

# Program Review Manual

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	Program Review Overview	1
<b>II.</b>	Program Review Self-Study Questionnaire	8
	Program Review Questionnaire	10
<b>III.</b>	Selection of the External Review Team	14
<b>IV.</b>	Arranging the External Review Visit	15
<b>V.</b>	The External Review Report	17
<b>VI.</b>	Follow-up	19

### Appendices

- A. Program Review Support Team; Useful URLs
- B. Questionnaire Terms/Definitions
- C. Program Review Deadlines/Timeline
- D. Sample External Program Review Schedule/Itinerary



## *I. Program Review Overview*

### A. Background.

The University's program review policy is given in UAM 6,091. For purposes of program review, the definition of an academic program is given in Appendix B.

In accordance with Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5 of the Board of Regents Handbook, NSHE institutions with academic programs are required to review existing programs on at least a ten-year cycle. Reviews of degree-granting programs at the University are conducted more frequently, with the process beginning in the 7th year following program approval or following a prior program review.

The Office of the Provost maintains a program review master schedule indicating when academic programs are scheduled for review. When possible, closely related programs and programs in the same academic department are scheduled to undergo review in the same year, typically with the same team of external reviewers. The program review master schedule is updated and revised annually and is distributed to the deans of the colleges with academic units prior to the start of the fall semester.

A program review may be scheduled to be combined with an accreditation review already scheduled. In order to accomplish this, the leadership of the academic program must alert the Office of the Provost of an expected accreditation review and the request that the accreditation review be combined with a program review. If granted, the requirements for this combined review described in the Program Review Manual must be met.

The program review process calls for a systematic analysis of the objectives and performance of an academic unit and its academic programs based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence, as well as planning for the future. The review process should be collaborative and interactive, with open, professional dialogue among all regular faculty in the department or who participate in the program, and those individuals should be invited to be participants in the program review visit. This collaboration should occur at all stages of the program review, from development of the self-study questionnaire through the review visit to the construction of a department or program response to the external review report following the visit.

In early July each year, the Provost will distribute a memo to departments with programs scheduled for review in the next academic year. A program review orientation is offered by the Office of the Provost each academic year at the start of the fall semester. Departments and programs are encouraged to send multiple representatives to the orientation.

Under special circumstances, the master schedule can be revised, or a program review can be accelerated, extended, or postponed. This request should be made to the provost through the dean and vice provost. If the program review is to be combined with an accreditation review, the department should alert the provost's office of this request as planning for the accreditation review begins and expect that certain adjustments or supplements to the self-study questionnaire and responses and actions following the accreditation visit and report will be necessary.

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

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

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

Following receipt of the external reviewers' report, responses will be obtained from the department, dean, graduate council (if the review includes a graduate program), and provost. A brief report on the major findings of the review will be provided by the provost's office for dissemination to the Board of Regents.

The program review process must be a collective effort in which all regular faculty of the program participate. This includes discussions about the overall objectives and accomplishments of the program in preparation for the visit, as well as participation in the external review visit and the response following the visit. A successful program review will result in reaffirmation of some activities and identification of new activities to improve the program.

In summary, program review is:

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

- Required by the Board of Regents

B. Administration of the Process.

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

C. Description of the Process.

The program review process is comprised of the following steps:

1. Selection and appointment of external reviewers. (By September 30.)
2. Completion of the self-study questionnaire by the program in consultation with members of the Program Review Support Team. (By November 30.)
3. Posting of the self-study questionnaire, appendices/exhibits and program review schedule to the Program Review NevadaBox site for access by the following individuals: (By January 15.)

Provost

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Vice President for Research and Innovation

Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School

Dean

School Director, if applicable

Department Chair or Program Director

Asst. Vice Provost, Assessment & Accreditation

Director, Academic Affairs

If the review involves a graduate program, to the Graduate Council representative through the Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School

4. Coordination of the review visit logistics, including scheduling, travel and lodging arrangements, catering, and associated university paperwork.
5. Review of the self-study questionnaire by the university representatives who will meet with the external reviewers.
6. Visit and report by external reviewers.
7. Meeting of the provost with Graduate Council to receive written report.
8. Dean's and department's response to the external reviewers' report.

