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It is very important that comments from the survey be summarized rather than reported verbatim so that those who have made comments cannot be individually identified.

Summary: In this survey, 75% of the program’s faculty responded to the survey questions. Faculty strongly reacted on three particular questions: (1) Insufficient full-time faculty to support the program. In the last several years, the program has lost at least four full-time faculty members. Equivalent programs across the county have twice or three times of the full-time faculty members; (2) the quality of students: a large portion of the students are unprepared for college education and there is a need to raise the admission standard and perhaps adopt an entrance exam. Many students entering the program cannot write, read, or understand the basic statistics and they cannot be sufficiently trained to meet the career requirements; and (3) lack of financial support and institutional invest on the program: the program often struggles with things such as photocopy papers, software licenses and facility maintenance/repair, instead of focusing on the larger issues in the disciplines. Faculty members expect that the program review will be an opportunity to transfer the information to the upper-level administration.

- Are you a full time or part time faculty member?

  Among the faculty who responded, 78% (7 out of 9) are full-time faculty members and 22% (2 out of 9) are part-time faculty members.

- Are you familiar with UNLV’s mission statement? It can be found here: http://unlv.edu/about/mission-statement

  78% of the faculty members (7 out of 9) responded that they are familiar with UNLV’s mission statement. 22% (2 out of 7) said that they were not familiar with the mission statement—among these, one of them is a full-time faculty member.

- Are you familiar with UNLV’s Core Themes? They can be found here: http://www.unlv.edu/about/mission-statement

  78% of the faculty members (7 out of 9) responded that they are familiar with UNLV’s Core Themes. 22% (2 out of 7) said that they were not familiar with the Core Themes—among these, one of them is a full-time faculty member.

- How does your program’s mission support UNLV’s mission and Core Themes?

  Only 44% of the faculty members (4 out of 9) responded to this question. The responses are diverse. Two faculty members stated that the program supports UNLV’s mission and Core Themes through training undergraduates for professional careers and by focusing on research and scholarship as important values. The other two commented that the unit did not review the university mission and Core Themes quite often, but in spite of unfamiliarity and confusion, the program strives to achieve the best of the students’ benefit that is consistent with UNLV’s mission and Core Themes.
• Please rate your satisfaction with the classrooms available to the program.

* Four faculty members (44%) responded “very satisfied”; two (22%) responded “satisfied”; and three (33%) did not respond to this question. Two faculty members (22%) commented that there are enough rooms available to the program, but the maintenance/technique support is unsatisfactory and the maintenance costs will soon outpace the available resources (currently, mainly student fees).

• Please rate your satisfaction with the equipment available to the program.

* In answering this question, 56% of the faculty (5 out of 9) are satisfied; 11% (1 out of 9) are dissatisfied; and 33% (3 out of 9) did not respond. Comments include the lack of up-to-date hardware and software, the darkness in the ground floor of the building, and lack of efforts on bundling licensing fees of common software across units for reduced cost.

• Please rate your satisfaction with the library resources available to the program.

* 67% of the faculty (6 out of 9) are satisfied or very satisfied with the library resources and 33% (3 out of 9) did not answer this question. Faculty appreciate the university library support (particularly university librarians), but sometimes it takes too long to get the inter-library loan books.

• Do you submit assessment results to your department?

* 56% (5 out of 9) of the faculty answered ‘yes’ to this question; 11% (1 out of 9) said ‘no’, and 33% (3 out of 9) did not answer the question. Comments stated that in recent years, the two faculty members who have been in charge of the assessment did an excellent job in actively engaging the course surveys and developing new tools of obtaining feedbacks.

• Have you made any changes based on assessment results?

* 44% (4 out of 9) answered ‘yes’; 22% (2 out of 9) said ‘no’; and 33% (3 out of 9) did not answer the question. Comments stated that the assessment now plays a major role in annual unit activity and, although some parts may still need to be improved, the assessment results have helped to revise the curriculum, course materials and syllabi.

• Is there an appropriate number of full time faculty to support this program?

* Among the faculty members who answered this question (66%; or 6 out of 9), all answered “no” to this question. The other three (33% or 3 out of 9) did not respond to the question. All the faculty members who responded to this question commented that the program lost at least 4 full-time faculty members in the last several years and the program needs more full-time faculty to teach and conduct research. Some faculty also commented that the program needs more qualified, new faculty hires.

• Is the number & quality of part time instructors teaching in the program appropriate?
Answers to this question are diverse. 33% (3 out of 9) answered ‘yes’; 33% (3 out of 9) said ‘no’; and 33% (3 out of 9) did not respond. Most of the comments stated that the number of PTIs may be sufficient, but the quality of PTIs varies. The faculty suggests to improve the PTIs by implementing a faculty monitoring system and by hiring PTIs who have already had experiences in the field (even if they do not have a PhD).

• Are students adequately prepared for your courses?

67% of the faculty members (6 out of 9) answered ‘no’ to this question and the other 33% (3 out of 9) did not respond. All responded faculty commented that many students currently enrolled in the program cannot write, read, and understand the basic statistics. They strongly encourage that the university admissions standards should be increased and there should an entrance exam.

• Are graduation requirements sufficient to prepare students for employment or further educational programs?

44% of the faculty (4 out of 9) answered ‘yes’, 22% (2 out of 9) answered ‘no’, and 33% (3 out of 9) did not respond to this question. Three faculty members commented that the requirements may be sufficient but a large portion of the students tried to get through the program by meeting the minimum requirements. They also commented that the instructor rigor is highly variable and the push for improving graduate rates may cause grade inflation. This has to be a university-level strategic plan – many unprepared students entering the program thought this is an easy major and they may not have earned their degree with challenging and thoughtful work, but by doing the minimum. Those graduates are not well-prepared for employment after their degree.

• Is there sufficient funding from all sources to assist the program in achieving it outcomes?

All faculty members who responded to this question (67%; 6 out of 9) said ‘no’. Faculty commented that the annual technology cost is estimated as about $150,000, but this year’s available funds (mainly student fees) are about one third of that amount. Faculty and students are worrying about the photocopy paper, rather than focusing on the larger issues in the disciplines. This program is a technology and software-heavy discipline and faculty members hope that there is a regular state funding source.

• Is there anything else you would like to say about this program?

Faculty commented that the program has great potential to be successful, to generate funds, and to be part of the university fundraising machine, but the lack of support has substantially hindered the program’s success. The upper-level administration needs to understand the needs of the program – not just financial support, but thoughtful institutional investment.