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Dixie State College of Utah

Regular Interim Accreditation Report
Submitted to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Executive Summary

Part A: Actions Taken Regarding Recommendations:
Dixie State College received four recommendations following its full-scale accreditation, October 6-9, 2002.

Recommendation One concerns faculty evaluations. DSC has devoted a significant amount of time and effort during the past five years to address the concerns regarding the consistency and uniformity of faculty evaluations. New policies have been created, duly approved and implemented; matrices for regular and uniform evaluations have been devised by faculty committees and academic administrators and evaluation instruments have been revised. Improvements are ongoing and fully embraced by faculty through the Faculty Senate.

Recommendation Two relates to faculty workloads. Evaluators noted that workloads for DSC faculty were high and opportunities for professional development were insufficient to support the highest levels of teaching and learning. DSC is evolving as an institution, moving from a community college to a baccalaureate degree-offering state college, and efforts to implement a new workload policy have necessarily been affected by the rapidly changing faculty demographic. Nevertheless, DSC began a faculty-driven process of developing a Faculty Workload Policy and a Workload Model that addresses issues of compensation, overload assignments, and intellectual property rights, among other things. A thoughtful review of Professional Development policies and processes began at the same time, with new policies currently in place. At this writing, a new workload model has been approved by the Faculty Senate and other internal councils and committees and is awaiting approval of the Board of Trustees.

Recommendation Three indicates that DSC’s rapidly growing and changing mission had led to lapses in adequate protection of students’ interests when discontinuing programs, as well as some inaccuracies in published information affecting students, and a lack of understanding of policies and processes and the dissemination of information. DSC acknowledges these shortcomings and has rectified them by creating new policies regarding “teach-out” of discontinued programs and policies and procedures for ensuring accuracy and timeliness of published materials. In addition, DSC undertook the immediate and thorough review regarding communication and implemented a regular process of communication and updates for its various constituencies.

Recommendation Four requires that DSC review its mission statement to reaffirm its general content and revise it to better reflect institutional realities. A three-year process involving internal and external scans culminated in a new mission statement in June 2005.

A full discussion of the institution’s progress in each area of recommendation follows in the report.

Part B: Questions Relating to Other Institutional Changes: Standards One through Nine
This section presents a brief discussion of the changes related to the nine standards.

Appendices:
The appendices provide information that supports the body of the report. Items less central or too large to include as appendices will be made available to the reviewers as exhibit items.
Introduction and Accreditation History:

This document is the Regular Interim Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation presented by Dixie State College of Utah to Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. The following chronology provides background and context for this regular interim report.

- September 1999, the Utah Board of Regents approved a mission change for the college, expanding its community college mission to add baccalaureate programs. The name of the college was changed from "Dixie College" to "Dixie State College of Utah."
- March 2000, the Commission approved the college's prospectus for substantive change and granted the college informal candidate status at the baccalaureate level.
- October 2002, Dixie State College of Utah underwent a full-scale accreditation evaluation.
- January 2003, the Commission notified the college that its accreditation was reaffirmed at the associate level and formally approved at the baccalaureate level. At that time, the Commission also requested that the college prepare a report and host a focused interim evaluation visit in spring 2004. The Commission specified that the evaluation would address general recommendations one through four.
- April 2004, evaluator Dr. Tana Hasart, representing the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, visited Dixie State College of Utah to evaluate how well the college responded to four recommendations resulting from the October 2002 visit. Dr. Hasart concluded that: "Dixie State College is an example of how accreditation can result in positive changes for an organization" ("A Focused Interim Evaluation Report" p 8).

The October 2002 Full-scale Evaluation Report:

Following the accreditation visit of October 6-9, 2002, the evaluation team issued six general commendations and four general recommendations (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report).

GENERAL COMMENDATIONS:

1. **General** - The Committee commends the Dixie State College of Utah faculty, staff, and administrators for their high level of dedication and commitment to the success of Dixie State College students.

2. **Information Technology** - The Committee commends Dixie State College for its commitment to providing a high level of information technology for students and faculty. The Smith Computer Center, online student records and registration, the robust and well planned network, the online resource support in the library, the well trained IT staff and adequate IT budget resources are all examples of the level of this commitment. As the college implements the new SCT Banner Systems, it is suggested that a high level of support and training for staff be maintained and financially supported by the college. (5.B.5)

3. **Community Service and Continuing Education** - Dixie State College has demonstrated exemplary performance in providing community service, continuing education, and cultural activities in the local community. These activities are consistent with the Mission of the college and Dixie is to be commended for the formation of these partnerships and collaborations with the community. Examples include Community Education, the Adult Education...
Program/Americorps program, the Cultural Activities program, the Hurricane and Kane County Educational Centers, the Institute for Continued Learning, Leadership St. George, the Southwest Orchestra, and the Dixie College Business Alliance. It is clear that Dixie State College is an active partner with the community.

4. **Fundraising** - The Committee commends Dixie State College for its extraordinary success in fundraising, exemplified in the amount of scholarship funding made available to support student access to the institution and in the major gifts that have played a significant role in ensuring that construction of key facilities proceeds in a timely response to enrollment growth and programmatic needs. This admirable record, recognized nationally, is the result of nurturing relationships with individuals and organizations in a forthright and informed manner over many years. The college’s students are the ultimate beneficiaries of these dedicated efforts.

5. **Physical Appearance** - The Committee commends Dixie State College for the physical appearance of its St. George campus, which serves to welcome the visitor and reinforce the sense of pride so evident with the members of its community - students, faculty, staff, trustees, and citizens of the region. Nestled in a strikingly dramatic setting, the campus displays carefully manicured grounds, broad open spaces, appropriate interconnecting paths between buildings, well-maintained structures and supporting infrastructure, and intentional placement of the Gardner Student Center at the heart of the campus.