9. Meeting of dean, department chair, provost, vice provosts, vice president for research and innovation, dean of the graduate school, and director, if applicable, to review the report and responses.
10. Conclusions and recommendations of the review by the Office of the Provost. (By May 15.)
11. A report to the Board of Regents. (Fall of each year.)

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

#### D. Responsibility Areas of the Program Review

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

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

#### **Administrative Tasks**

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

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

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

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

**3. Office of the Provost Responsibilities.** The Office of the Provost will be responsible for coordinating the following items:

- a) Issuing program review start-up memos and instructions to departments in early July of each year.
- b) Establishing a NevadaBox folder for each of the program(s) undergoing review.
- c) Providing data related to the program's students, faculty, and productivity for use in completing the self-study questionnaire.
- d) Conducting a *Program Review Orientation* in the fall semester for those programs undertaking a review.
- e) Determining members of the external review team and designating its chair, after consultation with the Dean.
- f) Corresponding with the external review team regarding invitation to serve, role and responsibilities, honoraria, expenses, review dates, travel, and follow-up correspondence concerning reports and other matters.
- g) Assisting the reviewers with reimbursement for airline travel; arranging lodging for the reviewers.
- h) Providing an account number for review hosting expenses up to \$150.

- i) Posting documents on the NevadaBox site and requesting appropriate responses from dean and chair/director and others involved in the review.
- j) Scheduling a meeting with the Provost; Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; the Vice President for Research and Innovation; Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School; Dean; Director of a School, if applicable; Coordinator, General Education and University Assessment, and the Department Chair/Program Director to discuss the external review team's report, department/program response, and Dean's response.
- k) If the review included a graduate program, meeting with the Graduate Council to receive its report and recommendations concerning the program review.
- l) Preparing a written response to the dean and program which incorporates all reports.
- m) Reporting to the Board of Regents as required.

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

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

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

- a) Reviewing the itinerary prior to the visit.
- b) Reviewing and signing the University Independent Contractor form establishing honoraria and expenses for the visit.
- c) Completing the on-line Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Supplier Registration at <http://suppliers.nevada.edu>
- d) Working with the Provost's office regarding travel and lodging arrangements; providing receipts/requests for reimbursement following the review visit.
- e) Reviewing the department/program self-study questionnaire and other documents prior to the visit.

- f) Providing a written report to the University.

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

E. Financial Responsibilities for Program Review

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

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

[https://apps.unr.edu/WebFormsPDF/PDF\\_UNR\\_ICA\\_US.aspx](https://apps.unr.edu/WebFormsPDF/PDF_UNR_ICA_US.aspx)

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

Social functions including one dinner may be appropriate during the review visit if time allows. The provost's office will host the opening breakfast for the program review. In addition, each program will be granted up to \$150 from provost hosting funds toward hosting expenses during the visit. These include meetings during the review visit where meals, refreshments, or other hosting items are provided. However, *individual* reviewer meals while travelling or before or after scheduled review meetings where university representatives are not present are not considered hosting.

Department attendees to hosted meals held during the review visit will vary. However, only one dinner hosted with university funds should be held during the visit. Additionally, the number of hosted department faculty should be limited to two plus the host and the reviewers. Additional department attendees should arrange for payment of their own meals. Also, keep in mind that university guidelines regarding costs and alcoholic beverages apply to the meals paid with university funds. These guidelines can be found in the University Administrative Manual, Section 1,067.

If hosting costs exceed the \$150, the program or department will be responsible for the extra expense. Hosted meals paid by a university employee can only be reimbursed from this amount.



### *III. Program Review Self-Study*

The program is responsible for completing the self-study questionnaire providing key information concerning the department/program and its students, various degrees, faculty, finances, and facilities. The self-study questionnaire begins on page 10, and can be downloaded as a MS-Word template from the documents page of the Provost's Office website. The self-study questionnaire should be followed as closely as possible, with additional narrative or information being provided as appendices. Much of the statistical information needed will be provided to the department or program at the start of the program review process. The Office of Institutional Analysis, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, or Graduate School may be able to assist in locating additional information that will be useful in completing the self-study questionnaire. The Program Review Support Team can provide feedback on draft documents and can give other assistance as is possible.

