” for faculty teaching ANTH 101. The packet will describe the assessment processes, including the assessment common test questions and the scoring rubric. Additional resources and materials may be included as needed.

To further make students aware of the Core Curriculum objectives being emphasized in this course, instructors will include the student learning outcomes in their course syllabus and/or on course assignments (as relevant). Finally, the Anthropology Department’s Core Curriculum committee is meeting with the Anthropology Department’s Web Page Design Committee to discuss placing the Core Curriculum objectives and Core course student learning outcomes on the Anthropology Department’s Web page.
Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Development of assessment scoring rubric
- Development of “Instructor Assessment Packet”
- Redesign of course syllabus to include student learning outcomes

A similar assessment process to ANTH 101 was implemented for ANTH 201: Peoples and Cultures of the World. Faculty attended a summer workshop on assessment, developed assessment tools, and implemented new data collection and reporting requirements. The instructors for ANTH 201 have a common scoring rubric, though some of the language within the rubric is in the process of modification for purposes of clarity. Assessment data were collected for ANTH 201 in Fall 2008. The findings indicate that around 80% of students were meeting the course student learning outcomes in a satisfactory or excellent fashion. Students seemed to have most trouble with the student learning outcome that dealt with the understanding and application of theoretical perspectives to topics studied. The instructors found that using embedded assessment was an effective way to measure student performance.

ANTH 201 instructors met to specifically discuss the goals of the Core Curriculum and how this course meets some of those goals. As with ANTH 101, instructors for ANTH 201 have added a section on the course syllabus that clearly outlines how the course meets the Core Curriculum objectives.

Changes made as a result of assessment:

- Redesign of assessment scoring rubric
- Redesign of course syllabus to include student learning outcomes
- Discussion of student learning outcomes with students on the first day of class

Psychology: The Department of Psychology concluded a Program Review Self Study in Fall 2008 (Exhibit 2.2p). One of the purposes of the Self Study was to review the department’s contribution to the university’s Core Curriculum.

In order to accommodate the large number of students who would like to take PSY 101: Introduction to Psychology as a Social Science, the department developed a self-paced program of instruction to deliver this course. Self-Paced, Interactive, Networked System of Instruction (SPIN) is a modified version of Personalized System of Instruction (an instructional design technology that was pioneered by Fred Keller in the early 1960s). The PSY 101 system of instruction (SPIN) has been designed to maximize students’ active responding and enhance their personalized learning of the course material. The maintenance of this system has required the instruction and management of approximately 1200 students per year since Fall 2000. Prior to 2000, the course was taught in a related but different format. Instruction of this course requires a great deal of supervision of graduate students and undergraduate lab managers. Because of the tradition in the Behavior Analysis Program of ongoing assessment of program outcomes, a great deal of data have been gathered, analyzed and disseminated (see Exhibit 2.2q).

The study findings demonstrate that a majority (i.e., 80% in Spring 2007; 70% in Fall 2007 and Spring of 2008; 73% in Fall 2008) of PSY 101 students received a grade of C or higher in the SPIN system during 2007 and 2008.
The study also finds an average of 30% learning gain in this course since Fall 2002. Further, the overall consumer satisfaction data for the year suggest that a high percentage (average of 66% for Spring 2007, Fall 2007, Spring 2008 and Fall 2008) of students would recommend this course to their friends.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of SPIN as an instructional system, psychology graduate student assistants conducted a series of systematic component analyses in the form of theses and dissertation projects in this system. One of the experimental studies in SPIN titled “Differential Effects of Elaborate Feedback and Basic Feedback on Student Performance in a Modified PSI Course” was recently accepted for publication (in press) in a refereed journal (Journal of Behavioral Education). In addition, graduate students implemented the use of “Clickers” (instant voting devices) in group discussion sessions in Spring 2007 to promote active responding component of the SPIN. As shown in the course evaluation for Spring 2007, students who came into contact with this technology found it extremely useful as a source of learning. Accordingly, the department has implemented students’ usage of Clicker technology as of Fall 2008. In order to systematically examine the impact of use of Clicker technology on students’ performance, the Department of Psychology is currently (Spring 2009) conducting assessment of the Clicker component of PSY 101.

Changes made as a result of assessment:
- Implementation of Clicker technology in all course sections

Resource Economics: The primary instructor who teaches RECO 100: Society and the Economic Value of Nature, developed an assessment tool in Fall 2008 to measure the course’s student learning outcomes. The assessment questions were embedded into the course assignments, including a weekly journal, book reviews, and a research paper. The quality of the analysis of course material and student’s demonstration of effectively communicating the ideas central to economic theory were measured several times throughout the semester. For example, by the end of the semester, 70% of students were fully using microeconomic theory appropriately in their discussion of current issues in weekly journals, while an additional 20% of students were appropriately discussing microeconomic theory to some degree. Students’ average scores also increased in the areas of critical evaluation and in the understanding of the fundamental linkages between society, the economy, and the environment. Based on the assessment findings, the instructor is planning to incorporate in-class group activities to increase student’s own exchange of ideas about microeconomics.

Planned change:
- Redesign of in-class group activities to provide a forum for student exchanges

Sociology: In Summer 2008, the sociology faculty developed an assessment tool with defined student learning outcomes. Data were collected in Fall 2008 and a report with the survey results was completed in January 2009. A total of 401 students across seven different sections of SOC 101: Principles of Sociology, took the assessment survey. The assessment tool measured student’s understanding of basic concepts of sociology and student’s development of an interest in societal processes. The survey results showed that 59% of students surveyed fully met the learning outcome: “Students will develop an understanding of basic concepts of sociology.” Student course evaluations were used to measure to what extent students had developed an interest in societal processes. The survey results indicated that 68% of students fully met the learning outcome. However, the faculty would like to develop a better assessment tool to address this second student learning outcome.
because it is believed that the language used in the assessment underestimated results. The faculty also recognized that the assessment tool was administered differently in the various class sections (e.g. some sections were incentivized with extra credit points). The next round of data collection will include a standardized administration of the assessment tool.

The SOC 101 assessment findings illustrated differences in student performance between students who had tenured or tenure-track faculty as instructors versus students who had temporary instructors (LOAs). The faculty is concerned about this discrepancy and is in the process of making modifications in how the department supports its temporary faculty. The goal is to close the student performance gap between courses taught by temporary and regular faculty.

**Planned change:**
- Modification of assessment tool to better address SLOs
- Professional development (instructor training) to assure consistency in data collection
- Development of assessment tool to measure differences in student learning between courses taught by temporary and regular faculty

*Women’s Studies:* In summer 2008, the women’s studies faculty developed an assessment tool with defined student learning outcomes for WMST 101: Introduction to Women’s Studies. Data were collected in Fall 2008 from three course sections. A report describing the assessment results was completed in January 2009. The assessment tool measured student learning in five outcome areas including knowledge of feminist perspectives, and reasons for differences in women’s status worldwide, among others. The survey results showed that many students did improve their level of knowledge by the end of the semester. However, the assessment tool proved to be cumbersome and it failed to distinguish the levels of proficiency among students. The assessment tool is being revised with more clearly stated student learning outcomes.

**Planned change:**
- Modification of assessment tool to better address SLOs
- Development of embedded assessment tool

*Fine Arts*

Fine Arts faculty has revised their mission and vision statements. As a result of a small assessment study a new interdisciplinary fine arts course, SOTA 101: Introduction to the Arts, was piloted in Fall 2007. The particular thrust of this course was a multi-cultural approach to the fine arts. A course embedded assessment was built into the course proposal submitted to the Core Curriculum Board. The primary instructor for SOTA 101 presented the course assessment plan and design at the Rocky Mountain Association for Institutional Research Conference in Fall 2007.

Based on mid-semester assessment of student performance (grades) in Fall 2008, the instructor modified the exams to better accommodate the learning styles of students. Additionally, the new exam format (online) allowed the instructor to better assess students’ conceptual and analytical understanding of the material. An informal discussion with students suggested that students were happy with the adjustment because they were better able to demonstrate their knowledge level than with the previous testing format.
A round-table discussion with students, conducted at the end of the Fall 2008 semester, garnered information about students’ opinion regarding the course’s online component. Students responded favorably to the online interface with the instructor through WebCampus and to the online assignments and assessments. As a result of these qualitative findings, the instructor plans to expand the use of online content to enhance student learning.

The new instructor for SOTA 101 has designed a new assessment tool to be used as of Fall 2009. At the beginning of each semester, students in SOTA 101 complete an online self-assessment that measures their base knowledge about the arts. At the end of the semester, a post self-assessment tool will be administered, also online. This tool will allow the instructor to measure gains in student learning achievement over the course of the semester.

**Planned change:**
- Redesign of assessment tool to include online Knowledge Survey
- Design of assessment tool to measure student learning gains via embedded assessment

**Core Humanities**

In Spring 2007, in response to updated Core Curriculum learning objectives, and in collaboration with the College of Liberal Arts administration, the Core Humanities faculty developed specific student learning outcomes for each of the three Core Humanities classes, CH 201: Ancient and Medieval Cultures, 202: The Modern World, and 203: American Experience and Constitutional Change. A Core Humanities Assessment Web site was developed to communicate the learning outcomes to faculty and students (http://www.unr.edu/cla/ch/main_assess.htm).

In Fall 2008, the Interim Core Humanities Director worked with Core Humanities faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of student course evaluations as an assessment tool. The student evaluation form was redesigned to include questions based on expected learning outcomes. This evaluation tool was coupled with a portfolio-based assessment of student learning outcomes and the results of alumni and employer survey data (Exhibit 2.2c).

Finally, the Interim Core Humanities Director presented material on assessing a humanities discipline at the 5th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference.

**Changes made as a result of assessment:**
- Redesign of course syllabus to include student learning outcomes
- Adoption of new Instructor Evaluation Instrument

**Planned change:**
- Evaluate data from Instructor Evaluation forms in summer 2009
- Establish substantive ways for non-Core Humanities faculty to discuss with Core Humanities faculty the student learning outcomes of the Core Humanities Program
- Develop ways to educate current students and non-Core Humanities faculty about the long-term benefits of the Core Humanities Program

**Diversity**
Diversity courses span a broad range of disciplines. The Diversity Sub-Committee developed a survey to audit existing assessment activities in Diversity courses. A preliminary rubric has been developed based on Diversity course criteria (Exhibit 2.2d). The Diversity Sub-Committee will work with Diversity faculty this semester (Spring 2009) to refine the rubric. The goal is for faculty teaching Diversity courses to pilot use of the rubric in Fall 2009.

**Planned change:**

- Administer assessment rubric in Fall 2009
- Analyze assessment data in Summer 2010

**Capstone**

Likewise, Capstone courses span a broad range of disciplines. The Capstone Sub-Committee developed and administered a survey to audit existing assessment activities in Capstone courses (Exhibit 2.2e). The Capstone Sub-Committee has asked the Writing Center director to work with Capstone faculty to conduct critical thinking and writing assessment in Capstone courses. (The Writing Center director’s scholarship focuses on writing across the curriculum.) The goal of the Office of the Core Curriculum is to perform pilot assessments in Spring 2009 and expand the assessment activity for Fall 2009.

**Planned change:**

- Conduct pilot assessment in Spring 2009
- Implement full assessment in Fall 2009
- Analyze assessment data in Summer 2010

**List of Exhibits:**

- 2.2a 2006 Core Writing Program Assessment Report
- 2.2b 2009 Core Mathematics Program Review
- 2.2c 2009 Core Humanities Self Study Report
- 2.2d 2007 Diversity Assessment Rubric
- 2.2e 2007 Capstone Assessment Inventory
- 2.2f Core Writing Course Objectives
- 2.2g Specific Guidelines for Large Lecture Recitation TAs
- 2.2h Core Writing Program Orientation
- 2.2i 2000 Core Writing Program Assessment Report
- 2.2j 2002 Core Writing Program Follow-up Assessment Project
- 2.2k 2002 English as a Second Language Program Assessment Report
- 2.2l Conference Participation and Presentations, CWP Director
- 2.2m 2005 Core Math Student Engagement Survey Results
- 2.2n Core Math Program Faculty’s Conference Presentations
- 2.2o 2008 Core Natural & Social Sciences RFP for Summer Stipends
- 2.2p 2008 Department of Psychology Program Review Self Study Report
- 2.2q Department of Psychology Conferences and Publications
Colleagues: In preparation for responding to the Northwestern Accreditation review I need some information. By next week I need to report on how we evaluate LOA and other part time instructors, lecturers, LOAs and GTAs as well as how the information is used, e.g., determination of rehire or sit-down visits on how to improve teaching in response to class reviews. I'd appreciate a description of your college practice and policy by Friday, Dec. 12 at 5:00 pm. Thanks.
Marc Johnson
10 June 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: HEATHER K. HARDY, DEAN
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

FROM: HOWARD ROSENBERG, PROFESSOR

RE: DEPARTMENT EVALUATION OF LOA PERSONNEL

The Department of Art evaluates LOA Personnel on the same criteria and using the same referent points and materials used for full-time, tenure-track Faculty [excluding the Creative Work/Research and Service components].