6. **Physical Development** - The Committee commends Dixie State College for the priority given to planning for the physical development of the St. George campus. In view of the addition of baccalaureate programs and rapid growth in enrollment, the phased addition of building space and siting of new structures, enabled by key property acquisitions, is being given the visionary attention that will ensure the functionality and beauty of the campus in the future.

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The evaluation team made four general recommendations that will be discussed in depth in Part A of this report.

**General Recommendation 1:**

*Faculty Evaluation:* The accreditation team recommends that Dixie State College review and revise its faculty evaluation process, paying specific attention to policy 4.1. While the team did find evidence that Dixie applied its evaluation policy in a number of departments, the lack of consistent application across all departments was apparent. Recommendation number two in the 1992 Northwest Accreditation report indicated, “the faculty evaluation process is inconsistent and fragmented, lacking clear direction and conformity.” That is still the case in 2002 (4.1).

**General Recommendation 2:**

*Workloads:* The Committee recommends that Dixie State College engage in a process that will bring faculty workloads into compliance with Standard 2.A.1 and 4.A.3. In order for the institution to demonstrate its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning (2.A.1) it is essential that sufficient human resources be provided to support the educational programs and facilitate student achievement of program objectives wherever and however they are offered. Current full-time faculty workloads are high; however faculty have willingly taken on additional burdens of teaching overloads and additional assignments that have exceeded the amount where the high standards of teaching and learning can be sustained. Further, there are too many instances where the burdens on faculty and staff workloads come to the point that there is not sufficient time and support allowing for professional growth and renewal (4.A.3).
General Recommendation 3:

Institutional Integrity: The team found inconsistencies, inaccuracies and omissions in information present to Dixie’s constituencies (including the Commission) and some lapses in ethical treatment of undergraduate students. Whether its failure to “teach out” a discontinued program to ensure fair student treatment, publication of inaccurate information about the current accreditation status of programs, communication of inaccurate information in schedules and catalog, or failure to document compliance with policies, the institution has had lapses in its attempts to adhere to high ethical standards. Any institution undergoing rapid change in size, mission, or personnel is prey to lapses, and the Committee understands that. Taken individually, these instances vary in their significance. Although unintentional on the institution’s part, the number of such occurrences indicates inadequate review of publications, and inadequate communication among those responsible for making, documenting and publicizing administrative actions and decisions. No single action or procedural change can correct this array of problems. The Committee recommends that the college re-evaluate the means by which policies and procedures are disseminated, their application monitored, and their results implemented and reported in college documents. (Standard 9, 9.A.2 and 9.A.3)

General Recommendation 4:

Recommendation on Mission - The mission statement of Dixie State College of Utah was created amidst change that is still unfolding. It does not appear that the internal community was fully engaged in its creation. While it is published widely and widely recognized by the campus community, it is not as widely understood, perhaps because it does not capture the unique characteristics of Dixie State College or give clear guidance as to the next changes. The evaluation team therefore recommends that the campus review the current statement to both reaffirm its general content and to implement whatever adjustments would make it fully consonant with current institutional realities and reflect Dixie’s unique characteristics (1.B.3 and 1.B.9). Dixie can use that process to its advantage so it decides how to resolve its resource dilemmas. (Page 56.)

Soon after receiving the evaluation team’s report, the college created a plan for initiating improvements related to these four general recommendations with a detailed list of tasks, the responsible office or person, and a date for completion (Appendix A.1, Accreditation Recommendation Tasks). This plan and the recommendations themselves serve as organizing principles of the first part of this report. The report will discuss the recommendations and describe the college’s ongoing efforts to improve itself in each area.
PART A: ACTIONS TAKEN REGARDING GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

General Recommendation One: Faculty Evaluation

Problems Identified by the Evaluation Team

The college's 2002 self study explains that through the 1990s the college redesigned its faculty evaluation process, creating a comprehensive set of evaluation procedures with four parts: (a) student opinion surveys, (b) supervisor evaluations, (c) self-evaluations, and (d) peer evaluations (Exhibit A.2, Faculty Evaluation Policy, Revised May 2003). Each of these procedures is to be implemented on a specified schedule of rotation, with opinion surveys administered in all sections of all courses.

The evaluation team's report noted the following:

The Dixie State College self study asserts, “All faculty, both full- and part-time, will report that their teaching is consistently evaluated.” Interviews with faculty in most all of the academic areas substantiate this assertion. However, certain faculty report that the evaluation process is not consistently applied across the campus. Evaluations in the areas of student, administrative, peer and self occur in most departments, but once again faculty report that the evaluation process is not consistently applied and that the results from the evaluation process are sometimes not returned to the faculty member. The self study indicates, “Evaluators may sense some unevenness in the ways that faculty evaluation is implemented.” The accreditation team did, in fact, discover the aforementioned phenomenon. (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report, page 45)

The team's report concluded with this general recommendation:

Faculty Evaluation: The accreditation team recommends that Dixie State College review and revise its faculty evaluation process, paying specific attention to policy 4.1. While the team did find evidence that Dixie applied its evaluation policy in a number of departments, the lack of consistent application across all departments was apparent. Recommendation number two in the 1992 Northwest Accreditation report indicated, “the faculty evaluation process is inconsistent and fragmented, lacking clear direction and conformity.” That is still the case in 2002 (4.1).