While the self-study questionnaire includes many questions and requires certain data, the primary purpose of program review is not answering questions and providing data. Program review becomes a valuable tool for improvement when goals, objectives, outcomes, and plans are examined in the context of expectations and data.

The self-study questionnaire should be completed with input from the entire department or program or a subcommittee appointed to the task. Likewise, the self-study questionnaire document should be available for review by the faculty as it is being finalized and the final document provided to faculty prior to the external visit.

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

Descriptions and data are important in order for the external reviewers and University administrators to understand any conclusions of the department and make recommendations. It is essential that careful analysis be provided in order to extract the maximum value from the program review process. This includes not only an examination of trends from the past to present, but also projections into the future. Since this is not a process for obtaining a stamp of approval, such as accreditation, but one to provide self improvement, it is encouraged that

the review delve into the important future challenges and opportunities for the program and take advantage of both self-reflection and the expertise of the external review team.

A word of caution is in order regarding solving problems or making improvements exclusively with the use of new resources. This approach will inevitably lead to disappointment; program review is not an opportunity to list what the program can do only if the funds become available. It is expected that many solutions and improvements can be accomplished with careful planning and a focus on the most effective use of existing resources.

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

The document should be prepared so that it is clear to your external reviewers who may not be familiar with special terms and acronyms. A glossary of terms is included as ***Appendix B*** for your reference.



## **PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Below is an outline of the questions on the self-study questionnaire. There is a separate self-study questionnaire MS Word document on the Provost's website under Forms and Policies: Program Review and also at this link: <http://www.unr.edu/Documents/provost/provosts-office/forms/Program%20Review%20Self-Study%20Questionnaire%202016.docx>.

### **Contact and Program Information**

#### **Program Description**

Unit or Department:

College or School:

#### **Author Information**

Primary individual responsible for completing this form and accompanying narrative (if included):

Name:

Title:

Campus Address:

Campus Phone:

Email:

Other faculty members who contributed to this report:

### **Program Information**

(1) Describe the organizational structure of the department.

(2) List all degrees (including options/emphases), minors, certificates, etc. offered by the department

(3) What is the mission statement of your program(s)? If your unit has a strategic plan, please upload it.

(4) How does your unit and its program(s) contribute to other units and programs in your college or school and/or in other colleges and schools at UNR?

(5) Explain how these degrees, mission statements, and strategic plan and objectives support the mission and core themes of UNR (see <https://www.unr.edu/accreditation/mission-and-core-themes>).

### **Previous Program Review**

(1) Identify recommendations from your unit's previous program review and explain what has been done to address these recommendations.

(2) Identify specific strengths that you believe your program possesses and weaknesses or challenges that you believe it faces.

## **Student Data**

- (1) Refer to the student data on your department's "vital statistics" and discuss, for example, any trends or initiatives relevant to the success of your undergraduate program(s).
- (2) Refer to the student data on your department's "vital statistics" and discuss, for example, any trends or initiatives relevant to the success of your graduate program(s).

## **Courses and Curricular Issues**

- (1) Are enough courses offered to meet enrollment demands for your programs/departments?
- (2) Are there any particular enrollment challenges that impact student retention, progression, and completion? Identify specific courses.
- (3) What actions have been or could be taken to address these challenges?
- (4) How would additional resources, if made available, be deployed?
- (5) Describe the processes of academic advising and mentoring in your program.

## **Student Learning**

### (1) Undergraduate Programs

- (A) List or separately attach the Core Objectives satisfied by courses in your program and explain how the Silver Core is represented by your program.
- (B) Program Student Learning Outcomes: List your program SLOs, explain how student learning is assessed, and provide a summary of the recent results of this assessment. If your program has implemented longitudinal assessments ("aligned" or "three-point" assessment), discuss the results so far. Identify any curricular or pedagogical changes implemented as a result of program assessment.
- (C) Does research, creative, or entrepreneurial activity inform student learning in your program?
- (D) Explain the role of experiential learning, outreach, and engagement in your program's learning outcomes.
- (E) What resources are available for providing students with experiential learning, internships, and explanations of employment and/or professional opportunities?
- (F) Describe the recruiting, advising, and retention programs in place for your undergraduate students. What impact have these efforts made on your programs and students?
- (G) Have any issues been frequently articulated in student evaluations of courses and instruction in your program(s)? Have these issues informed any administrative response?
- (H) Are there any causes for concern regarding grade distribution in the courses offered by your program(s)?