Both Department Chair and Personnel Committee Chair:

1. review syllabi and course materials [books, art materials, etc.] to assure goals are established and consistency maintained.

2. engage in peer visitations/evaluations to observe and evaluate [a] instructional atmosphere, [b] method[s] and technique[s] and [c] students' work and final production.

3. observe "student work" in progress [and on exhibit.] throughout each semester.

4. review grades, scores, etc.

5. review student evaluations of class and instructor.

The key to this process is continual communication. Faculty and Staff "visit" informally with one another; discussing students and "student work", how "the work" compares with other classes, at other times, etc. This information is both objective and anecdotal and allows for any issues to be quickly and effectively addressed.

The Department Chair and Personnel Committee Chair report to the Faculty during each semester and decisions as to rehires, etc. for the following semester are made by the full Faculty upon recommendation by Department Concentration Lead Instructor and Chair.

HR/hs
Heather Hardy

From: Miriella Melara
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2008 8:49 AM
To: Heather Hardy
Subject: RE: evaluation of LOAs

Heather,

The review of LOAs in my department is an informal process and is not written in the bylaws. The chair reviews students' evaluations (both numerical scores and comments) either twice per year when they are completed or once per year in January when other faculty evaluations are being reviewed. If numerical scores are below average or if certain student comments are of concern, the chair speaks with the LOA and indicates that there are problems. The LOA is given the opportunity to improve or correct those problems the following semester. If no improvement is shown, the LOA risks not getting reappointed. Usually course syllabi and materials are not reviewed because LOAs typically teach in multi-section courses and therefore follow the syllabus written by the coordinator for the language being taught. That coordinator also lets the chair know when an LOA does not properly follow the rules and procedures of that language section. The LOA receives no formal feedback (either positively or negatively). The chair's evaluation of the LOA is used solely for the purpose of making rehiring decisions.

In the spring we began discussions on improving our evaluation of LOAs but had to postpone further discussions until the fall.

I hope this is of some help.

Best,

Miriella
June 9, 2008

TO: Heather Hardy, Dean
    College of Liberal Arts

FROM: Gordon Zimmerman, Chair
      Speech Communication and Theatre

RE: LOA Evaluations

LOA instructors are selected by the department chair upon recommendation of the respective faculty of Speech Communication and Theatre. All first-time LOA’s in the past several years have been familiar to our faculty; no unknown applicants have been hired. In COM, we have seen them teach as TA’s in our graduate program. In THTR, we have observed their work at UNR or in the profession. In both programs, the M.A. or the M.F.A. are requisite degrees.

Evaluation of LOA teaching occurs every semester. However, because of the scheduling overlap (spring semester LOA hires must be made before fall semester has concluded), a fall semester appointment usually means a two-semester presumption of service.

Evaluation Procedure

1. **Student evaluations.** All LOA’s receive student evaluations in every section they teach. The chair reviews all evaluation summaries and comments. We seek mean scores in each category above the department average. (In general, the LOA’s as a group demonstrate higher mean scores than full time faculty in both COM and THTR.)

2. **Grade averages.** At the end of each semester, gpa’s of each LOA-taught section are reviewed to assure consistency with departmental norms. (At least two LOA’s have been counseled to be more discriminating in assigning A’s.) LOA grade averages in Wintermester, Mini-Session and Summer School are not included in the analysis.

3. **Observation.** At least one full-time faculty member observes new-hire LOA teaching. Rehire is based on that faculty feedback to the chair. (“Continuing” LOA’s are not directly observed by full-time faculty.)

4. **Annual Review.** The chair meets with at least one faculty member in either COM or TH to review performance and to determine whether the LOA should be retained for another academic year. This decision occurs before the fall schedule is finalized. During the rehire process, the chair discusses with the LOA his or her past teaching performance.

The LOA evaluation process relates only to rehiring decisions. No formal evaluation documents are prepared and no records are kept. Evaluation is used to assure ongoing quality of teaching and assist the chair in hiring decisions. COM and THTR personnel committees do not participate in the LOA evaluation process.
Heather Hardy

From: B. G Stitt
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2008 10:06 AM
To: Heather Hardy
Subject: RE: evaluation of LOAs

Heather,

Our LOAs are evaluated using our departmental evaluation form. Evaluations generate both numeric scores and student’s comments. These are then reviewed by me and copies of the scores and student’s comment are then returned to instructors for them to use in the consideration of modifying their courses. We have been very fortunate in being able to attract highly qualified criminal justice professionals who for the most part are excellent teachers. In cases where instructors have not met our standards they have not be continued. We also have collected and reviewed syllabi for review in light of assessment concerns.

I hope this helps.......

Grant

Dr. B. Grant Stitt
Professor and Chair
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, Nevada 89557-0026
(775)784-6165
Fax (775)784-6201

From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu [mailto:owner-cladepts@unr.edu] On Behalf Of Heather Hardy
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 2:00 PM
To: cladepts@unr.edu
Cc: clasects@unr.edu
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,
At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching,” “reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average,” “reviews syllabi and course materials”) and (2) how it relates to their reappointment (or not). (3) Do they receive any kind of formal feedback on this evaluation or is it used only for purposes of rehiring decisions?

I appreciate your help in my being able to report on this. If I can hear from you before next Tuesday I would be most grateful.

Heather
Here's the requested info for English. Most LOAs are in Core Writing, and Jane drafted that section, so I'm copying her. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Stacy

------------

Evaluation of Part-Time Instructors in the Department of English

200-400-level courses

- English hires few LOA instructors for 200-400-level courses. For the last five years, nearly all have been experienced instructors who currently or previously taught for the department for two or more years as teaching assistants or contingent faculty. Most have been PhD candidates hired to teach a single section of a course. Few teach courses on LOA more than a few times.
- The department chair does not regularly observe LOA instructors of these courses, but does if the instructor so requests. The chair reads student course evaluations for each 200-400-level section taught by an LOA, and instructors have access to their evaluations. These evaluations are a factor in the decision to rehire.

Core Writing Program

- Inexperienced part-time instructors are required to attend the August orientation for teaching assistants to learn Core Writing course outcomes and pedagogical best practices. Novice instructors have their teaching materials reviewed by experienced instructors, and they submit drafts for final review and revision (if necessary) before the beginning of the fall semester. LOAs who do not yet have an MA (all of whom are enrolled in our MA program) are required to take ENG 737, “Teaching College Language and Literature,” which focuses on composition theory and pedagogy and is taught by the CWP director. In 737, new instructors develop a syllabus and materials for their next assigned course.
- Experienced part-time instructors submit syllabi for each course within the first two weeks of each semester. The CWP assistant directors and the director review these, and, if needed, direct instructors to revise them to meet course guidelines.
- LOA instructors are observed at least once each year. LOAs who do not yet have MA degrees are observed by the director and their individual faculty mentors. Experienced LOAs are observed by the assistant directors. The CWP keeps formal reports of these observations on file, and instructors receive copies.
- Student evaluations for LOA instructors are reviewed each semester. The quantitative responses on the evaluation are tabulated, and, when scores are well below the mean, the discursive comments are reviewed very carefully. CWP keeps student evaluations for five years, and instructors have access to their evaluations.
- Should a course go seriously awry, the CWP director meets with the LOA instructor to discuss the LOA’s handling of the course and offer corrective feedback. If the instructor will not or cannot make the necessary adjustments, the director briefly explains (orally in or writing) why he or she will not be rehired. If the instructor requests a more formal explanation, the director responds with a letter.
Colleagues,
At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching,” “reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average,” “reviews syllabi and course materials”) and (2) how it relates to their reappointment (or not). (3) Do they receive any kind of formal feedback on this evaluation or is it used only for purposes of rehiring decisions?

I appreciate your help in my being able to report on this. If I can hear from you before next Tuesday I would be most grateful.

Heather

Heather K. Hardy
Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Professor of English
MS 086
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0008
Phone: (775) 784-6155
Fax: (775) 784-1478
hhardy@unr.edu
Hi Heather,

In all candor the Philosophy Department in general could do more with regard to LOA evaluations than it does now, but for that to happen some constituency needs to make it more of a priority than anyone has as yet done. Our formal response is “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching.”

Most of our LOAs have been with us for many years and are very much "known" individuals. Problematic LOAs were dropped. As Bill Cathey has acknowledged in the past this university couldn't function without its LOAs.

If there were a merit system in place for LOAs that would perhaps provide an incentive for fuller LOA evaluation, but in the current budget crisis such a suggestion is a real nonstarter. Every new priority and responsibility put on chairs comes at some opportunity cost, so more emphasis on LOA evaluation can be had, but always at the cost of something else not getting done. Forgive my "candor", but I am very aware that my chairmanship ends in three weeks.

Cordially yours,
Ken Lucey

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu on behalf of Heather Hardy
Sent: Fri 6/6/2008 2:00 PM
To: cladepts@unr.edu
Cc: clasects@unr.edu
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,

At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., "the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching," "reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average," "reviews syllabi and course materials") and (2) how it relates to their reappointment (or not). (3) Do they receive any kind of formal feedback on this evaluation or is it used only for purposes of rehiring decisions?
Heather Hardy

From: Phillip C Boardman
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 4:03 PM
To: Heather Hardy
Cc: Jodie E Helman; Neal Ferguson (nealf@unr.edu)
Subject: RE: evaluation of LOAs

Heather,

You just caught me before I left school for the day—or, for the week. Quickly, for your information, we have all teachers give out student evaluation forms. These are, so far, narrative forms on which students register comments about the main lecturer/lecture on one side and about the discussion leader/quiz section on the reverse. Because the teaching teams meet every week to hash out pedagogical problems as they arise, and because the lecturers customarily look at both sides of all the evaluations, the first evaluative response about LOA teaching comes from the lecturer, either in continuing team discussions or, eventually, if problems arise, with me. I don't usually read all the evaluations for the program, because all faculty and some TAs are evaluated by the departments and we provide copies of the evaluations to department personnel committees. I read the evaluations of LOAs about whom any student, any supervising teacher, or my own instinct suggests may have had a problem, especially for those who don't have a track record with us or for those who are teaching individual classes.

If problems do arise, I of course meet with the teacher about the issue, but I have not normally provided written comments to the teacher. The customary way to deal with LOAs who have continuing problems is simply not to rehire them in succeeding semesters. I will agree with what many said in the Chairs' Meeting, that we do not pay enough to put the LOAs through too obviously intensive an evaluation process, and we do not have a deep enough pool to pretend to standards of excellence we are not willing to pay for. In my experience—next fall we have more than twenty slots covered by fifteen different LOAs, most of them veteran teachers—we mostly get better teaching from our LOAs than we deserve. And the job of doing a serious written evaluation and consultation with this many LOAs would prove an immense burden to the director or any evaluation committee without the justifying rewards of merit, salary increases, etc. This new proposal seems set up to monitor and identify bad teaching practice and not to reward good teaching, and I think we're able to do this more unobtrusively already.

Anyway, that's my last weigh-in on this issue. Have a cool week (it's predicted to be unhealthily hot all week in Washington, high 90s).

Phil

From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu [mailto:owner-cladepts@unr.edu] On Behalf Of Heather Hardy
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 2:00 PM
To: cladepts@unr.edu
Cc: clasacts@unr.edu
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,
At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., "the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching," "reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average," "reviews syllabi and course materials") and (2) how it relates to their
Heather Hardy

From: Scott E Casper  
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 3:56 PM  
To: Heather Hardy  
Cc: Bruce T Moran  
Subject: RE: evaluation of LOAs

Heather,

We evaluate LOAs as follows:

1. LOAs, like all History faculty, have students complete course evaluation forms at the end of every semester.

2. The chair reviews those evaluations. I have done this in January, when I’m reading all the regular faculty’s student course evaluations for annual eval/merit review.

3. The chair also reviews most LOAs’ syllabi before the semester begins, to provide feedback. This is especially the case for new LOAs, whom we provide with a copy of our undergraduate skills template.

4. Generally, the chair does class visits/evaluations of LOAs: certainly new LOAs every term, and sometimes continuing ones. Those visits involve providing feedback to the LOA afterward. Sometimes there’s a repeat visit later in the term, for follow-up evaluation.

This system (if it can be called system) has not usually led to a decision not to rehire someone—although it has on occasion led to that outcome. We don’t use a lot of LOAs, and most of ours are longtime teachers in the department. Several earned graduate degrees in the department, i.e., we know them well.