Faculty evaluation activities had been thoroughly and consistently applied in some academic units; however, evaluation in other units lacked consistency. For example, the evaluation team's report noted that evaluation was in evidence in several academic units. One evaluator wrote that:

Both the science and mathematics departments are engaged in faculty evaluations. Faculty seem to pay particular attention to written comments on the student evaluations (which are done at least once at year for all faculty) and both departmental chairs are consistent in doing classroom observations followed by one-on-one feedback with faculty. (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report, page 12)

Another evaluator wrote that in the Education and Family Studies Department:

Faculty evaluation includes regular student feedback, portfolio for self-reflection, administrator observations and feedback. Peer input is still in the developmental process across the campus. Adjunct faculty participate in the student feedback process and observations by the department chair.

Nevertheless, evaluators did not see consistency in all academic units, principally the three departments in the Division of Business, Health & Technology.
Plan for Improvement

Consistency is the main issue identified in the evaluation team's general recommendation regarding faculty evaluation. To make improvement on this recommendation, the college planned the following tasks:

Review Faculty Evaluation Policy to ensure that it is consistent and applied across the campus. In order to respond to the evaluation team's general recommendation, the college began by reassessing the overall design of the evaluation process, with particular attention to the scheduling frequency of evaluation procedures. By May 2003, the college had completed its review of the evaluation process and incrementally revised the overall design. As it currently exists, the policy still includes four main types of evaluation activities. Depending on whether a faculty member is full-time or part-time and whether probationary or non-probationary, the schedule of evaluation activities is as follows:

Full-time probationary faculty:
- Student Opinion of Instruction Surveys conducted in all courses every term.
- Self-Evaluation completed once per year during the probationary period.
- Supervisor Evaluation completed once per academic year during the probationary period.
- Peer exchange completed during the spring semester.

Full-time non-probationary or tenured faculty:
- Student Opinion of Instruction Surveys conducted in all courses during the fall term.
- Self-Evaluation completed during the spring semester.
- Supervisor Evaluation completed once every three academic years.
- Peer exchange completed once every three academic years.

Part-time faculty:
- Student Opinion of Instruction Surveys conducted in all courses every semester.
- Supervisor Evaluation will be completed once per academic year (Exhibit A.2, Faculty Evaluation Policy, Revised May 2003 http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html).

Implement all procedures for all faculty during 2003-2004. Since 2002, all deans and department or program chairs have refocused energy and commitment to this important process. During the 2003-2004 AY and every year since, all faculty evaluation activities have been implemented for all faculty.

Centralize some faculty evaluation procedures. The college centralized certain faculty evaluation procedures, in particular the student opinion of instruction survey, to ensure consistent application. For many years the college has used a common set of survey questions that was developed and periodically refined by faculty committees; however, it had not been administered through a single office. Instead, prior to 2004, each of the academic divisions had created its own survey form and utilized its own system for reporting results to faculty. For example, for several years the Division of Arts, Letters & Science used a one-page Scantron form and created a custom report of results that listed averages and compared instructor averages to division averages. However, the Division of Business, Health & Technology used another opinion survey format, and never tabulated results. Instead of returning survey forms to faculty, all forms were filed in the division offices, and results were not statistically compiled.

To ensure that all faculty were evaluated under uniform and consistent methods, the Office of Institutional Research (IR) was assigned to administer the student opinion survey. The IR office contracted with a private company to create a professionally designed survey form (Appendix A.2, Student Opinion of Instruction Survey). In fall semester 2003, this survey form was administered in every section of every class taught on the campus (689 sections and 253 individual faculty members overall), resulting in over eleven thousand individual surveys. Each faculty member received an individualized report showing average responses. Also, the academic vice president wrote a memorandum explaining how the results should be interpreted. After the deans had reviewed written comments on the reverse side of the forms, all forms were
mailed to individual faculty members. Results were reviewed in Academic Council and professional development initiatives which will be discussed later in this report were implemented.

The method for evaluation described above became the standard strategy from 2003 onward. Centralizing student opinion survey functions has ensured that all faculty are evaluated in uniform and completely consistent ways; in addition, the process and application of the revised strategy for evaluation is monitored regularly. Samples of the evaluation forms are Appendix A.2.

Create a matrix that lists all faculty and dates of all past and future evaluation activities. The college also sought to resolve the consistency issues through a report that would show the current status of faculty evaluation activities. The academic vice president required the deans of academic divisions to submit ongoing reports showing the completion of faculty evaluation activities. Each of the academic divisions has created and is maintaining such a matrix (Exhibit A.3, Matrix of Faculty Evaluation). The academic vice president periodically reviews the matrices to ensure that faculty evaluation is consistently applied through all academic units on campus. Additionally, each division was asked to create and maintain complete faculty evaluation files. Each division will be able to produce documentation of the various types of faculty evaluation for every faculty member.

In 2006, the new vice president of academic services requested that the academic deans conduct a review of their respective matrix schedules and evaluate the effectiveness of the college’s universal and uniform faculty evaluation. That review was completed in October 2006. After a review of procedures, processes and forms, the deans determined that, indeed, the college was conducting universal, regular, and uniform practices of faculty evaluation.

During 2005-2006, the Faculty Senate worked with administration to develop a new compensation model, making rank and tenure an integral basis of compensation. This moved the institution away from a unified salary structure to a market-based structure and gave the rank and tenure—and evaluation—real significance. The model is Exhibit A.6.

Additionally in 2006-2007, the Faculty Senate undertook the development of new, substantial evaluation procedures which will be integrated into the application procedure for tenure and advancement in rank. Currently, the policy is making its way through the various committees for approval.