### (2) Graduate Programs

- (A) Program Student Learning Outcomes: List your program SLOs, explain how student learning is assessed, and provide a summary of the recent results of this assessment. Identify any curricular or pedagogical changes implemented as a result of such assessments.
- (B) What resources are available to students for research, scholarship, and artistry; conference travel; teaching; other professional opportunities?
- (C) Describe the recruiting, advising, and retention programs in place for your graduate students. What impact have these efforts made on your programs and students?
- (D) Have any issues been frequently articulated in student evaluations of courses and instruction in your program(s)? Have these issues informed any administrative response?

(E) Are there any causes for concern regarding grade distribution in the courses offered by your program(s)?

### (3) Student Success

(A) What information have you gathered on placements (e.g., job, graduate and professional schools) of the graduates of your programs? Have you received any relevant data from the Career Studio?

(B) For the success of both undergraduate and graduate students, what needs do you anticipate over the next 3-5 years? How do you anticipate your programs evolving during this time?

### **Faculty Data**

(1) Refer to the faculty data on your department's "vital statistics" and discuss any issues relevant to the success of your program(s).

### **Teaching Loads**

(1) Discuss the teaching loads for ranked faculty in your department.

(2) Discuss the teaching loads for graduate teaching assistants in your department.

(3) Discuss the teaching loads for LOAs in your department.

(4) Discuss the teaching loads for postdoctoral fellows in your department.

(5) Discuss the teaching loads for continuing lecturers in your department.

### **Searches**

(1) Provide the number of searches for new faculty in last seven years (categorize by new or replacement). Explain how any new hires complement the program.

### **Research, Scholarship, and Artistry**

Include CVs of full-time instructional and research faculty as appendices when you submit this document.

Describe the research and scholarly activities of your department, its success in external funding, and its productivity.

### **Outreach and Engagement**

(1) Describe any outreach and engagement activities pursued by your faculty. How have these activities informed (1) teaching/student learning, (2) research, scholarship, creative, or entrepreneurial activity, and/or (3) the community beyond UNR?

### **Financial Data**

(1) Refer to the financial data on your department's "vital statistics" and discuss any issues relevant to the success of your program(s).

(2) Are these resources sufficient to meet the instructional and scholarly needs of your program?

(3) If not, describe your additional needs.

(4) Has your academic unit engaged in any development and/or fundraising activities since the previous program review? Please describe in detail, including, e.g., donors and revenue.

(5) Identify any other sources of funding.

**Facilities**

(1) Discuss any concerns (regarding, e.g., size, safety) on the office, teaching, research, and/or performance space allocated for use by your department.

(2) Is the quality and quantity of available technology resources, such as computers, adequate? If not, explain.

(3) Is the quality and quantity of available equipment (other than computing) adequate? If not, explain.

(4) Is the quality and quantity of available library and information resources adequate? If not, explain.

**Conclusions and Planning**

(1) Describe your plans for program improvement. Your plans should include strategies for improvement using existing resources, and describe how additional resources would be invested.

### *III. Selection of the External Review Team*



The external review team that will come to the campus for a site visit is appointed by the Executive Vice President & Provost in consultation with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Dean, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate School, and the Chair/Program Director. The purpose of the external review visit is to provide an opportunity for carefully selected professionals to review the state of the program, discuss their findings and recommendations, and assist the program in the development of plans to improve its effectiveness. The external review team is responsible for submitting a report within three weeks of the visit. See *The External Review Report* section of this manual beginning on page 17.

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

## *IV. Arranging the External Review Visit*



### A. Itinerary for External Review Team Visit

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

A preliminary itinerary should be prepared and available with the questionnaire document by January 15. This will allow time for any necessary additions or changes once participants have had a chance to review the document. A sample itinerary is provided as *Appendix E*. Listed below are itinerary participants who must be involved; others may be added if needed.