Scott

Scott E. Casper  
Professor and Chair  
Department of History  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Reno, NV 89557

phone: 775-784-6484  
fax: 775-784-6805  
e-mail: casper@unr.edu

From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu [mailto:owner-cladepts@unr.edu] On Behalf Of Heather Hardy  
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 2:00 PM  
To: cladepts@unr.edu  
Cc: clasects@unr.edu  
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,

At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching,” “reviews quantitative scores and
The present method of evaluating LOA’s in Music and Dance is as follows:

1) The chair reviews all student evaluations of teaching
2) The heads of each area (i.e. voice, theory, music appreciation) review syllabi and course materials
3) Each LOA receives copies of student evals with short comments from the chair
4) In the case of too many negative evaluations, reappointment will be discussed.

Andrea Lenz
Chair, Dept. of Music and Dance
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0049
775-784-6145

From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu [mailto:owner-cladepts@unr.edu] On Behalf Of Heather Hardy
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 2:00 PM
To: cladepts@unr.edu
Cc: clasects@unr.edu
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,

At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching,” “reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average,” “reviews syllabi and course materials”) and (2) how it relates to their reappointment (or not). (3) Do they receive any kind of formal feedback on this evaluation or is it used only for purposes of rehiring decisions?

I appreciate your help in my being able to report on this. If I can hear from you before next Tuesday I would be most grateful.

Heather

Heather K. Hardy
Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Professor of English
MS 086
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0008
HI Heather, I would like to check in with you but am off to take dogs to vet in a bit.

The chair reviews all student evaluations and deals with any student issues that arise in the course. The chair also meets with LOAs on an as needed basis (by either instructor or Chair) to discuss issues and policy. The chair also collects and reviews syllabi.

If the performance is unsatisfactory, the chair meets with the LOA. The information is used primarily for rehiring decisions. Some of our LOAs are students in our graduate programs and the materials from their teaching is incorporated into their annual review of progress in their program. In that we have a goal of training academics, performance as an instructor is relevant.

Victoria Follette
Chair
Psychology

---

From: owner-cladepts@unr.edu [mailto:owner-cladepts@unr.edu] On Behalf Of Heather Hardy
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 2:00 PM
To: cladepts@unr.edu
Cc: clasects@unr.edu
Subject: evaluation of LOAs

Colleagues,

At the last meeting of the ALC (when I was out of town), there was discussion of the accreditation finding that charged the university with demonstrating that they had a system in place for evaluating the performance of part-time faculty. In a brief discussion of this issue at a chairs meeting, you all indicated that you did in fact review the performance of your LOAs.

The college will need to demonstrate in the fall that we have a definite plan for doing this, and new LOAs will need to be told at the orientation (which I believe the university is organizing) that they will be evaluated. In order to prepare for this, I would be grateful if you would (1) very briefly describe what your current method of evaluating part-time faculty is (e.g., “the chair/personnel committee reviews all student evaluations of teaching,” “reviews quantitative scores and comments if scores are below average,” “reviews syllabi and course materials”) and (2) how it relates to their reappointment (or not). (3) Do they receive any kind of formal feedback on this evaluation or is it used only for purposes of rehiring decisions?

I appreciate your help in my being able to report on this. If I can hear from you before next Tuesday I would be most grateful.

Heather

Heather K. Hardy
Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Professor of English
MS 086
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0008
December 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Marc Johnson, Provost
From: Manos Maragakis, Interim Dean, College of Engineering
Subject: Evaluation of LOA's

The College of Engineering evaluates the teaching performance of LOA's using a course/instructor evaluation that students complete at the end of each semester. Students are also encouraged to provide input to the department chair or the dean at any time throughout the semester, and if an instructional problem is apparent, a meeting is arranged with the LOA. If there is any indication the instructional mission of the course is jeopardized during or upon completion of the semester and the problem cannot be resolved, the LOA is terminated from the department.
College of Education
Evaluation of Letter of Appointment Faculty (LOA), Part-Time Instructors, Lecturers and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA)

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology

The CEP Department conducts regular evaluations for any and all who teach courses through the department. This includes both LOAs and GTAs. Both LOAs and GTAs use the regular course evaluation form that is used by regular faculty members. Course evaluations of LOAs and GTAs help determine hiring practices. The Department Chair examines each course evaluation and the comments. In cases where evaluations are in the “Excellent” range, the LOA and/or GTA is simply apprised of the results. In cases where evaluations are less than “Excellent” range, the Department Chair arranges for a meeting to go over the evaluation and to make suggestions and recommendations.

Although CEP has not had to reassign a GTA due to poor evaluations nor not re-hire an LOA due to the same, our policy is that an LOA and/or GTA is given one more semester to correct the situation unless the situation requires immediate change.

Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL)

All LOAs are evaluated at the end of the course with the regular student evaluation of faculty form just like regular faculty. Their syllabi are also checked at the beginning of the course to make sure they are following the agreed upon curriculum for the course. Any student complaints are also followed up. If a faculty member is teaching another section of the course taught by an LOA, the faculty member will also work with the LOA to ensure quality control since they follow the same syllabus.

If an LOA does not follow the syllabus, receives poor evaluations, or complaints from students, and if any of these issues are validated following a review by the department chair, the LOA is not rehired.

Department of Educational Leadership

We require that LOAs complete the same student feedback form as other staff members. LOAs get a copy of the results. This feedback and an interview with the department chair serves as the primary basis for LOA evaluations. The evaluations are a component of the possibility of rehiring.

We also require that GTAs complete the same student feedback form, which is used by other faculty members. The department office manager compiles the evaluation ratings and types the comments from the students in order to produce a packet for the GTAs to review.

Ratings and comments are carefully reviewed to identity and remedy areas of concern. The areas of concern are discussed with the LOAs and GTAs. In addition, we review comments and the ratings to identify areas of strengths. Furthermore, during the semester the department chair meets informally with LOAs to review and discuss teaching and learning within the course.
Department of Educational Specialties (EDS)

All LOAs hired in EDS have substantial teaching experience and academic credentials in the area in which teach. Every attempt is made to recruit professionals who, in the judgment of the faculty, will be effective teachers of adult learners.

Graduate Teaching Assistants who teach courses in the EDS department have sufficient experience and/or subject matter expertise to be effective in the class.

Instructors in EDS are full time and have been selected through a search process. Currently, one position is state-funded and two additional ones are supported through soft money or as one-year hires for vacant positions. In 2009-2010, the department anticipates having only one instructor position.

The following describes the support for and evaluation of LOAs, GTAs, and instructors in the Department of Educational Specialties

LOA Support:

A handbook for LOAs and new instructors is given to all LOAs and is available on the department’s website. This introduces instructors to the department’s and university’s policies, syllabus format, and performance assessment framework.

Each first-time LOA is assigned a faculty contact where the LOA can get any needed information about the academic program housing their course, sample syllabi, and textbooks or other resources.

Each semester, one of the department’s graduate assistants (GA) is assigned about 5-10 hours per week in support of LOAs. This GA serves as a liaison for the LOAs and helps to prepare materials for their campus courses. Most LOAs are public school teachers and the 4:00 time slot for many courses does not enable them to make copies, check their mailboxes, and so forth.

LOA Evaluation

All courses are evaluated at the end of the semester using the College of Education course evaluation form. The results are tabulated and a report is generated and kept on-file by the chairperson of EDS. The LOA is also provided with the information.

Before determining whether an LOA will be retained to teach in subsequent semesters, the department chair reviews the evaluations and consults with relevant program faculty. Those LOAs with strong course evaluations are re-hired, if needed, in subsequent semesters.

It should be noted that student evaluations are not the only indicator used as criteria for re-hire. There are some courses that students do not like due to rigorous or controversial content. Some instructors have unique expertise and/or high expectations that do not translate into high student evaluations.

Professional judgment of the chair and faculty is balanced with student ratings.

Support for Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs)

In addition to the orientation provided by the Graduate School, EDS provides an orientation for GTAs. This orientation includes a written outline of the responsibilities and performance expectations for Evaluation of LOAs, Instructors, GTAs COE December 2008
GTAs. In addition, the orientation covers FERPA regulations, student confidentiality, and departmental requirements.

EDS provides a policy and procedures manual for GTAs that can be found on the departmental website: http://www.unr.edu/educ/eds/documents/GA_Manual.pdf.

GTAs who are sole or co-instructors of course with a handbook for new instructors, available on the departmental web site at: http://www.unr.edu/educ/eds/documents/facHandbook.pdf

An experienced faculty member in EDS is responsible for supervision of each GTA who is the sole or co-instructor of a course. This supervision will include review of the course syllabus, mentoring and guidance in ordering texts, and assistance throughout the course with assignments, grading, and issues with difficult students. Whenever possible, the GTA has “shadowed” that faculty member as he or she taught the course in a prior semester.

Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) Evaluation

All courses are evaluated at the end of the semester using the College of Education course evaluation form. The results are tabulated and a report is generated and kept on-file by the chairperson of EDS. The LOA is also provided with the information.

It is assumed that GTAs will improve their classroom performance with more experience, so course evaluations are seen as an important part of formative assessment. If a GTA has weak evaluations, the GTA meets with the department chair or an experienced faculty member to discuss course issues and methods of improvement. If the GTA does not show improvement in instruction, he or she would be reassigned to other duties and/or would assist a faculty member in teaching the course to see a model of more effective instruction.

As with LOAs, student evaluations are not the only indicator used as criteria for evaluating GTA teaching. There are some courses that students do not like due to rigorous or controversial content. Professional judgment of the chair and faculty is balanced with student ratings.

Evaluation and Support for Instructors

In 2008-2009, there are three instructors in EDS and one field-based faculty. One of these instructors is permanents and two are soft-money funded. All are full-time. Instructors are oriented like any other new faculty member. Since their teaching load is 4+4, they are specifically recruited for their teaching abilities and experiences. Their role statements usually allocate 80-90% of their effort to teaching.

Instructors are evaluated in terms of COE guidelines with heavy emphasis on student ratings with other indicators of quality documented in their annual reports. If student ratings were poor, without other specific indicators of quality, instructors would be mentored in teaching by faculty in their areas of expertise. Other support could include professional development activities through existing campus service (TLT, etc.) or thorough professional organizations, as budget allowed. Poor teaching evaluations would result in overall poor annual evaluations and a pattern of such ratings would likely result in termination.

Evaluation of LOAs, Instructors, GTAs COE December 2008
APPENDIX 5A

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

LOAs, lecturers, and GTAs in our department are required to obtain student feedback. In past semesters, we took the time to meet with each of them (especially if they are new to the department) to review evaluations and discuss progress. In addition, the department chair talks fairly regularly with LOAs and the lecturer in an informal way about how their classes are going and what can be done to help if needed. We also have a system for GTA evaluation, including visits by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS).

Office of Field Experiences

Lead teachers and supervisors are hired as LOAs to mentor our interns.

- Lead teachers are evaluated by the intern and supervisor. The Director of the Office of Field Experiences considers their evaluations during the placement of our interns. Teachers who received satisfactory evaluations will be eligible to have interns in the future and may be rehired as Lead Teacher LOA's. Those lead teachers who were unsatisfactory are not rehired and their unsatisfactory performance is discussed with their school principals. In rare situations, lead teachers have been terminated mid-semester as LOA's. The two lead teacher evaluation documents may be viewed at: www.unr.edu/educ/ffx and then see the 'final evaluation' link.

- Supervisors are evaluated by the intern and lead teacher. The Director meets with supervisors annually to discuss their performance and evaluations. If the supervisor's performance is unsatisfactory, the Director meets with supervisor immediately and determines a plan for improvement and/or remediation or termination if necessary. A few years ago, one supervisor was terminated mid-semester and we've had several who were not rehired. Supervisor evaluations are considered each semester when supervisors are rehired. We want our interns to use best and current education practices so it is vital that the supervisors are knowledgeable about this too. The Director uses the supervisor's evaluation data to guide and plan staff development activities for supervisors. The one supervisor evaluation document may be viewed at: www.unr.edu/educ/ffx and then see the 'final evaluation' link.
Following is CABNR’s evaluation policy for LOAs and TA/GAs:

LOA evaluation
All CABNR class Instructors of Record, whether LOAs or non-tenure or tenure track faculty are evaluated by the Aleamoni Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ). The CIEQ is a nationally recognized student rating form and statistical analysis package designed for use as part of a program for assessing both course and faculty teaching performance. LOAs who receive a single poor evaluation are not retained. For further information on the CIEQ please see http://www.cieq.com/index22.htm.