Faculty Survey, May 2007: Since the 2002 accreditation visit triggered several general recommendations relating to faculty issues, the vice president of academic services authorized a survey of full-time faculty at the end of the 2007 academic year. Faculty were invited to go online and respond anonymously to ten questions relating to workload, salaries, professional development and communication with academic administrators. Of the 114 full-time faculty members, 71 responded. The survey asked faculty to evaluate the current four-part faculty evaluation with this question: The current four-part faculty evaluation (student, supervisor, peer, self) is an effective tool that I use to improve my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Evaluations (70 responses)</th>
<th>Supervisor Evaluations (69 responses)</th>
<th>Peer Evaluations (70 responses)</th>
<th>Self Evaluations (70 responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.42% (1)</td>
<td>4.34% (3)</td>
<td>8.57% (6)</td>
<td>4.28% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>34.28% (24)</td>
<td>50.72% (35)</td>
<td>44.28% (31)</td>
<td>58.57% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4.28% (3)</td>
<td>15.94% (11)</td>
<td>20% (14)</td>
<td>12.85% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes meets</td>
<td>34.28% (28)</td>
<td>23.18% (16)</td>
<td>12.85% (9)</td>
<td>18.57% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>20% (14)</td>
<td>5.79% (4)</td>
<td>14.28% (10)</td>
<td>5.71% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey and an item-by-item analysis of the responses are in Exhibit A.4. Clearly, the respondents have mixed feelings about the usefulness of some existing evaluation methods. The Faculty Senate recognizes that the new retention, rank, tenure and promotion policy will be of little value without meaningful evaluations, and it instructed the Faculty Excellence Committee to review the methods and to develop a new Peer Review process which will be put forward for approval during the 2007-2008 academic year.

**General Recommendation Two: Faculty Workloads and Professional Development**

**Problems Identified by the Evaluation Team**

In the Final Evaluation Team Report (Exhibit A.1), the team made the following general recommendation:

Recommendation Two: Workloads: The Committee recommends that Dixie State College engage in a process that will bring faculty workloads into compliance with Standard 2.A.1 and 4.A.3. In order for the institution to demonstrate its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning (2.A.1) it is essential that sufficient human resources be provided to support the educational programs and facilitate student achievement of program objectives wherever and however they are offered. Current full-time faculty workloads are high; however faculty have willingly taken on additional burdens of teaching overloads and additional assignments that have exceeded the amount where the high standards of teaching and learning can be sustained. Further, there are too many instances where the burdens on faculty and staff workloads come to the point that there is not sufficient time and support allowing for professional growth and renewal (4.A.3).

**Historical Perspective of the College's Faculty Workload Policy and Workload Procedures**

The college's 2002 self study explains that a faculty workload policy regulates teaching and administrative assignments for faculty members. By Regent policy and college policy, faculty teach an annual equivalent of thirty credits per year. Because of the diversity of the faculty's working conditions, like many institutions, the college has many differing arrangements for workload that include particular arrangements for such things as laboratory instruction, reassigned time, and "paper load."

For several years, the college maintained a complicated workload policy draft that outlined formulae for assigning workload. Because it was continually under revision, this policy draft could never be finalized. At any point in time, two or three workload-related issues were pending, and administrators could never bring a finalized policy forward for approval. Instead, the college operated with the policy draft as a "working document" to which periodic, incremental adjustments were made.

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the college implemented a strategy to finalize its workload policy. The process for reviewing and updating the particular formula is included in the policy; however, the formulae themselves were in a non-policy document called "The Workload Model." In essence, this slowly changing working draft was separated from the workload policy, allowing the policy itself to finally be approved. The new policy identifies the procedures for changing the Workload Model, stipulating that a standing committee review and update the document.

**Economic Downturn of 2001-2002**. The problems that the evaluation team found at Dixie State in their 2002 visit were based in part on economic conditions in Utah at the time of the evaluation visit. Through the 1990's Utah enjoyed a sustained period of economic growth, and state appropriations for higher education grew. The operating budget increases to Utah's system of higher education through the years 1997-2001 amounted to an average annual increase of just over $20 million.
In spring 2001, when Utah's legislature issued its budget summary, it projected another increase to higher education to bring the system budget to $625 million; however, through that spring the state and the nation began to sense a fundamental economic slowdown that began to look like a recession. Through that spring, the college learned of growing budget rescissions that would be necessitated by Utah's earlier inaccurate state revenue projections. By summer 2001, budget makers estimated that the state's revenue would fall short of projected levels by nearly $400 million. In April 2001, the college was required to cut 4.86 percent of its operating budgets, or $1,056,000. The college froze unfilled positions and implemented a number of cost saving measures.

Faculty workload cost-saving measures: The college implemented two measures that involved faculty workload and one related to professional development: First, the college reviewed the academic credentials of all staff employees, and where appropriate and approved by the department chair in the academic discipline, staff employees were asked to teach classes during duty hours without additional remuneration. For example, the academic vice president taught chemistry classes, and the academic deans taught classes in their disciplines. Various advisors, librarians, and business officers taught classes in areas where they had graduate degree credentials. Many campus personnel taught courses such as freshman orientation, sophomore capstone, and COOP.

Second, the college, having frozen new faculty hiring, relied more heavily on part-time instruction. When appropriately qualified instructors could be found, they were assigned to teach. Also, because of increased demand for part-time instruction, the college allowed its full-time faculty to teach large amounts of "overload," instructional assignments above the regular faculty contract.

Third, for many years, the college had allocated funding for faculty members to pursue professional development projects of a variety of types, including travel to professional meetings and workshops, sabbaticals, and funding for technology training and equipment. The college's 2002 self study reported that:

Dixie State College provides opportunities for faculty to obtain professional development in the form of small grants (up to $1500), which allow faculty to undertake small-scale professional development projects, and sabbatical leaves, which allow faculty to receive up to sixty percent of their annual salary while they engage in long-term professional development activities. Since 1996, the College has spent the following amounts of funding for professional development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>$25,453.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>$54,913.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>$70,124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$90,625.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$47,698.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as the college adjusted its budgets downward, it stopped making professional development awards. The college's full-scale evaluation occurred within months of these very difficult times, and the college informed the evaluation team that when they arrived on campus, they would find employees who were troubled by the cost-cutting measures:

When evaluators visit campus, they are asked to be sensitive to the impact on morale of these difficult economic times. Evaluators should anticipate the anxiety that the College's difficult adjustments, cost-cutting and downsizing have caused (Exhibit A.5, Institutional Self-Study, 2002, p. 36).