#### **Itinerary Participants**

##### **Initial breakfast meeting of the team with the following group:**

Executive Vice President & Provost  
Vice President for Research and Innovation  
Vice Provost for Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School  
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
Dean of the College  
Director of the School in which the department is located, if applicable

##### **Meeting of the team with the following individuals:**

Dean of the College  
Director of a School in which the department is located, if applicable  
Department Chair/Program Director

##### **Meetings of the team or individual team members with:**

Department/Program Faculty  
Faculty in related or served programs  
Graduate Council program review representative (if applicable)  
Vice President for Research and Innovation  
Vice Provost for Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School

Student representatives  
Alumni (if available)  
Employers of graduates (if available)  
Advisory groups (if applicable)  
Others, as appropriate

**Exit meeting of the team with the following group:**

Executive Vice President & Provost  
Vice President for Research and Innovation  
Vice Provost for Graduate Education / Dean of the Graduate School  
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
Dean of the College  
Asst. Vice Provost, Assessment & Accreditation  
Director, Academic Affairs



## ***V. The External Review Report***

### Outline for External Review Team Reports

The external review team visit is the culmination of an extensive process of self-examination by the program. External reviewers are chosen to provide feedback from a broader perspective and to provide guidance to the program and the administration.

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

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

The following represents an outline for the evaluation committee's final report:

### University of Nevada, Reno Evaluation Committee Report Outline

---

#### **General Department/Program Strengths/Commendations:**

*Evaluation (include strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement) for each area:*

[Recruiting/Enrollment/Progression \(recruitment materials, recruitment activities, department website, enrollment trends\)](#)

Undergraduate

Graduate

Curriculum (curriculum organization, credits, relevance, currency, availability of courses, etc.)

Undergraduate

Graduate

Advising (staffing, leadership, career counseling, mentoring)

Undergraduate

Graduate

Student Learning and Success (assessment of program learning outcomes, retention/graduation/time-to-degree, job/graduate and professional school placement)

Undergraduate

Graduate

Program/Department (management, organization, leadership, planning, culture, administrative and professional staffing)

Facilities (teaching, faculty/staff offices, laboratories, and space unique to the department)

Faculty (morale, retention, mentoring, promotion, workload, hiring priorities)

Research/Funding (productivity, reputation, new sources)

**Strategic recommendations for Improvement (revenue neutral as well as if new resources become available):**

**Evaluation of the UNR external review process/site visit/self-study questionnaire document.**

## *VI. Program Review Follow-Up*



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

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

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

- I. Description of the Program
- II. Review Process and Criteria
- III. Major Findings and Conclusions of the Review
- IV. Next Steps for the Program Based on Program Review Findings and Recommendations
- V. Descriptive Statistics

## **Appendix A Program Review Support Team**

### **Contact People**

Joseph Cline, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, MS 0005, Phone 784-1740, e-mail [cline@unr.edu](mailto:cline@unr.edu).

David Zeh, Vice Provost for Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School, MS 0326, Phone 784-6869, e-mail [zehd@unr.edu](mailto:zehd@unr.edu).

Arthur Chenin, Institutional Analysis, MS 0118, Phone 784-4546, e-mail [achenin@unr.edu](mailto:achenin@unr.edu).

Audrey Casey, Director, Academic Affairs, MS 0005, Phone 682-7483, e-mail [acasey@unr.edu](mailto:acasey@unr.edu).

Russell Stone, Asst. Vice Provost, Assessment & Accreditation, MS 1005, Phone 682-7489, e-mail [crstone@unr.edu](mailto:crstone@unr.edu).

### **Links and Websites**

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

[http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/T4CH14N  
SHEPlanningProgramReviewArticulationandEnrollment\(1\).pdf](http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/T4CH14N%20SHEPlanningProgramReviewArticulationandEnrollment(1).pdf)

Provost Office Website:

<http://www.unr.edu/provost>

University of Nevada, Reno, Office of Institutional Analysis:

<http://www.unr.edu/ia>

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

If you experience any problems accessing the above material, please contact Russell Stone at [crstone@unr.edu](mailto:crstone@unr.edu).

You will be provided with the most current information available for awards and expenditures. The Office of Sponsored Projects posts previous years' reports at [www.unr.edu/sponsored-projects/reports](http://www.unr.edu/sponsored-projects/reports).

## **Appendix B**

### **Program Review Terms/Definitions:**

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

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

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

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

**self-study questionnaire** – a written document containing a systematic and thorough examination of an academic program's components in light of guidelines contained in the program review manual. The organization of the document is in the format of responses to a defined set of questions about the program.