TAs/GAs
The departments of Animal Biotechnology, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Natural Resources and Environmental Science and Resource Economics use TA/GAs only under the direct supervision and presence of the instructor of record, thus, for these departments TA/GA evaluation is ongoing and continual. The Department of Nutrition is the only CABNR Department wherein TAs teach laboratory sections not in the direct presence of the instructor. A detailed presentation of the duties, supervision and evaluation practices of the various CABNR departments, is listed below:

1. Animal Biotechnology (AB) – AB uses TA/GAs in both lecture and lab courses. Their duties are to assist the instructor in preparation, help with grading and assist with laboratory sections. The Instructor of Record is present during all teaching functions of the graduate student (including all lab sections). Evaluation is therefore ongoing and continual throughout the semester.

2. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) – BMB uses TA/GAs only for laboratory courses. Since instructors are present throughout and for all laboratory sections evaluation is ongoing and continual throughout the semester.

3. Natural Resources and Environmental Science – NRES uses TA/GAs in both lecture and lab courses. Their duties are to assist the instructor in preparation, help with grading and assist with laboratory sections. The Instructor of Record is present during all teaching functions by the graduate student (including all lab sections). Evaluation is therefore ongoing and continual throughout the semester.

4. Resource Economics (RE) – Resource Economics uses TA/GAs only for one course APST 270. This course has an accompanying lab for which the TA/GA is responsible. The Instructor of Record sits in and therefore provides ongoing evaluation.

5. Nutrition (NUTR) – NUTR uses TAs/GAs only to help teach their lower division NUTR 121 laboratory class sections. New TA/GAs are under direct supervision of the Instructor and a senior TA. All TAs meet with the Instructor before each of the four different lab classes for instruction on that particular lab experiment to insure the expertise of all TAs and to discuss any problems that may have arisen. The instructor and senior TA visit the first several lab sections taught by a new TA/GA to see how they manage the lab and if necessary then work with the new TA to improve their teaching skills. If students have issues or complaints the instructor follows up to correct the situation.

In all departments TA/GAs who do poorly and cannot improve are not rehired.

If further information is needed on teaching evaluations in CABNR please let me know. Bruce Shivley asked me to mention to you that in CABNR student advisement is only done by our faculty. I thought David had spoken to you about this but if he hasn’t and you would like a full report about out advisement practices please let me know.

Carol

Dr. Carol M. Condit
Associate Dean Academic Affairs
College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources
Mail Stop 222
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557
Phone: 775-784-1059
Fax: 775-784-4227

-----Original Message-----
Hi Audrey, Please see below!

Thanks,
Feride

Feride McAlpine
Director Of Human Resources, UNSOM
Ph: 702-671-2210
Fax: 702-671-2215

Dear Dr Johnson,

The following is a summary of the School of Medicine LOA and other part-time temporary faculty evaluation process. I attached a few actual evaluation documents for your information. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you!

Feride McAlpine,
Director, UNSOM HR

The medical school teaching can be grouped in the following ways:

**Medical Student Teaching:** In medical school education, students routinely evaluate all teaching faculty, including LOA faculty. Student evaluations are reviewed closely by the Associate Dean for Medical Education and the Director of the Division of Interdisciplinary Medical Education (DIME). The Associate Dean for Medical Education or the Director of DIME provide each teaching faculty member with summary copy of their evaluation. Areas needing improvement are addressed through the Director of DIME. Suggested recommendations and resources are offered to help improve or mitigate the problem. If there has been no improvement made within the specified time frame, the temporary appointment/LOA faculty member will be terminated.

**Resident Teaching:** LOA faculty members are regularly utilized for resident teaching to include didactic or hands on patient care in the LOA faculty members’ clinics. Subsequent to any rotation in an LOA faculty members’ clinic, residents are required to complete an evaluation of the training on e-value. These evaluations are compiled annually and the Department Chair sends a summary of the evaluation to the LOA faculty member with a cover letter. If there are issues and/or negative comments regarding an individual, the Chair
addresses it immediately with the subject LOA faculty member. If negative comments continue or no improvement is noted, the LOA appointment will be terminated.

Samples of the past LOA faculty member evaluations are attached.

---

From: Ole J Thienhaus [mailto:othienhaus@unr.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 7:34 AM
To: Melissa Piasecki
Cc: Feride McAlpine
Subject: FW: Academic deans only--info needed

Melissa,

Would you (or Feride) be able to help with this?

Thanks,

Ole

---

From: Marc Johnson
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 5:31 AM
To: John McDonald; Marsha Read; Heather Hardy; Steve Zink; Audrey Casey; David Thawley; William Sparkman; Karen Hinton; Ole Thienhaus; Jeff Thompson; Greg Mosier; Manos Maragakis; Jerome Ceppos
Subject: Academic deans only--info needed

Colleagues: In preparation for responding to the Northwestern Accreditation review I need some information. By next week I need to report on how we evaluate LOA and other part time instructors, lecturers, LOAs and GTAs as well as how the information is used, e.g., determination of rehire or sit-down visits on how to improve teaching in response to class reviews. I'd appreciate a description of your college practice and policy by Friday, Dec. 12 at 5:00 pm. Thanks.

Marc Johnson
Marc Johnson

From: Rosemary F McCarthy
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 9:36 PM
To: Marc Johnson
Cc: Jerome M Ceppos
Subject: LOA evals

Marc,

In response to your query below:

At the RSJ all LOA's, GTA's and lecturers are primarily evaluated along with regular faculty using the class evaluation process each semester.

The evaluation results are reviewed by the Academic Chair and the dean who then assess whether to rehire in the case of LOA's and whether to re-assign in the case of GTA's.

The group of LOA's/GTA's who lead the lab sessions associated with a core writing course meets regularly with the lead faculty member who structures the course and monitors teaching activities. Experienced LOA's in this group also coach and support its newer instructors.

Additionally, regular faculty and the Academic Chair provide coaching and support of our LOA's and GTA's during the semester as the need arises.

Rosemary

Rosemary McCarthy
Reynolds School of Journalism
University of Nevada, Reno
775-784-1791

From: Marc Johnson <marc@unr.edu>
Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2008 05:31:01 -0800
To: John A McDonald <jam@unr.edu>, Marsha H Read <read@unr.edu>, Heather K Hardy <hhardy@unr.edu>, Steven D Zink <stevenz@unr.edu>, Audrey M Casey <acasey@unr.edu>, David Thawley <thawley@cabnr.unr.edu>, William E Sparkman <sparkman@unr.edu>, Karen Hinton <hintonk@unce.unr.edu>, Ole J Thienhaus <othienhaus@unr.edu>, Jeffrey S Thompson <thompsonj@unr.edu>, Gregory C Mosier <greg.mosier@unr.edu>, <mmarakakis@yahoo.com>, Jerome M Ceppos <jceppos@unr.edu>
Subject: Academic deans only--info needed

Colleagues: In preparation for responding to the Northwestern Accreditation review I need some information. By next week I need to report on how we evaluate LOA and other part time instructors, lecturers, LOAs and GTAs as well as how the information is used, e.g., determination of rehire or sit-down visits on how to improve teaching in response to class reviews. I'd appreciate a description of your college practice and policy by Friday, Dec. 12 at 5:00 pm. Thanks.

Marc Johnson
December 11, 2008

TO:    Marc Johnson  
       Executive Vice President and Provost

FR:    Jeff Thompson, Dean
       College of Science

RE:    Annual Evaluation of Lecturers, Letters of Appointment and Graduate 
       Teaching Assistants

__________________________________________________________________________

The College of Science does not have a policy that specifically addresses the 
evaluation of state-funded lecturers, lecturers supported with temporary 
instructional funds (contingent lecturers) or contract teachers through a letter of 
appointment (LOA). I have collected the evaluation procedures from the science 
departments and their policies are consistent across the College. The evaluation 
process follows the same standards for lecturers and LOA’s as the departmental 
standards for evaluating tenure-track faculty. Student evaluations are collected for 
every course taught by a lecturer or LOA and each instructor is also evaluated by a 
peer classroom visit during the semester. Lecturers receive feedback during the 
annual performance evaluation process, and issues related to their teaching 
performance are addressed during an interview with the department chair. LOA’s 
receive a copy of their student evaluations and peer evaluations. If issues are 
identified by the student or peer evaluations, the LOA meets with the department 
chair and the issues raised by the evaluations are discussed and potential remedies 
are identified. Reappointment decisions for lecturers and LOA’s are heavily 
influenced by the student and peer evaluations of their courses.

Graduate teaching assistants (TA) are evaluated using student teaching evaluations 
and observations by either a senior teaching assistant or the course instructor. TA’s 
are given feedback from the senior teaching assistant or course instructor during 
the semester and receive their student course evaluations after the semester is 
completed. Reappointment and or reassignment decisions are made using this 
information.
December 23, 2008

Milton Glick
President
University of Nevada, Reno
1664 North Virginia Street
Reno, Nevada 89557

Dear President Glick,

In response to your request, this is to confirm the action taken by the Nevada System of Higher Education Board of Regents to initiate a self-assessment process in 2009. In light of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities recommendation for the University of Nevada, Reno in the reaccreditation report, the Board has delegated to its Board Development Committee responsibility for planning a self-study and workshop.

Planned for August 2009, this two-day workshop will likely use the expertise of the Association of Governing Board, although at this point in time, no firm commitments have been made given financial constraints. The Board Development Committee will meet in January 2009 to make further plans. Regardless of the exact format, the Board action making this commitment is on record as of August 2008, and a self-assessment and workshop will take place no later than 2009.

In conversations with Northwest Commission staff, I have been assured that the plans underway for Nevada’s governing Board’s self-assessment meet the criteria established in Standard 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.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jane A. Nichols
Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

JAN/sj

Cc: Regent Michael Wixom, Chair, Board of Regents
Regent James Dean Leavitt, Chair, Board Development Committee
Chancellor James E. Rogers
Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich
Scott Wasserman, CEO, Board of Regents
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Ballrooms B & C
Joe Crowley Student Union
University of Nevada, Reno
87 West Stadium Way, Reno
Thursday, August 7, 2008, 8:30 a.m.
Friday, August 8, 2008, 8:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL:
Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Chair
Mr. Howard Rosenberg, Vice Chair
Mr. Mark Alden
Dr. Stavros S. Anthony
Mr. Cedric Crear
Dr. Thalia M. Dondero
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

NOTE: Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented at the discretion of the chair. In accordance with the Board of Regents' Bylaws, Title I, Article V, Section 20, items voted on may be the subject of a motion to reconsider at this meeting. A motion to reconsider an item may be made at any time before adjournment of this meeting. Similarly, if an item is tabled at any time during the meeting, it may, by proper motion and vote, be taken from the table and thereafter be the subject of consideration and action at any time before adjournment of this meeting.

The Board of Regents, at its regularly scheduled meetings, meets concurrently with its Audit, Student & Academic Affairs, Budget & Finance, and Cultural Diversity & Security Committees. The Board’s Audit, Student & Academic Affairs, Budget & Finance, and Cultural Diversity & Security Committee meetings take place in accordance with the agendas published for those Committees. Regents who are not members of the committees may attend the Committee meetings and participate in the discussion of Committee agenda items. However, action items will only be voted on by the members of each Committee, unless a Regent is temporarily made a member of that Committee under Board of Regents’ Bylaws, Title 1, Article VI, Section 6. The full Board of Regents will consider Committee action items in accordance with the Board of Regents’ agenda published for the current or for a subsequent meeting.

In accordance with the Board of Regents’ Bylaws, Title I, Article V, Section 13, a quorum may be gained by telephone hook-up.

In accordance with NRS 241.020(6), support materials that are submitted to the Board of Regents’ Office and then distributed to the members of the board of Regents after the mailing of this agenda but before the meeting, will be made available as follows: 1.) Copies of any such supplemental support materials are available at the board of Regents’ Office Reno, Nevada. A copy may be requested by calling (775) 784-4958, and 2.) Copies of any such supplemental support materials will be available at the meeting site.

Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically disabled persons attending the meeting. Please call the Board office at (775) 784-4958 in advance so that arrangements may be made.
CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
INVOCATION

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. CHAIR’S REPORT
Chair Michael B. Wixom, as part of the Chair’s report, requests that the President of each hosting institution introduce one student and one faculty member to discuss a topic of the hosting President’s choosing to help provide Board members with a focus on the reasons they serve as Board members. He will also discuss current NSHE events and his current activities as Chair.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Audit Committee, 9:00 a.m., (Joe Crowley Student Union, Ballroom A)
Student & Academic Affairs, 9:00 a.m., (Joe Crowley Student Union, Ballrooms B & C)
Budget & Finance, 11:00 a.m., (Joe Crowley Student Union, Ballroom A)
Cultural Diversity & Security, 11:00 a.m., (Joe Crowley Student Union, Ballrooms B & C)

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT
Chancellor James E. Rogers will discuss the overall financial health of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
Public comment will be taken during this agenda item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair of the board of Regents may place reasonable limitations as to the amount of time individuals may address the Board. The Chair may elect to allow public comment on a specific agenda item when that item is being considered.
30. RESEARCH & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chair Schofield will present a report on the Research & Economic Development Committee meeting held on July 31, 2008, and Board action may be requested on the following:

- Minutes – The Committee considered for approval the minutes from the June 5, 2008, Committee meeting. (Ref. RED-2)

31. BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chair Leavitt will present a report on the Board Development Committee meeting held on July 30, 2008, and Board action may be requested on the following:

- Minutes – The Committee considered for approval the minutes from the January 31, 2008, Committee meeting. (Ref. BD-1)
- Board of Regents’ Self-Assessments – The Committee considered recommendations for facilitation of the self-assessment, including but not limited to, a process for moving forward with a self-assessment and the frequency of self-assessments.
- Review of Sample Self-Study Criteria – The Committee considered recommendations of the self-study criteria to be utilized by the Board.

32. TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Chair Whipple will present a report on the Technology Committee meeting held on July 30, 2008, and Board action may be requested on the following:

- Minutes – The Committee considered for approval the minutes from the January 29, 2008, Committee meeting. (Ref. TC-1)
- iNtegrate Project: Updates and Future Direction – The Committee heard an update on recent developments, current status and future direction of the project and considered recommendations for the future direction of the project.
- iNtegrate Project: Implementation Funding – The Committee considered recommendations for funding the institutional implementation of the iNtegrate project.
- iNtegrate Project: Governance Structure – The Committee considered recommendations for the governance structure for the iNtegrate project. (Ref. TC-5)
Minutes are not final until approved by the Board of Regents at the October 2008 meeting.
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BOARD OF REGENTS

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Ballrooms B & C
Joe Crowley Student Union
University of Nevada, Reno
87 West Stadium Way, Reno
Thursday-Friday, August 7-8, 2008

Members Present: Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Chair
Mr. Howard Rosenberg, Vice Chair
Dr. Stavros S. Anthony
Mr. Cedric Crear
Dr. Thalia M. Dondero
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

Members Absent: Mr. Mark Alden

Others Present: Chancellor James E. Rogers
Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaitch
Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, UNHSS, Maurizio Trevisan
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Chief Counsel Bart Patterson
Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen
President Michael D. Richards, CSN
President Stephen G. Wells, DRI
Interim President Carl Diekhans, GBC
Provost Leslie DiMare, NSC
President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC
President David B. Ashley, UNLV
President Milton D. Glick, UNR
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC
Chief Executive Officer of the Board Scott Wasserman
Also present were faculty senate chairs Dr. Sondra Cosgrove, CSN; Dr. Dave Decker, DRI; Ms. Cindy Hyslop, GBC; Mr. Gregory Robinson, NSC; Ms. Sharon Wurm, NSHE; Dr. Nasser Daneshvary, UNLV; Dr. Bill Follette, UNR; Mr. Stephen Bale, TMCC; and Mr. Richard Stewart, WNC. Student government leaders present included Mr. John Creedon, ASCSN Vice President CSN; Mr. Eron Sanchez, SGA President, GBC; Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSSA President, NSC; Mr. Adam Cronis, CSUN President, UNLV; Ms. Jessica Lucero, GPSA President, UNLV; Mr. Eli Reilly, ASUN President, UNR; Ms. Britany Thompson, GSA President, UNR; Mr. Jeff Meyers, ASTM Chairperson, TMCC; and Mr. Andy Pozun, ASWN President, WNC.
31. Approved — Board Development Committee (Agenda item #31) — (Cont'd)
The Committee, along with the representatives from AGB, discussed the benefits of a facilitated discussion, satisfying the requirements of accrediting bodies such as the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, the need for a continuing schedule of self-assessments and the most appropriate time of year to engage in self-assessment.

Chair Leavitt requested Board action on the following recommendations:

- Minutes — The Committee recommended approval for the minutes from the January 31, 2008, Committee meeting (Ref. BD-1 on file in the Board office).
- The Committee moved for consideration of the Board a recommendation that the Board of Regents work with AGB to conduct a formal self-assessment and two-day facilitated workshop to be held in August of 2009.

Regent Leavitt moved approval of the Committee minutes and acceptance of the report. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony, Dondoro and Sisolak were absent.

Regent Leavitt moved approval of the Board’s authorization for the Board Development Committee recommendation to work with AGB to conduct a formal self-assessment and two-day facilitated workshop to be held in August of 2009. Regent Knecht seconded.

Regent Leavitt stated that there is obvious sensitivity to the budget situation. He has been assured by Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich that funds allotted for this purpose are available. A self-evaluation of some sort is mandated by the NWCCU and is something that must be done. He requested the broadest possible authority for discussion at the Board Development Committee level.

Chair Wixom asked if this will address the concern raised during UNR’s NWCCU accreditation process. President Glick offered to follow up with the NWCCU accreditation chair and report back to the Board. Regent Leavitt related that the AGB representatives indicated their surprise that this requirement was placed in the accreditation standards. He added that it was a very generalized recommendation and requested that President Glick or Vice Chancellor Nichols to report back to him.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich echoed Regent Leavitt’s request that the Committee be authorized to maintain flexibility in working through this.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony, Dondoro and Sisolak were absent.
32. Approved - Technology Committee (Agenda Item #22) - Chair Whipple reported that the Technology Committee met on July 30, 2008, and heard discussion on the following matters:

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich introduced the new iNtegrate Project Director, Ms. Robyn Render. Ms. Render comes to the NSHE from the University of North Carolina General Administration and brings with her a great deal of experience in higher education and ERP implementation.

Ms. Render provided an update on the status of the iNtegrate project including campus readiness assessments, the development of a project charter and technical training plan, the role and responsibility of System Computing Services and the results from a recent needs and expectations study.

Associate Vice Chancellor Kenneth McCollum provided an update on the status of the RFP that was issued for hardware to support the iNtegrate project. Dr. McCollum and his team have narrowed the bids down to two possible solutions which are at or under budget.

With regard to implementation funding, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich encouraged the Committee to reaffirm that the institutions are able to use a portion of the technology fee for the project. He discussed the need for everyone to work harder to get the job done since there is nothing in the budget for backfill costs.

Ms. Render highlighted a few minor changes to the iNtegrate project governance structure, further clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the various constituencies.

Chair Whipple requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

➢ Minutes – The Committee recommended approval for the minutes from the January 29, 2008, Committee meeting (Ref: TC-1 on file in the Board office).

➢ The Committee recommended approval of a recommendation that the Board acknowledge and reaffirm that, under existing Board policy, the institutions have the authority to use a portion of the technology fee for implementation of the iNtegrate project and a directive that, if the institutions choose to use a portion of the technology fee, the utilization of the fee be stated separately within the annual report that is submitted to student government and to the Board.

➢ The Committee recommended approval of the revised governance structure for the iNtegrate project (Ref: TC-5 on file in the Board office).

Regent Whipple moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony, Dondero and Sisolak were absent.
33. Information Only – New Business (Agenda Item #33) – None.

Chair Wixom expressed his appreciation to all of the staff for a challenging meeting. He expressed his gratitude to the Regents for their time and effort in attending.

The meeting adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

Prepared by: Jessica Morris
Administrative Assistant IV

Submitted for approval by: Scott G. Wasserman
Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents
Academic and Administrative Personnel

Faculty Providing Consulting Services, Continued 2,690

Academic Faculty:

Outside Consulting: Academic faculty members have the right to offer specialized professional services which may include studies, surveys, consulting, research, teaching, and/or training programs, which are compensated through sources other than university-administered funds. There are certain limiting conditions on the right to obtain payment for federal consulting services. Faculty members must consider and consult Federal Circular A-21, issued by the Executive Office of the President through the Office of Management and Budget, in applying the guidelines contained in the Faculty Consultation Policy before they can claim payment for federal consulting services. Faculty members paid from federal funds must also consult Circular A-21 before engaging in any consulting services.

The following policies apply to academic faculty members providing specialized professional services compensated through sources other than university administered funds:

1. Faculty members understand that the services must not interfere with normal university duties;
2. Faculty members must notify, in writing, their dean or director through the appropriate channels and provide information as to the nature of the services to assure compliance with the conflict of interest policy;
3. When consulting for the State of Nevada agencies, faculty members must receive written permission from their dean or director;
4. Faculty members inform those who engage them that they are not acting in the name of the University;
5. Specialized professional services occupy no more than one day’s equivalent time per week, exclusive of non-contract days, evenings, weekends and holidays. Faculty under “A” contracts must take accumulated annual leave time for performance of services upon agreement by the dean or other appropriate administrator and the university central administration.
6. University facilities, equipment or personnel are not used unless such use is authorized by the dean or director with proper consideration made.

Conflict of Interest Policy 2,691

Revised: September 2008

The Conflict of Interest policy sets forth University of Nevada, Reno, NSHE Board of Regents, state and federal requirements to identify, manage, reduce and/or eliminate conflicts of interest. The key to conflict of interest management is timely and appropriate disclosure by university employees who shall disclose any outside activity or interest that may adversely affect, compromise, or be incompatible with the obligations of the employee to the university or to widely recognized professional norms as defined in the policy. Employees shall disclose all potential conflicts held by the employee or the employee’s household or family members that the employee knew or should have known. Such disclosure shall be made on an annual basis by faculty and key personnel and on a project basis as necessary for other employees. Potential conflicts of interest, when properly disclosed and managed, can serve to benefit the University, the State of Nevada, and the nation. The policy prescribes procedures for disclosure, review, and for the exercise of ongoing oversight of potential and/or actual conflicts where necessary. It also provides for review of decisions at higher levels of university administration. Lastly, it indicates the sanctions that may be applied when the policy is violated.

To view the entire Conflict of Interest Policy and access the Annual Summary of Outside Activities and Interests form: http://www.unr.edu/ospa/website4/content/policy.htm
University Policy on Conflicts of Interest

A. POLICY STATEMENT

1. This document sets forth University, NSHE Board of Regents, State and Federal requirements to identify, manage, reduce and/or eliminate conflicts of interest. The key to conflict of interest management is timely and appropriate disclosure by University Employees who shall disclose any outside activity or interest that may adversely affect, compromise, or be incompatible with the obligations of the Employee to the University or to widely recognized professional norms as defined herein. Employees shall disclose all potential conflicts held by the Employee or the Employee’s Household or Family Members that the Employee knew or should have known. Such disclosure shall be made on an annual basis by Faculty and Key Personnel and on a project basis as necessary for other employees. Potential conflicts of interest, when properly disclosed and managed, can serve to benefit the University, the State of Nevada, and the Nation. This document prescribes procedures for disclosure, review, and for the exercise of ongoing oversight of potential and/or actual conflicts where necessary. It also provides for review of decisions at higher levels of University administration. Lastly, it indicates the sanctions that may be applied when the policy is violated.

B. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

1. In carrying out its primary missions of teaching, research and service, the University must implement a diverse set of principles: maintaining academic freedom and an atmosphere that promotes free and open scholarly inquiry without bias; facilitating the transfer of technology and other developments for the benefit of the public; and serving as the steward of public and private resources entrusted to it. There are several general categories of Conflict of Interest that this policy will address: Research and Other Sponsored Projects, Use of University Resources, Technology Transfer and Commercial Endeavors, and Institutional Conflict of Interest. The University recognizes the value of transferring technology and other activities to enhance public access to University research and to further the economic development of the State and the Nation. Additionally, participation by academic and administrative faculty, staff and students in external activities that enhance their professional skills or constitute public service may be beneficial to the University as well as the individual. As the institution grows and develops relationships with federal, state, and private institutions, the potential for conflicts of interest increases. These conflicts, when properly disclosed and managed can serve to benefit the institution, and spur economic development and diversity for the state of Nevada and its citizens. The primary goal of this policy is to provide a means to manage potential conflicts to enhance the benefit to the public and reduce or eliminate the costs and perceived negative outcomes that such potential conflicts may carry.

2. To this end, it is critical that business transactions and the design, conduct or reporting of research will not be biased or compromised by any conflicting financial interest or other potential or actual personal gain of an Investigator or the University or one of its units. Failure to comply may

---

1 This policy overlaps with but does not supplant University Employees' responsibilities under the Nevada Ethics in Government Law, NRS 281.411, which in some instances may include additional reporting responsibilities. In many instances, this policy is broader than the Ethics Act in the situations covered. Also, incorporated by reference are the NSHE Board of Regents Handbook; UNR administrative manual; the National Science Foundation Policy; Grant Policy Manual 510, Investigator Disclosure Policy, 60 F.R. 132, pp. 35810-823 (July 11, 1995) and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Objectivity in Research Subpart F-Responsibility of Applicants for Prompting Objectivity in Research for Which Funding is Sought, 42 CFR Part 50, Subpart F. As additional external federal policies are imposed, or if project specific requirements are imposed by a federal or state sponsor, this policy will incorporate such new policies by reference. In all events, adherence to the most restrictive policy is required.
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jeopardize existing or future funding, and erode public trust. The University recognizes that many potential conflicts of interest do not constitute actual conflicts or may be acceptable with proper oversight and safeguards. The complexity and diversity of professional relationships has grown increasingly intertwined with outside entities in research and other University activities. Increased research support from private entities, changes in federal law and regulations encouraging technology transfer and the need for the University and its Employees to demonstrate public accountability mandate new approaches in the discovery and management of potential conflict of interest situations. This may require reevaluation of previously acceptable activities. The most effective way to address conflict of interest is to establish a process by which Employees disclose and obtain evaluation of potential conflict on a case by case basis.