The evaluation team noted that Dixie State College faced extraordinary budget pressure, but was resolute in its judgment that it had stretched resources beyond the point at which standards of quality could be maintained:
The institution is experiencing what much of the higher education faces - declining resources, increasing demand, and a struggle to maintain standards. Dixie seems to be doing its best to provide sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its programs (2.A.1). That dilemma at Dixie is highlighted throughout this report. Resources in general are stretched very thin. The committee cites that severally in the text on standard two and standard four. It will require additional resources to address the workload issue, for example. (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report, page 8).

Plans for Improvement

The issues identified in the recommendation relate to, first, "high standards of teaching and learning" and the amount of resources devoted to those standards (2.A.1); second, the relationship between the "talents and competencies of faculty" and their teaching assignments (4.A.3); and third, whether there is "sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal (4.A.3). To initiate improvement, the College planned the following tasks (Appendix A.1, Accreditation Recommendation Tasks).

**Revise workload policy to limit overload instruction for full-time faculty to two courses per term and twelve credits per year.** In May 2003, the college revised its workload policy to limit overload assignments to twelve credits total for the regular academic year and twelve credits for summer semester (Exhibit A.7, Workload Policy, Revised May 2003).

Interim evaluators will find that faculty members report that they are teaching fewer "overload" courses per term, and the overall number of supplemental teaching assignments has decreased. Many faculty members will comment that this policy change was a financial hardship initially, since they had relied on the supplemental income, and there was considerable faculty resistance to this policy change when it was proposed and implemented. Despite some faculty opposition, the college has complied with this limit on overload, requiring that it redouble efforts to find, train, and employ appropriately qualified adjunct instructors. Furthermore, increased efforts to fund faculty salary equity and raise salaries by significant levels have taken considerable pressure off faculty to teach excessive overloads.

**Revise workload policy to ensure that no faculty is required to take overload instruction.** In May 2003, the college revised its workload policy to include this paragraph:

10.2.2 No full-time faculty member shall be obligated to teach more than 30 semester credit hours or equivalent per year. (Exhibit A.7, Workload Policy, Revised May 2003.)

The college has carefully avoided requesting full-time faculty to assume overload teaching assignments above and beyond their normal teaching loads. If a full-time faculty member is teaching a supplemental course, it is at his or her own prerogative, without institutional pressure, and current policy limits overload courses to one per year.

**Revise workload policy to vest department chairs with responsibility to evaluate credentials:** If no qualified faculty (as determined by department chair) can be found, the instruction will not be offered. The college takes care to ensure that its instructors are appropriately qualified for their teaching assignments and are maintaining high standards of teaching. In accordance with the faculty's major role and responsibility in curriculum and academic integrity, department chairs are responsible for assessing the qualifications and quality of instructors. The May 2003, revision of the workload policy includes these paragraphs:

10.1.1.1.1 With the assistance of the department chairs, the academic dean makes all academic assignments.

10.1.1.1.1.1 The department chair is responsible to evaluate the credentials of all persons teaching within their disciplines. If in the department chair's opinion no qualified faculty is available, the instruction will not be offered. (Exhibit A.7, Workload Policy, Revised May 2003.)
In July 2006, the workload committee recommended a draft of a “Faculty Workload Model” composed of equivalency definitions and workload formula. These definitions and formula have accounted for such variables as class size, number of preparations, paper load, laboratory or clinical contact time, artistic performance responsibilities, released time for administrative duties, and more.

The Workload Policy and the Workload Model (Exhibit A.7): In general, the “Model” identifies the specific formula for calculating workload, and the “Policy” identifies the procedures for revising the "Model.” These two documents describe the college's workload procedures. Inherent in the documents are attempts to make workload arrangements that are, in the words of the policy, "equivalent [for diverse faculty types] and appropriate for all academic disciplines.” The new workload policy was approved by the Faculty Senate in February 2007 and by Academic Council in September 2007.

Faculty Survey, May 2007 (Exhibit A.4):

In the faculty survey described above, faculty was asked to respond to the following statement regarding workload: *The instructional administration is committed to aligning regular workloads with national standards for 4-year schools within state controls.* Seventy responses yielded the results below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While faculty views the administration’s efforts as laudable, workloads continue to play a role in faculty dissatisfaction. In a related question, of the ten respondents who indicated they were seeking employment elsewhere or had considered doing so in the recent past, almost 64% cited heavy workloads as a major factor in their decision to look for a position elsewhere.

Reinstate full professional development funding next year. Under the direction of the academic vice president, professional development funding was restored and awarded. By March 2004, forty-five faculty members had applied for and received professional development awards totaling $43,449. From March 2004 to December 2006, eighty-two individual faculty members had been awarded a total of $112,879.31 to pursue professional development ranging from conference attendance to released time for degree completion and reimbursement for tuition costs (Appendix A.3, Professional Development, 2004-2006).

Additionally, a faculty-initiated and faculty-authored National Endowment for the Humanities grant was awarded to the Humanities and Social Sciences department. This grant allows twenty faculty members to participate regularly in weeklong on-campus seminars with noted visiting scholars from various disciplines. The same endowment has allowed faculty in the humanities to attend a two-week seminar at Kings College, Cambridge University and France in 2003 and a similar two-week seminar at Kings College and Italy in 2006. In addition to the endowment funding, sixteen eligible faculty members received a total of $24,000 from DSC professional development funds towards the 2006 seminar.