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

- a. "Academic faculty" means instructional, research, and library faculty as defined by the Board of Regents. These faculty shall possess at least the master's degree or its equivalent in the appropriate academic discipline, unless the President waives this requirement.
  - (i) "Tenured faculty" means members of the professional staff who have received appointments with tenure.
  - (ii) "Tenure-track faculty" means academic faculty who are on probationary status, and who are eligible to be considered for tenure.
  - (iii) "Nontenure-track faculty" means academic faculty who are not eligible for tenure.
- b. "Administrative faculty" means those professional staff employed in executive, supervisory or support positions, as defined by the Board of Regents. These faculty shall possess at least the bachelor's degree or its equivalent, unless the President waives this requirement.

The following definitions are to guide the use of student enrollment indicators in the completion of the questionnaire. If different terminology is required (e.g., to follow

established indicators within a discipline or used by a pertinent association), it should be clearly defined.

**time-to-degree or graduation** - Generally defined as the amount of time it takes a student to complete a designated program or course of study. Time-to-degree is normally measured and reported as the “normal or conventional” time-to-degree, “reasonable time-to-degree” and “extended time-to-degree.” **a.** Normal (conventional) time-to-degree is the period in which students at an institution complete all of the requirements for a degree or certificate according to the institution’s catalog. IPEDS/GRS defines normal time-to-degree as four years (8 semesters or trimesters, or 12 quarters, excluding summer terms) for a bachelor’s degree, two years (four semesters or trimesters, or 6 quarters excluding summer) for an associate’s degree; and the scheduled times for certificate programs. **b.** Reasonable time-to-degree: that period of time that normally reflects 150% of the normal time-to-degree. For a four-year bachelor’s degree, the reasonable time-to-degree is six years. **c.** Eventual time-to-degree is defined by the Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting (JCAR) as the point at which 95% of a cohort has graduated. The time required to complete a graduate degree may be measured in three different ways:

1. Total time-to-degree: Number of years between the awarding of the baccalaureate degree and the attainment of the advanced degree and is used by the National Research Council in its Survey of Earned Doctorates.
2. Elapsed time-to-degree: Time from entry into your graduate program to the awarding of the degree.
3. Registered time-to-degree: Time during which student was registered in your graduate program, excluding any time taken off between enrollment (stop out time).

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

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

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

**graduation** - From the NCAA Graduation Rates Disclosure Form Instructions 1995:

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

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

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

**Program Review Timeline**

Revised: 8/17

**Appendix C**

To be completed by: Name

Deadline: Date

Done?	Department/Unit	Date by:	Notes
	Receive startup memo	Summer of each year	
	Attend Program Review Orientation	Fall of each year	All dept. representatives who will work on the review are welcome
	Assemble questionnaire report team	15-Sep	Department faculty & staff who will obtain data for the program review questionnaire
	Determine possible external review team members	30-Aug	
	Contact possible external review team members	15-Sep	Phone/email to determine willingness and general availability to serve
	Forward names of review team nominees to dean & vice provost, undergraduate education	30-Sep	Include CVs & contact information
	Determine possible external review dates	30-Nov	Work with director, academic affairs to suggest possible dates
	Forward preliminary questionnaire to Dean; Vice Provost	30-Nov	Send to dean & vice provost
	Distribute final questionnaire to reviewers & others	15-Jan	Send to director, academic affairs for posting on NevadaBox
	Arrange visit schedule meetings/prepare schedule	15-Feb	Send to director, academic affairs for posting on NevadaBox
	External Review Visit	Before March 30	
	Provide response to external review report	Within 2 weeks	Send to director, academic affairs for posting on NevadaBox
	Attend closing meeting		Also attended by dean, provost, vice provosts, and others
Done?	Dean	Date by:	Notes
	Receive copy of startup memo	July	
	Consult with Vice Provost on External Review team membership	15-Oct	Submitted by chair w/ CVs & contact information
	Review Program Review questionnaire	15-Dec	
	Participate in External Review Visit	Before March 30	
	Receive/Review External Review Report	Before April 15	
	Provide response to external review report	Within 2 weeks	Send to director, academic affairs for posting on NevadaBox
	Attend closing meeting		Also attended by chair, provost, vice provosts, and others
Done?	Graduate Council	Date by:	Notes
	Appoints representative to Program Review	by January 1	Inform director, academic affairs of liaison
	Representative reviews Program Review matls.	30-Jan	
	Representative participates in External Review Visit	Before March 30	
	Receive/Consider report from representative	by 8/30	
	Discusses report w/ Provost at a meeting	by 8/30	
Done?	Provost's Office	Date by:	Notes
	Issue program review startup memos	July/August	
	Organize & offer Program Review Orientation	Early fall of each year	
	Provides data and prior program review info.	July/August	Posted to NevadaBox
	Prepares and send formal invites to reviewers	October	Sent by director, academic affairs
	Works with Dept. and Reviewers to establish visit date	October/November	By director, academic affairs
	Arranges travel, lodging for reviewers; prepares reviewer contracts	December/January	By director, academic affairs
	Ensure review schedule is received from department	30 days prior to visit	Posted to NevadaBox