C. APPLICABILITY

1. This policy applies to all University Employees. As appropriate, subcontractors and other external collaborators must also comply with this policy unless their institution/company provides adequate assurances that they are in compliance with the federal regulations referenced below. This policy applies to any research, education or service activity regardless of whether or not support is provided to the University or Employee. Support may be in the form of sponsorship, pecuniary incentive, equipment or gift.

2. Conflicts also arise in procurement situations when an Employee has the option of purchasing goods or services from entities in which the Employee has a substantial financial or other interest. Procurement conflicts are treated separately in the NSHE Business Center North Purchasing Policies and Procedures and are not within the scope of this policy. However, because conflict of interest situations covered by this policy may also involve procurement issues, the Conflicts of Interest Committee will, from time to time, need to coordinate their efforts with the Director of Purchasing.

D. DEFINITIONS

1. “Business Entity” means a sole proprietorship, partnership, association, joint venture, corporation, firm, trust, foundation, or other organization or entity used in carrying on a trade or business, including parent organizations of such entities or any other arrangement in which an entity operates through a subsidiary.

2. “Clinical Investigations” include any research project dealing with humans, including medical industry corporation or other private business entity sponsored trials, departmental sponsored research, studies utilizing human tissues, social science research, and medical chart reviews.

3. “Conflict of Commitment” may occur when external activities demand excessive time, conflicting with an Employee’s responsibilities to the University, or when external activities result in direct competition with University activities.

4. “Conflict of Interest” means any outside activity or interest that may adversely affect, compromise, or be incompatible with the obligations of an Employee to the University or to widely recognized professional norms. A significant conflict of interest includes, but is not limited to, situations where consideration of a significant financial or other interests will likely affect the approval, design, conduct, or reporting of research or other projects or the objectivity of decision making as an Employee of the University.

5. “Designated Official” is the person responsible for reviewing all financial disclosures and will review situation information and advise the Conflict of Interest Committee as to whether a conflict of interest exists. The designated official shall be appointed by the President of the University. This individual may change from time to time upon designation by the President.

6. “Employee” means any person who is employed by the University of Nevada, Reno, whether full or part time, and includes but is not limited to staff, faculty, postdoctoral appointees, residents and
student Employees. It also includes Investigators as defined by the federal policies referenced below and individuals who are not paid on a project (i.e., “volunteers”).

7. “Faculty and Key Personnel” include individuals who are engaged at least 0.5 FTE as a faculty member and/or who serve as a Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on research or other projects and who are involved in the design, conduct, execution, reporting or fiscal oversight of University or externally funded projects and/or individuals who are determined to be Inventors of Intellectual Property by use of University resources.

8. “Family Member” means spouse and any other persons such a child, parent, sibling or other family member claimed on the Employee’s tax return.

9. “Household Members” means an association of persons who live in the same home or dwelling, sharing its expenses, and who are related by blood, adoption or marriage.

10. “Institutional Conflict of Interest” refers to situations where the University’s beneficial relationship with corporate entities may place it in conflict with its responsibilities as a public institution of higher education. The conflict may involve equity interest in companies, certain licensing situations, and Board and other leadership positions held by University faculty or administrators.

11. “Intellectual Property” means any ideas, inventions, technology, creative expression and embodiments thereof, in which a proprietary interest may be claimed, including but not limited to, patents, copyrights, trademarks, know-how, and biological materials. This policy is intended to affect only that Intellectual Property owned by the University. It does not alter other University policies that determine ownership of Intellectual Property.

12. “Investigator” includes any faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellow, resident or student who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research or scholarly activities conducted in whole or in part at the University of Nevada.

13. “Personal Gain” includes gifts and other incentives to Investigators, their University departments, or other University entity, or immediate family members.

14. “Research Agreements” may include testing agreements, service agreements, collaborative agreements, clinical investigation agreements, purchase orders, material transfer agreements, confidentiality agreements and any other written agreement between the University and an external entity that has been duly signed and agreed upon by authorized officials of the cooperating entities.

15. "Significant Financial or Other Interest" means ownership by the Employee or Household or Family or Family Member of 5% or more of the capital stock, assets, or control of any business entity or income amounting to more than $10,000.00 aggregate in a 12 month period from a single external entity to the Employee and his/her Household or Family or Family Member or 5% or more of the gross income of the Employee or Household or Family or Family Member from any business entity. It includes anything of significant monetary value, including but not limited to salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria); equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interests); intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights and royalties from such rights); or other item of monetary value. Significant financial or other interest also includes the holding of a position as an officer, director, agent, consultant or Employee of a business entity. Significant Financial or other Interest includes such interests held by the Employee and by the Employee’s Household or Family or Family Members. The term does NOT include:

a. Salary, royalty income from copy-written materials except for income derived from technology transfer licensing, or other remuneration from the University;

b. Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or nonprofit entities;

c. Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or nonprofit entities;

d. Equity interest that when aggregated for the Employee and the Employee’s Household or Family or Family Member meets both of the following tests.
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1. Does not exceed $10,000 in value as determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measure of fair market value, and
2. Does not represent more than a five percent (5%) ownership interest in any single entity;
e. Income from mutual funds and/or pension funds; and/or
f. A percentage of income received from the Veteran’s Administration Medical Center as part of physician reimbursement for University faculty or income generated under and in compliance with the physician practice plans approved by the Dean of the Medical School.

16. “Technology Transfer” includes any option, license, assignment, or conveyance of any other legal or equitable interest in Intellectual Property owned by the University, including but not limited to the right to make, market, copy, sell, or use such property in any way.

E. CONFLICT OF INTEREST SITUATIONS

1. The issues addressed in this section include situations that constitute a Conflict of Interest and require full disclosure. Approved conflicts of interest require oversight by the University and may require modification to reduce or eliminate the conflict. Certain activities present an unacceptable Conflict of Interest that the University will not allow under any circumstances (See Section G below).

a. Use of University Property or Facilities.

1. Employees shall not use NSHE time, property, equipment, or other facility to benefit their personal or financial interest. However, as provided in NRS 281.481(7), limited use for personal purposes is allowable if the use does not interfere with the performance of an employee’s duties, the cost and value related to the use is nominal, and the use does not create the appearance of impropriety or of NSHE endorsement. Personal use shall not interfere with official institutional use. Personal use of NSHE time, property, equipment, or other facility must be approved in advance by the employee’s supervisor. If the institution or unit incurs a cost as a result of a use that is authorized pursuant to this policy or would ordinarily charge a member of the public for the use, the employee shall promptly reimburse the cost or pay the charge. An employee who intentionally or negligently damages NSHE property, equipment, or other facility shall be held responsible for the resultant expense.

2. Except as otherwise approved pursuant to this or other University policy or agreement, use of University facilities and equipment resulting in identifiable costs to the University REQUIRES APPROVAL by the Provost. Approval of such situations may be granted in exceptional circumstances conditioned upon reimbursement of costs. Only the President may grant exceptions to the requirement for reimbursement.

b. Conflict of Interest Involving Students. Research agreements with external sponsors, especially entities in which an Investigator has a financial, managerial or executive relationship must maintain basic academic values and promote open dissemination of knowledge. Student participation in such activities is of particular concern. It is important that the educational experience of students and postdoctoral fellows not be influenced detrimentally by faculty special interests or relationships with external funding entities. Consistent with these policies and concerns, the following projects require APPROVAL before they are commenced and MONITORING throughout:

---

2 NSHE Code; Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 25.

3 This section is not intended to preclude the involvement of research assistants or research associates who are primarily University Employees in support of commercial activities or work that will not be used for evaluation of a student or fulfillment of degree requirements, under arrangements otherwise consistent with this and other University policies.
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1. Projects of a confidential nature that include restrictions of student publication or communication rights with respect to research or other work that will be the basis of evaluation of the student or fulfillment of degree requirements. Such projects will only be permitted if the publication restrictions are reasonably necessary to protect intellectual property rights and do not prevent the publication of student research in a timely manner. Publication in a timely manner shall usually be the earlier of 60 days from the completion of the project or the completion of the student’s degree requirements.

2. Sponsored research projects involving students that have the potential to benefit substantially a business entity in which a faculty member has a significant financial or other interest. Approval shall be granted only where there is a demonstration that students will receive some academic benefit from their efforts without risk to academic freedom, integrity and objectivity. Approval shall not be granted where such research is motivated primarily by commercial concerns and will be the basis of evaluation of the student or fulfillment of degree requirements.

3. Sponsored research projects where a student is both working on a project for a faculty member at the University and working at a company in which the faculty member has a financial or other interest.

4. Sponsored research where the research is driven primarily by commercial considerations and the sponsor is involved in the direction of the research.

c. Interactions with Private Enterprise. All of the examples described in this section have the potential for appearance of, and actual, misallocation of resources. Each situation requires APPROVAL AND MONITORING. Approval should normally be based on the proponent demonstrating that the activity significantly benefits the University and its public mission and does not involve an unacceptable risk of misallocation of funds and other resources or breach of the University’s integrity. Approvals will be conditioned on technical and financial oversight of the project and any related activities, as well as reimbursement of all costs for uses of University resources that primarily benefit private entities.

1. Research projects where an Employee also has direct or indirect authority over expenditure of funds and where the research is sponsored by a business entity in which the Employee or his/her Household or Family Members have a significant financial or other interest.

2. Reimbursed use of faculty, students, research associates, technicians or other staff supported by public funds for work motivated primarily by commercial concerns or intended to benefit a business entity in which an involved Employee or his/her Household or Family Members have a significant financial or other interest.

3. Participation by an Employee in a University decision that has the potential to benefit significantly or injure, directly or indirectly, a business entity in which the Employee or his/her Household or Family Members have a significant financial or other interest. The preferred procedure will normally be for the Employee to withdraw from participation in the decision. In no event should the Employee be the final decision maker.

4. Use of University or other public or private funds for expenditures that have the potential to benefit a business entity significantly in which an Employee or his/her Household or Family Members have a significant financial or other interest. One example of this situation is the purchase of equipment that may be useful to a business for which the Employee consults, or in which an Employee has an ownership interest. Another example of this situation is a

4 The procurement of general goods and services from private enterprises can create significant potential conflicts of interest. Procurement conflicts are specifically addressed in the Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 1 (7) and are not within the purpose and scope of this policy. However, because conflict situations covered by this policy may also involve procurement issues, this policy and the Board of Regents Handbook policy may both apply.
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project involving testing of a product in which an Employee has a significant financial or other interest, or a product that is a competitor of a product in which the Employee has a significant financial or other interest.

5. Transfer of University technology or other Intellectual Property to a business entity in which the University Employee inventor or his/her Household or Family Member has a significant financial or other interest.

6. Clinician referrals to a business entity in which the clinician/Employee or his/her Household or Family Member has a significant financial or other interest unless such referral is otherwise authorized under the UNR physician practice plan.

7. Submission of proposals and acceptance of awards for grants or contracts by, to or from a business entity in which an involved Employee or his/her Household or Family Member has a significant financial or other interest, where the subject matter of grant proposal is substantially related to the Employee’s University research and where the University is qualified and eligible to apply.