In 2006-2007, additional monies were committed for work-to-study opportunities, in which educational assistance is made available when regular funds are depleted within the three-year cycle.

In general, the college has recommitted itself to professional development. The faculty professional development policy was approved on April 21, 2005. The revised policy lists priorities for professional
development awards and outlines a straightforward procedure for application. A standing committee, the Faculty Excellence Committee, has the responsibility of bringing the faculty's perspective to professional development planning. Policy 3-9, Professional Development, is Exhibit A.8, and is online at http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html.

In the 2007 Faculty Survey, respondents expressed the following levels of satisfaction when asked to rate professional development: The professional development process supports my professional and career needs. Seventy-one faculty members responded (Exhibit A.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discontinue required use of staff employees as instructors.** While several staff employees continue to accept teaching assignments in the evenings and during their off-duty hours, the college no longer asks them to teach during their normal duty hours without additional remuneration.

While Dixie State budgets continue to be very tight, the college has been able to maintain a commitment to "high standards of teaching and learning" and provide "sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its educational programs" (2.A.1).

**General Recommendation Three: Institutional Integrity**

**Problems found by the evaluators:**

The college's 2002 self study remarked that "an institution's ethical standards grow out of the hearts and minds of the institution's people, almost more than out of the institution's policies. . . . Dixie's people—the students and employees—have great integrity, decency and commitment to ethical standards, and this commitment has formed the ethical atmosphere of the institution" (Exhibit A.5, page 285).

The evaluation team noted that despite this commitment to ethical behavior, the institution's "performance under this standard is not fully successful" (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report, page 54). The team issued the following general recommendation:

Recommendation Three: Institutional Integrity: The team found inconsistencies, inaccuracies and omissions in information present to Dixie's constituencies (including the Commission) and some lapses in ethical treatment of undergraduate students. Whether its failure to "teach out" a discontinued program to ensure fair student treatment, publication of inaccurate information about the current accreditation status of programs, communication of inaccurate information in schedules and catalog, or failure to document compliance with policies, the institution has had lapses in its attempts to adhere to high ethical standards. Any institution undergoing rapid change in size, mission, or personnel is prey to lapses, and the Committee understands that. Taken individually, these instances vary in their significance. Although unintentional on the institution's part, the number of such occurrences indicates inadequate review of publications, and inadequate communication among those responsible for making, documenting and publicizing administrative actions and decisions. No single action or procedural change can correct this array of problems. The Committee recommends that the college re-evaluate the means by which policies and
procedures are disseminated, their application monitored, and their results implemented and reported in college documents. (Standard 9, 9.A.2 and 9.A.3)

Historical Perspective:

Elimination of the Aviation Program: The closure of one program in spring 2002, just months before the full-scale evaluation, caused some concern among evaluators. In February 2002, Utah's legislative fiscal analyst reviewed funding arrangements in flight programs at Utah's colleges and universities. Subsequently, analysts and legislature drafted budget intent language requiring the college's aviation program to operate on a "self-support" basis, which would effectively quadruple the tuition for this program. After discussions with students and faculty, the college learned that none of the enrolled students desired to continue under the new financial terms imposed by the state. The college's Board of Trustees deliberated about the closure of this program for over two months and objected vehemently to the state-level mandate before the program was officially closed by motion of the board.

The closure was harmful to a small number of students, and while the college did not take this step unilaterally, capriciously, or without pressure, the college agreed that policy at both the institutional and state level should guard against similar closures in the future. The college requested that the Utah System of Higher Education create a system policy, and the college created its own institutional policy that outlines procedures for ethically closing a program.

Inaccuracy of published information about program accreditation: Through a scheduling problem, the evaluator for the college's NATEF (automotive) accreditation could not come to the college in spring 2002 as planned. The evaluator scheduled an evaluation for the following fall term; however, he did not communicate that such a delay would cause the program's accreditation to temporarily lapse. When the college's catalog was published in May 2002, it listed the college as having NATEF accreditation, and at that particular time, it indeed was still accredited. In July 2002, however, the college's NATEF accreditation lapsed, and the evaluation team expressed great concern over this inaccuracy in the college's catalog. The college's accreditation was restored in November of 2002 following the NATEF evaluation.

Inaccuracy of published information about science labs: The evaluation team was concern about "communication of inaccurate information in schedules and catalog." Specifically, the 2002-2004 catalog published a lab requirement for general education natural science component courses when, in fact, the lab courses had been eliminated. The evaluators said: “This discrepancy presents a potential issue of misrepresentation" (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report page 12).

For many years, Dixie State's general education included a requirement that students take at least one science course with a lab, a requirement based on the college's philosophy of general education. However, the doubling of Dixie State's student headcount in a decade rendered this goallogistically unfeasible, and in spring 2002, the science department chair proposed that this requirement for a lab course be limited to only certain courses. After contentious debate, the compromise solution was rejected and the science lab requirement for all general education science courses was removed. Unfortunately, this change was approved within a few weeks of publication of the college's new catalog, so that the catalog that the evaluation team reviewed was out of date.

Like most college catalogs, Dixie State's catalog includes a disclaimer that:

All statements herein are true and correct as of the time of publication. However, the catalog is not to be considered a binding contract between Dixie State College and any student or other institution. The college reserves the right to change its regulations or course offerings as conditions require during the period of any student's attendance. At the time of printing this catalog, Dixie State College intends to give the courses listed herein, but reserves the right to eliminate any of them or to add new courses.