	Participate in External Review Visit	Before March 30	
	Receive external review report & makes available	Within 3 weeks	Posts to Shared NevadaBox Folder
	Arrange for payment/reimbursement of reviewers	Within 30 days of visit	By director, academic affairs
	Receive dept. & dean responses to report		
	If applicable, meet w/ Grad. Council for input		
	Schedule closing meeting		
	Provide formal closing memo to Dept.		
	Complete final report to Board of Regents	Fall of each year	

**Department/Program Name – Program Review**

University of Nevada, Reno - \_\_\_\_ - \_\_, 20\_\_

<b>Arrivals</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Airline</b>	<b>Flight No.</b>
	__/__/20__	Reviewer 1	__:__ a.m./p.m.		
	__/__/20__	Reviewer 2	__:__ a.m./p.m.		
	__/__/20__	Reviewer 3	__:__ a.m./p.m.		

  

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Name/Org./Group</b>
	____, 20__	7:30-9:00 a.m.	Breakfast Meeting	Please specify location: (Usually, restaurant at reviewer's hotel.)	Kevin Carman (Provost), Joe Cline (Vice Provost), David Zeh (Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School), Mridul Gautum (Vice President, Research & Innovation), ____ (Dean, ____), and (if applicable) ____ (Director, School of ____)
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Insert name, Chair
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Insert name, Dean
		½ hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Current students (undergraduates)
		1 – 1 ½ hours	Lunch/Meeting	Location: TBA	Review Team & ?
		½ hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Current students (graduates)
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Department faculty
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Faculty in related or served programs (if applicable)
		½ hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	David Zeh (Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School)
		½ hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Graduate Council liaison (if applicable)
		1 hour	Prepare for Dinner	Hotel	
		Evening	Dinner	Location: TBA	Dinner w/Chair + 2 Faculty
	____, 20__	1 – 1 ½ hours	Breakfast	Reviewer Hotel or TBA	Review Team
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Employers of Graduates (if applicable/available)
		1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Classroom Observations (optional)
	1 hour	Meeting	Location: TBA	Alumni (if available)	

# APPENDIX D

		1 – 1 ½ hours	Lunch/Meeting	Location: TBA	Insert name, Chair
		1 hours	Meeting	Location: TBA	Review team meets to prepare for exit interview
		45 minutes (early pm of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> visit day)	Exit Interview	Location: TBA	Kevin Carman (Provost), Joe Cline (Vice Provost), Mridul Gautam (Vice President for Research and Innovation); David Zeh (Vice Provost, Graduate Education/Dean, Graduate School); _____, Dean; _____, Director (if applicable); Russell Stone, Asst. Vice Provost, Accreditation & Assessment; Audrey Casey, Director, Academic Affairs
<b>Departures</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Airline</b>	<b>Flight No.</b>
	___ , 20__	Reviewer 1	__ : __ a.m./p.m.		
	___ , 20__	Reviewer 2	__ : __ a.m./p.m.		
	___ , 20__	Reviewer 3	__ : __ a.m./p.m.		
<b>Notes</b>					
	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Host</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>	<b>Date</b>	
	Name	Name	Cell phones	___ , 20__	
	Name	Name	Cell phones	___ , 20__	
	Name	Name	Cell phones	___ , 20__	