F. CLINICAL RESEARCH

1. It is critically important for the University to manage conflicts in the area of Clinical Investigations due to the ethical requirement for protection of research participants and the general public. Financial or other personal gain interests of the Investigators, their Household or Family Members, the University, or units of the University must not influence, or appear to influence, the approval, design, conduct or reporting of research or any clinical trials involving the evaluation of products such as drugs or medical devices or procedures. It is of the utmost importance that personal gain by any member of the clinical research team not influence the consent process such that participation is encouraged by even subtle minimization of the risks and exaggeration of the benefits to the potential subject. Additionally, arrangements with corporate sponsors which include recruitment bonuses, time designated accrual incentives, or finder-fees may influence the consent process, the reporting of adverse events, or the analysis of the data, thereby creating conflicts which must be disclosed and reviewed. For these reasons, the following policies apply to all Clinical Research projects at the University:

a. Prior to each study involving human subjects, all aspects of financial relationships between members of the investigative team, their Household or Family Members, the University and its entities, and the corporate sponsor must be DISCLOSED. These include commitments of financial support unrelated to the current study, financial incentives, payments as a consultant, and non-monetary rewards and incentives to Investigators and their Household or Family Members, including travel, entertainment and gifts.

b. Clinical research projects sponsored by business entities where Investigators, other Employees, or their Household or Family Members, or University units, have significant financial or other interests require APPROVAL and MONITORING. Employees with significant conflicts may participate as an Investigator or key personnel only under exceptional circumstances. Under no circumstances shall a conflicted Employee obtain consent from subjects for their participation in a research project. At the time of a new study submission and at the time of continuing review, the IRB will evaluate how the management plan suggested by the Conflict of Interest committee affects the conduct of the research or research subjects. In that review, the IRB will determine if the proposed management plan needs to be modified to protect the research subjects.

c. All studies of human subjects REQUIRE APPROVAL from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) with additional assurance from the Investigators that there are no personal conflicts that may threaten the safety and privacy interests of the patient/research subject and public trust of the University’s integrity and credibility.
d. Any financial or other interest that an Investigator, his/her Household or Family Member, or a unit of the University, have in a business entity sponsoring a clinical investigation must be DISCLOSED to the subjects recruited into the study.

e. Sponsors of human research may provide payments or incentives related to a specific study by depositing into a departmental account. Employees with a financial or other interest in the sponsoring entity should not have signatory privileges on this account for disbursement of funds. Individual Employees involved in a study may not themselves or on behalf of their Household or Family Members, accept payments, incentives or gifts from sponsors of clinical research.

G. ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NOT ALLOWED

1. The following activities present conflicts of interest that cannot properly or effectively be approved and monitored and, therefore, are NOT ALLOWED.

   a. Solicitation or Receipt of Gifts.

   i. Solicitation or receipt by a University Employee or his/her department of a gift (including money, non-pecuniary gifts, excessive compensation or non-commercial loans) where

      i. The purpose or effect of the gift is likely to influence the Employee in the discharge of his/her University responsibilities (i.e., vendor selection);

      ii. The gift is given to reward the Employee for official action taken; or

      iii. The gift is given in close proximity to recent past, present or future transactions between the University and the giver of the gift.

   2. This section is not intended to apply to the regular or ordinary compensation an Employee receives from a business entity in situations covered above by Section E.1.e, where approvals have been granted. This section also does not apply to occasional non-pecuniary gifts that have an insignificant monetary value and would not tend to influence an Employee in the discharge of his/her duties.

   b. Academic Freedom.

   i. Secrecy or confidentiality requirements beyond the scope of Section E.1.b on projects that will be the basis of evaluation of a student or fulfillment of degree requirements, or evaluation of faculty or other Employees.

   2. Arrangements that permit sponsor interference with the scientific analysis or publication of research results or conclusions.

   3. Evaluation of faculty, postdoctoral fellows, staff, or students based on participation in (or refusal to participate in) outside activities involving business entities in which the evaluating Employee or his/her Household or Family Member have a significant financial or other interest. The involved Employee shall not participate in such evaluations.

   c. Conflicts Associated with University Employees and Private Enterprise.

   i. Non-reimbursed involvement of faculty, students, research associates, technicians, or other staff supported by public funds, on University time, for work motivated primarily by commercial concerns or intended to benefit a business entity. Such involvement must be disclosed and the University resources utilized must be fully compensated by the commercial entity through a negotiated contract in accordance with the Board of Regents Policy.

---

5 NOTE: A University Employee advising a government agency on matters in which the Employee has a significant financial or other interest, evaluating commercial competitors for a government agency, or consulting for a federal agency while conducting research sponsored by the agency, may be subject to agency conflicts of interest policies and disclosure requirements. Employees should remember that such requirements exist separate from and in addition to University requirements.
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2. Physician consultation for the purpose of marketing a product for a medical product company when the physician/researcher is in receipt of a grant or contract from the same company.

3. Obtaining consent of subjects by Employees who themselves, or whose Household or Family Member members, have financial or other interests in an entity sponsoring the clinical research.

4. Conflicts between an Employee’s obligations to the University and his/her commitments to an outside entity, including a sponsor of University-based research. For example, an Employee may not have an agreement with a sponsor regarding transfer of technology or Intellectual Property in conflict with the University policy governing ownership of Intellectual Property.

5. Transfer of University technology or other Intellectual Property without following the University’s patent and copyright policies.

6. Use of the University’s name in connection with private activities in a manner that inappropriately suggests that the University endorses, sponsors or approves of such activities or views of the Employee.

7. Use of the University's facilities, equipment, property, or personnel by an outside entity in which an Employee has a significant financial interest. Unless the entity has an agreement for lease or use of such space, equipment property or personnel signed by an institutional official with signature authority for the institution.

8. Receipt of publisher incentive fees by an Employee who has authority to require educational materials for students involved in specific coursework at the University. This provision does not preclude royalty payments to authors of educational materials used by students in their coursework.

9. Sponsored Agreements or sub-agreements between the University and an organization where an Employee or his/her Household or Family Members has a significant financial interest which do not fully reimburse the University for use of facilities, personnel, equipment, space or other resources including full payment of University overhead and other rates for such use.

H. CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT

1. Conflict of Commitment may occur when external activities, including consulting and other professional or personal activities, compete with an Employee’s responsibilities to the University and detract from the mission of the University. All University personnel holding full-time positions shall give full service to University work during scheduled work periods. Any non-University employment must not interfere with the discharge of the person’s full-time service obligations to the University. Full-time University Employees will treat the University as their prime employment activity.

2. Part-time or full-time employment in an off-campus position or business enterprise in addition to full-time University employment is discouraged unless such off campus employment is considered to

---

6 This section incorporates the consultant policy and use of University resources policies located in the University Administrative Manual.

7 Full-time - An employment relationship, applicable to both faculty and classified Employees, which requires a commitment of 100% of the individual's normal and expected working time and effort. Full-time employment is generally inconsistent with the acceptance of any other employment on a continuous or permanent basis. However, such activities may be acceptable with Department Chair or appropriate supervisor permission. In the event the employment poses a potential significant financial conflict or conflict of commitment, such potential conflicts should be disclosed to the University under the processes defined in this policy. Also refer to the Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, section 8.
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improve upon or facilitate the Employee’s teaching or other University duties. Each faculty member
or classified staff member is responsible to inform his/her immediate superior of all such outside
employment activities.

a. **Public Service.** The University approves of public service activities that are not incompatible
with full performance of University duties and not inconsistent with University policies and
procedures.

b. **Outside Teaching.** Academic Faculty members may not accept employment for, and may not
perform, any teaching, instructional, or research services for other academic institutions during
Teaching semesters without the knowledge and written approval of the cognizant chair and dean.
Compensated or uncompensated participation in an occasional short-term conference, seminar, or
symposium or the delivery of a scholarly paper or public address at a professional meeting or
academic gathering under the auspices of an academic institution, does not violate this policy.

c. **Public Addresses.** Requests for faculty or staff members to give addresses to clubs, community
organizations, and other groups may be responded to at the discretion of each individual faculty
or staff member. Such activities shall not interfere with the faculty or staff member’s University
responsibilities.

d. **Medical Faculty Consultations.** Full-time medical faculty may not engage in private practice or
consultation work except in conformity with the School of Medicine Practice Plan or other
policies approved by the president, upon recommendation by the Dean of the Medical School,
subject to such conditions and limitations as the president may require. Such medical practice or
consultation work must not interfere with the faculty member’s primary responsibility to the
University.

e. **Consultation.** Consultation and other services to persons, firms, institutions, and agencies
outside the University may be carried on by University Employees so long as the performance of
such services does not interfere with the individual’s obligations to the University, subject to the
following restrictions:

1. Faculty members are allowed to be compensated for outside professional or scholarly
activities providing they comply with the Board of Regents’ policy, Title 4, Chapter 3,
Section 8 of the Board of Regents Handbook. Compensated outside professional service by
faculty members is a legitimate activity unless specifically prohibited by the employee’s
contract with the University.

2. Use of consultation time should have a demonstrable relation to the professional interests of
the faculty member or administrative officer, and to the University’s general mission within
the community.

3. Consultation involving service to individual patients or clients may take place in a faculty or
staff member’s office. Other than limited use\(^5\) of University facilities and/or equipment for
non-University supported purposes must comply with the University Policy on the Use of
University Space and Equipment. When authorized by the Provost or the Provost’s designee,
use of University space or equipment shall be reimbursed on a full overhead basis.
Intellectual property rights developed using significant University resources shall be
negotiated with the University in accordance with the University’s Intellectual Property
Policy.

\(^5\) Limited use is defined by NRS 281 481, subsection 7 - - The use does not interfere with the performance of his
public duties; the cost or value related to the use is nominal; and the use does not create the appearance of
impropriety. Nominal use includes the use of mailing lists, computer data or other information lawfully obtained
from a governmental agency which is available to members of the general public for nongovernmental purposes; or
the use of telephones or other means of communication if there is not a special charge for that use.
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4. The individual engaged in consultation activities must arrange in advance, with the approval of the responsible department chairperson, director, or other line officer, for scheduling of classes or other work assignments missed as the result of consultation activities.

5. Individual exceptions to this policy may be approved by the cognizant vice president upon recommendation of the dean or director, subject to any specific conditions imposed by the President.

f. **Responsibilities of Consultants.** University Employees engaged in consultation services have the following responsibilities:

   1. The University Employee must advise, in writing, the person, firm, or agency for whom such consultation services are to be performed using language as specified in Sections i and ii below that

      i. The Employee, in his/her role as a consultant, is acting solely as an independent contractor, and not as an agent or Employee, or under the sponsorship, auspices, or control of the University of Nevada, Reno; and

      ii. The University assumes no responsibility whatever, express or implied, for the actions or omissions of the Employee in his/her role as a consultant.

   2. The University Employee must personally assure that the conditions and limitations upon external consulting activities, as required by University policy, are fully satisfied, and must be prepared to document that fact if called upon to do so by a responsible University officer.

   3. Before entering into a consultation contract, the University Employee must personally determine that the contemplated consultation activities and arrangements will not involve a Conflict of Interest with the individual's duties to the University that may be in violation of this policy. Such conflicts may be implicated if

      i. The consultant is or will be serving concurrently as a principal investigator under a contract or grant from the same external firm or agency; or

      ii. The consultant's services are directly related to and derived from activities performed under a contract or grant from the same external firm or agency, or from confidential information acquired as a result of participation in such a contract or grant; or

      iii. The consultant agreement anticipates the use or development of intellectual property in the same field or scope of work that the consultant provides to the University as an Employee and/or the agreement contemplates assignment of rights to such intellectual property.

1. **INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT**

   1. The University must also avoid and/or manage Conflict of Interest positions where its beneficial relationship with corporate entities may place it in conflict with its responsibilities as a public institution.

   2. **General Principles.**

      a. The University will deal legally and ethically with external sponsors of research and sponsored programs in ways that avoid institutional conflicts of interest.

      b. The University will not enter into agreements contrary to its mission.

      c. The University will not accept an award for a project that is unacceptable to the principal investigator. Once an award is accepted by the University, all parties are expected to fulfill their obligations under that agreement.

      d. The University will not enter into activities or agreements which could jeopardize its eligibility to receive federal or state funds.
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a. Of particular concern are research activities (the design, conduct, or reporting of research results) where the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation or Research Ventures, Inc has equity in a business or receive donations from a business sponsoring research. These situations may create conflicts, or the appearance of conflict, that compete with those of research investigators or in the case of clinical research, of the research subject. Any financial relationship with a corporate sponsor should be documented, and include the following: equity interest or ownership, payments to the University or a unit of the University beyond payments directly associated with costs to carry out a particular protocol or scope of work, any funds or other items of value given to the University or a unit thereof, any percent ownership of patents, royalties, or licenses granted to the commercial sponsor by the University, and whether or not the University stands to gain financially if the study shows a positive outcome.

b. Before entering into business agreements that may place the institution in a Conflict of Interest situation, the University shall ask the Conflict of Interest Committee to review and recommend strategies for management of the conflict. Similar reviews shall be made of all active previous business arrangements, and where conflicts are found, referred to the Conflict of Interest Committee for review. The process to reduce, manage or eliminate such research conflicts that the institution may have, will be handled by the Conflict of Interest Committee and managed similarly to an individual Conflict of Interest situation. The Conflict of Interest Committee that oversees institutional conflicts will include a minimum of two non-University affiliated individuals. Possible solutions may include special management to protect the scientific integrity of the study and in the case of clinical research management to assure the safety of research participants, or alternatively, having a clinical study performed at other sites.