Current and recent past catalogs are at http://new.dixie.edu/catalog/ and also available in Exhibit A.9.
Plan for Improvement

The issues identified in the recommendation relate to ethical procedure and accuracy of communication, and the institution recognizes the significance of the recommendation. To make improvement on these issues, the college planned the following tasks (Appendix A.1):

Create a policy on discontinued programs, specifying the college’s obligation to teach-out students in the pipeline. In May 2003, the college finalized and approved a policy on "Elimination of Academic Programs" with the following paragraphs:

46.3.1 The President of the College with the approval of the institutional Board of Trustees is authorized to eliminate academic programs or occupied academic positions consistent with the institution’s strategic plan and/or financial exigency. The President, or the President’s designee, shall conduct procedures for an in-depth review to inform and guide decisions on these matters, ensuring that affected students are treated ethically.

46.3.2 Before degree programs are eliminated, the College shall ensure that the following conditions are met:

46.3.2.1 All recruitment and new enrollment for the program will cease upon approval of the Board of Trustees.

46.3.2.2 The program’s elimination is adequately described in College publications and communications to the public.

46.3.2.3 The College has a viable plan to provide all students currently enrolled in the program all appropriate courses and services that they need to complete the program’s requirements.

46.3.2.4 No student currently enrolled in the program is required to pay tuition or fees in excess of the amount that would have been charged had the program continued.

46.3.3 Before non-degree programs are eliminated, the College shall ensure that the following conditions are met:

46.3.3.1 If the program constitutes the only way to fulfill a curriculum requirement, either the curriculum requirements will be appropriately adjusted, or other courses offerings will be provided to allow students to complete their requirements in a timely manner.

46.3.4 Student responsibilities: Under this policy, students bear certain responsibilities to communicate and coordinate with the College and its administrators. Upon learning of a proposed program elimination, impacted students should immediately communicate their needs and concerns to the dean who oversees the program to facilitate the College’s planning. Also, when the College presents a plan to provide appropriate courses, students must take those courses when they are offered. (Exhibit A.10, Policy 3.46, Elimination of Academic Program, http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html)

Establish more formal procedures to review publications for accuracy. Publish a catalog addendum which includes major curriculum changes. The Office of Public Relations is in charge of publishing catalogs, class schedules, and other documents. This office has implemented new and more stringent reviews to ensure that catalogs are up to date.

In 2005, the college funded a full-time position for a webmaster, adopted a content management system and developed a college-wide web committee. Significant work has been done to accurately describe college services and ensure that content is up to date.

Also, to ensure that students have up-to-date information, the college created an addendum that is included in all distributed copies of the college catalog (Exhibit A.11, Addendum to College Catalog). This document lists changes to the curriculum, procedures and policies, and brings the catalog absolutely up to date. Dixie
State College now maintains an online version of the catalog so that changes can be posted as they are made, and print editions of the catalog include a reference to the online address where students can find the most current information. As of July 2006, an official "snapshot" is taken of the current catalog for print purposes and the dynamic online version is updated with changes only twice a year, on January 1st and/or July 1st, dates established by policy (Exhibit A.12, Policy 3.41, Curriculum Creation, Change, Approval and Review, http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html).

Review decision-making process in a variety of settings: The president will review the process in his visits to departments. The executive director of human resources will review it in all-employee meetings. It will be discussed at all faculty and staff orientation meetings. One of the issues in the evaluation team's report that was most troubling to the college was the assertion that the college's faculty and staff do not understand the college's decision-making process. The Final Evaluation Team Report (Exhibit A.1) made both positive and negative comments about the general administrative atmosphere, as follows:

- It is evident through meeting minutes and departmental interviews that full-time faculty in a large number of departments participate in department and institutional decision making activities. (Page 44.)
- The president has created structures for participatory and timely decision making and has provided exemplary leadership in setting institutional goals and priorities in response to regional demand and the needs of a maturing institution. (Page 49.)
- While not all faculty would agree, their role in governance is extensive. They are represented appropriately in key decision making forums. They have formal and informal access to all levels of administration. They have such traditional areas as curriculum and academic policy within their purview. . . . Staff members feel they have appropriate access and lines of communication to the President about their issues; they are less clear about decision-making processes, and the ultimate disposition of their recommendations. (Page 50.)
- The Committee's interviews confirmed that there is far from universal understanding of "how it works" and, therefore, recommends that efforts be made to clarify the flow of recommendations and decisions among the various bodies. (Page 50.)

The general recommendation, however, pointed to "inadequate communication among those responsible for making, documenting and publicizing administrative actions and decisions," and in many venues the college sought to improve communication on the decision-making process. Throughout the past five years, the president and administrative staff have taken many opportunities to communicate the decision-making process and the resulting decisions. In 2003 all-employee meetings, as part of its campus services report, the administration reviewed the policies and procedures for implementing and communicating decisions. Exhibit A.13, "Approval Process".

The faculty survey of May 2007 indicated that, as one group of campus stakeholders, faculty were satisfied for the most part with the process and practices of the instructional administration. When responding to the statement, "the instructional administration communicates information to the faculty in a timely manner," over 70% of the seventy faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed (Exhibit A.4).

Write and submit prospectuses for substantive change for the College's online courses. The evaluation team's general recommendation notes that "the team found inconsistencies, inaccuracies and omissions in information presented to Dixie's constituencies (including the Commission)." This parenthetical reference, the college was told, regards the college's compliance with the Commission's policy on substantive change. The evaluation team had the need for substantive changed approval related to the college's learning centers at Hurricane and Kanab, and its very small number of online courses.

Based this information, the college prepared prospectuses on its Hurricane and Kanab Centers (Exhibit A.14, Prospectuses) and began work on a prospectus for online courses. However, upon submission of the
prospectuses, the Commission revealed that Dixie State College had previously been approved to offer general education courses at the Hurricane and Kanab Centers and the prospectuses were not required (Exhibit A.15, letter from Dr. Albert Johnson). As for a prospectus to offer online courses, conversations with the Commissioners in February 2007 confirmed that no prospectus for a substantive change to offer online courses would be necessary until such time as the college began to offer entire degree programs online.