4. Administrative Decision Making by Individuals Who have Personal Conflicts of Interest

a. All University Employees participating in decision making related to the design, conduct or the reporting of research should be aware and comply with Conflict of Interest principles, including those stated above. This includes when they are involved in personnel decisions, overseeing compliance activities, assigning space, selecting purchasing contracts, and other issues in which their personal Financial Interests may be perceived to bias their decision making regarding the research activity.

J. CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMITTEE AND DECISION MAKING

1. Conflicts of Interest Committee.

a. The Conflicts of Interest Committee shall be a standing committee appointed by the President (the “Committee”). The Committee shall be chaired by a faculty member nominated by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President. The Chair shall serve a three year term. The Committee shall be comprised of 6 members including the Director of Sponsored Projects, the Director of Technology Transfer, the Director of the Human Research Protection Office, the Dean of the Graduate School and a community member not otherwise affiliated with the University. The Designated Official shall attend Committee Meetings to provide advice and direction, but is not a voting member of the Committee. If appropriate, based on the nature of the Conflict of Interest disclosure, the Committee may request the presence of the Director of Purchasing, the NSHE Office of General Counsel or other faculty members, deans, chairs and/or directors to assist in the committee process. In the event of an institutional Conflict of Interest, a minimum of two individuals who are not affiliated with the University shall serve on the committee. The Designated Official will present a list of community volunteers to the Committee and the Committee will select two members to serve for the evaluation of any institutional Conflict of Interest disclosures. All members on the committee, including invited members, have voting rights. A quorum consists of over half of all voting members. The Committee shall serve as an advisory body to the University administration on conflicts of interest issues, as provided in this policy.
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b. The Committee will review information provided by the Designated Official and will make determinations as to the proper level of management of conflicts.

2. **Conflicts of Interest in Decision Making.**
   a. A Committee member shall be recused from discussion of a particular case if:
      1. The Committee member has a personal interest because of inter-departmental relationships, such as collaboration with the faculty member whose case is under consideration; or
      2. The Committee member has a personal financial interest in the case under discussion.

K. **PROCEDURES**

1. Any instance of Conflict of Interest must be disclosed, and reduced, managed or eliminated depending on the type and degree of conflict. It is the responsibility of each Employee to disclose possible individual conflicts for review. It is the responsibility of the University to evaluate and require the Employee to manage, reduce or eliminate the conflicts. A monitoring plan will be established for every instance of Conflict of Interest using Federal funds and private/corporate funds from a business entity as determined by the Conflict of Interest Committee.
   a. **Disclosure.** This policy uses disclosure as the key mechanism to bring potential conflicts of interest to light for further evaluation, and for oversight, where necessary.
      1. **Annual Disclosure.** All Faculty and Key Personnel\(^9\) shall fill out an Annual Summary of Outside Activities and Interests Form regarding the Employee’s, the Employee’s Household or Family, and other Household or Family Members where the Employee knows or should know of Significant Financial Interests that may pose a Potential Conflict of Interest. This disclosure shall be submitted as part of the Employee’s Annual employment evaluation. The Annual Summary of Outside Activities and Interests Form shall be submitted to department chairs or directors who will keep all negative disclosures in the employee’s personnel file and forward a copy of all positive disclosures in their unit to the Designated Official.

2. **Project Based Disclosure.** If a Conflict arises during the year that was not disclosed on the annual disclosure form due to a specific project, study, or technology proposal, protocol or intellectual property disclosure that might be perceived as being in conflict with external activities of the employee, the employee shall submit a Conflict Evaluation Form directly to the Designated Official or to the Office of Sponsored Projects, Graduate School, Controller’s office or Technology Transfer office as appropriate on a project by project basis. All Project Disclosures shall be routed to the Designated Official for review. The Principal Investigator shall indicate on a Sponsored Projects transmittal form if there are any Faculty or other Employees included in a proposal submission with a potential Conflict of Interest. The Principal Investigator shall ensure that any Employee with a potential conflict fills out and submits a Conflict Evaluation Form. If a new Conflict of Interest arises during the life of a project, a new Conflict Evaluation Form must be submitted within 10 business days to the Principal Investigator for forwarding to the appropriate administrative office.

3. **Confidentiality and Reporting of Conflicts of Interest.** All records and information provided by an Employee for the purpose of disclosure and management and all official records of disclosure and management shall be considered confidential. Any information disclosed by an Employee as required by this policy shall be used solely for the purpose of administering this policy and may not be used for any other purpose unless required by law. Unauthorized disclosure of any such information by an Employee shall be deemed to be unethical behavior and shall be subject to disciplined pursuant to appropriate procedures. Board of Regents

---

\(^9\) The chair/director of each University department may identify Employees whose positions do not require the completion of an Annual Disclosure Form.
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Policy requires that the University submit an annual report of outside compensated professional or scholarly service that has been approved by the University. The report will include aggregate data regarding positive disclosures reviewed and approved under this policy. An employee may be required to publicly disclose elements of a potential conflict of interest in his or her publications and/or presentations if appropriate, applicable and required by the Conflict of Interest Committee as part of a reasonable and appropriate management plan.

b. **Review.** Annual disclosures submitted to Department chairs and directors and project based disclosures which identify a potential Conflict of Interest will be forwarded to the Designated Official who, will review the disclosures, gather more details if necessary and forward the information for consideration to the Conflict of Interest Committee. To the extent that disclosures include procurement issues, the Designated Official shall also forward the disclosures to the Director of Purchasing or include the Director of Purchasing as an ad-hoc member of the Conflict of Interest Committee for review of such disclosures. The Committee will review the file and make a determination that the potential conflict does not require oversight, recommend a strategy for management and oversight of the potential conflict, or recommend that the activity should not proceed. The final determination of the Committee shall be provided, in writing, to the disclosing Employee and, if appropriate, to the Employee’s supervisor, chair, dean, or director. The Management, Monitoring and Implementation plan and a statement of the University’s best interest regarding the disclosed conflict will be forwarded to the President for final signature and approval.

c. **Management and Oversight.** The Conflict of Interest Committee will consider potential conflicts of interest and determine whether to Manage, Reduce or Eliminate the conflict. The Committee, in consultation with the University Employee ultimately responsible for the proposed research or activity, will develop a Management, Monitoring and Implementation Plan (the “Plan”). The Plan is subject to approval by the Designated Official. The Department Chair or Director of the Employee with a potential Conflict of Interest will be responsible for providing process and oversight for implementation of the Plan. All identified Conflicts of Interest must be handled by one of the following three approaches:

1. A conflict can be **MANAGED** if the conflict does not seem to be of such a degree that the research or activity as proposed would be compromised in regards to academic freedom, integrity or objectivity; or
2. The conflict must be **REDUCED** if there is a serious possibility that the research or other activity as proposed would be compromised or a serious concern that there could be a conflict with University policies.; or
3. The conflict must be **ELIMINATED** if the research or activity as proposed would be compromised by the conflict. If the conflict cannot be eliminated, the Employee shall eliminate the conflict by either divesting him/herself from all external financial interests or by not proceeding with the research or activity.

d. **Coordination with other Offices.** The Designated Official shall maintain a database of all University personnel that provides information regarding when each individual submitted a Financial Disclosure and the status of any Conflicts of Interests that have been identified. This database will be accessible to the Office of Sponsored Programs Administration, the Human Research Protection Office, and the Office of Technology Transfer

e. **Appeals.** Appeals to any determination made by the Designated Official and/or the Conflict of Interest Committee shall be made to the Vice President for Research (for research matters) or to the Provost for all other matters. The decision of the Vice President for Research or Provost on the appeal may be appealed to the President of the University. The decision made on this appeal is final. In conflict matters involving a Vice President, appeals shall be made to the President and his/her decision on the appeal shall be final. Institutional Conflict of Interest appeals should be addressed to the Executive Vice Chancellor for review and final decision.
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f. **Reporting.** Procedures for internal and external reporting will be implemented by the Designated Official.

1. **Internal Reporting.**
   i. Annual Monitoring Plan reports, and any violations, will be submitted by the Department Chair and Directors to the Designated Official, who will present them to the Conflict of Interest Committee, and to the cognizant Vice Presidents as appropriate.
   
   ii. For proposals that may restrict disclosure or publication of students' work that constitutes a degree requirement or that will be the basis of evaluation of a student (see Section E.1.b.1), initial disclosure shall also be routed to the Graduate School, who will make an initial recommendation to the Conflict of Interest Committee, and the Vice President for Students Services or other appropriate officials.

2. **External Reporting.**
   i. The Public Health Service ("PHS") requires that the University certify to the PHS awarding component that action has been taken, prior to the institution’s expenditure of any funds, to manage, reduce or eliminate any Conflict of Interest. The University must specify the process that it will undertake to manage, reduce, or eliminate the Conflict of Interest.
   
   ii. The National Science Foundation requires that the University report any conflicts of interest that cannot be, or have not been, satisfactorily managed, reduced or eliminated. It is anticipated that other Federal agencies shall require similar practices in the future. These requirements will be incorporated into this policy as requirements are imposed upon the University.

L. **VIOLATIONS AND SANCTIONS**

1. **Reporting and Investigating.**
   a. The Designated Official will forward any reports of violations to the Conflict of Interest Committee and to the Sponsoring Agency when specified by the agency policy, or contract or grant requirements. The Committee will then forward a recommendation to the Vice President for Research or other appropriate Vice President or the Provost as applicable. The cognizant Vice President or Provost shall coordinate the investigation of any violation with any sponsor who requires such investigation.
   
   b. The cognizant Vice President or the Provost shall have the authority as appropriate to determine resolution and discipline in accordance with NSHE Code or Nevada Administrative Code for the reported violations. The Vice President for Research shall coordinate the investigation of any violation with any sponsor who requires such investigation.

2. **Discipline.**
   a. Violation of this University policy may result in discipline, including suspension and dismissal as provided under any of the following University policies:
      1. NSHE Code Chapter 6; and
   
   b. Compliance with this policy may also be enforced through the exercise of administrative responsibility for oversight of funded research and management of University facilities and other University property. Such enforcement measures shall include, but shall not be limited to:

---

10 PHS requires the University to certify that it will manage, reduce, or eliminate any new conflict of interest, at least on an interim measure, within 60 days from the time that the conflict is identified.
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1. Freezing research funds or accounts;
2. Rescinding contracts entered in violation of this policy or state law; and/or
3. Bringing legal action to recover the amount of financial benefit received by an Employee as a result of the Employee’s violation of this policy.

c. Violations of this Policy may also result in civil and criminal penalties pursuant to the Nevada Ethics in Government Law NRS Chapter 281 et seq. and may include prosecution for a felony.
d. The remedies provided or referenced above are cumulative and shall be deemed to include any other remedies required or provided by applicable state or federal law.

M. FORCE OF LAW

1. This policy shall be deemed to include all requirements relating to conflicts of interest to which the University and University Employees are subject under state or federal law.

N. REVISIONS

1. Revisions may be made to this policy when otherwise appropriate or necessary and shall be submitted to the Administrative Manual Committee for review and approval and then submitted to the President for approval.

O. REFERENCES

1. Administrative Manual Policies and Procedures Section 1,505 — Conflict of Interest Prohibited.
2. Administrative Manual Policies and Procedures Section 1,525 — Personal Use of University Property or Resources.
3. Administrative Manual Policies and Procedures Section 2,370 to 2,373 — Disciplinary Actions and Dismissal of Staff Employees.
15. Nevada Public Officers’ and Employees’ Ethics Act, NRS. 281.
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17. NSHE Business Office North Purchasing Policy.

18. NSHE Code Chapter 6 — Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community.

19. NSHE Purchasing Code — Restricted Purchases and Special Procurement.

20. NSHE Purchasing Code — Procurement from Vendor, University Employee with Interest.

21. NSHE Regents Handbook Title 4.1.11 — Personal Use of University Property or Resources.

22. NSHE Regents Handbook Title 4 Chapter 3 Section 8 — Compensated Outside Professional Services.

23. UNR Additional Compensation and Overload Policy ("LOA" contracts).

24. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Objectivity in Research Subpart F — Responsibility of Applicants for Promoting Objectivity in Research for Which Funding is Sought, 42 CFR Part 50, Subpart F.
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If you have any questions regarding this email please call Jacque Ewing-Taylor at 682-8598.

To all faculty, postdocs, and classified staff members,

It's time once again to complete your Annual Summary of Outside Activities and Interests form, also known as the conflict of interest form. This message is to let you know of some important dates and pertinent information.

- The form has changed and the latest version can be accessed at http://www.unr.edu/ospa/website4/content/policy.htm
- The Reporting Period is 1/1/08 – 12/31/08
- The date the forms are due is January 31, 2009
- The Conflict of Interest Policy can be found at http://www.unr.edu/ospa/website4/content/policy.htm
- Turn your form into your department chair or supervisor