A final comment: The evaluation team's general recommendation notes that "Any institution undergoing rapid change in size, mission, or personnel is prey to lapses, and the Committee understands that." Implicit in this comment is the idea that lapses in integrity often result from administrative complexities and carelessness rather than from blatant dishonesty. The college accepts the general recommendation that it must be attentive and careful in its management, and it has worked diligently to set right its relationships with its various constituencies, including students, the Commission, and all members of the Dixie State College community.

General Recommendation Four: Mission Statement

Problems Identified by the Evaluation Team

In the Final Evaluation Team Report (Exhibit A.1), the team made the following general recommendation related to the college's mission:

Recommendation Four: Recommendation on Mission - The mission statement of Dixie State College of Utah was created amidst change that is still unfolding. It does not appear that the internal community was fully engaged in its creation. While it is published widely and widely recognized by the campus community, it is not as widely understood, perhaps because it does not capture the unique characteristics of Dixie State College or give clear guidance as to the next changes. The evaluation team therefore recommends that the campus review the current statement to both reaffirm its general content and to implement whatever adjustments would make it fully consonant with current institutional realities and reflect Dixie's unique characteristics (1.B.3 and 1.B.9). Dixie can use that process to its advantage so it decides how to resolve its resource dilemmas. (Page 56.)

Explicit in the general recommendation on the mission are three points of criticism: first, that the mission statement did not include input from “the internal community”; second, that it is too generic, failing to “capture the unique characteristics” of the college; and third, that it is not understood and prominent in day-to-day college governance and college culture. In addition to these three issues, the recommendation suggests that the mission statement is not "fully consonant with current institutional realities."

Historical Perspective of Dixie State's Mission Statement

The mission statement in 2002 (Appendix A.4, Old Mission Statement) was formulated through various internal and external processes. As an institution within the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE), the college drafted its mission in harmony with the college's role as expressed in the Regents' Master Plan 2000: A Commitment to the People of Utah and the Regents' Policy on Missions and Roles, R312 http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/r310.htm . These documents stipulate a variety of institutional elements, including the level and type of academic programs offered, the type of faculty hired, and the nature of workload arrangements. The mission statement included input from institutional trustees, students, faculty, staff and the community.

Importantly, the college also sought input from the Commission. On January 26, 2000, Dr. Larry Stevens wrote the college four detailed suggestions about its mission statement and gave specific directives regarding drafting and implementing its mission statement. The college took particular care to respond to
those directions, so it was disappointed to learn that it had received a general recommendation on its mission statement (Exhibit A.16, Dr. Larry Stevens’ Letter on Mission Statement, January 26, 2000).

Nevertheless, Dixie State College immediately began the process of revising and updating its mission statement as a result of the recommendation, a process that culminated with the adoption of a new mission statement in June 2005. Until that process was complete, the college continued to use the mission statement that was developed throughout 1999 and 2000 as described above.

**Plans for Improvement**

The evaluation team’s report noted that the college's current mission is "not fully understood." Further, "how the allocation of resources is unfolding under the mission...is a cause for concern and watchfulness as there is a clear tension between providing support for the traditional activities and new initiatives" (Exhibit A.1, Final Evaluation Team Report, page 6). The evaluation team's judgment is that the college's mission statement is not prominent in day-to-day college governance and college culture. The college approached the elements of this recommendation with sincerity, introspection, and responsiveness and it planned the following tasks (Appendix A.1 Accreditation Recommendation Tasks):

**Conduct a survey to evaluate faculty and staff understanding of the current mission and gather suggestions about its use.** The college's Strategic Planning Committee first determined the extent to which the college's various constituencies understood the current mission statement and used its principles in the day-to-day operations of the institution. The college created and implemented a survey that was designed to measure various constituencies' understanding of the college's mission, their agreement with the ideas in the current mission statement, and the effectiveness of the mission statement in college decisions and operations (Exhibit A.17, Mission Statement Survey Instrument and Results, February 2003).

This survey was administered in Spring 2003 and the results convinced the Strategic Planning Committee that the college should undertake a major revision of the mission statement. The strategic planning committee began the process in spring 2003. This process will be discussed below.

**Discuss the mission at all of the president's visits with campus units during coming year.** Each year, the president schedules a visit with campus units and academic departments to discuss concerns that are particular to the various groups. Since the time of the evaluation team's report, former President Huddleston and current President Caldwell have included a discussion of the mission in all meetings with campus units.

**Discuss the mission at the All Employee meetings.** Each fall and spring, the president conducts all-employees’ meetings in which the president’s administrative staff report on current projects and lay out future initiatives. In these meetings, the president and his staff continue to discuss the mission and its use in campus governance.

**Ask all persons serving on the Strategic Planning Committee to report about whether they have carried information back to the campus units they represent.** The college's strategic planning committee meets to discuss the college's mission and environmental issues that impact it. The strategic planning committee was urged to take a more active role in communicating its activities to the college's faculty and staff. Committee members are asked to communicate the committee's findings and work in the college's various department and unit meetings, as well as informally through conversation.

**Develop and implement a process for writing a new mission statement such that the entire campus community is involved.** The strategic planning committee implemented a process that involved two phases: First, the committee conducted an outward-looking Environmental Scan to measure important elements in the college's environment; and second, the committee conducted an inward-looking phase to measure the college's sense of its own mission as expressed by the various college constituencies

**Environmental Scan.** Throughout 2003, the strategic planning committee met with representatives of business, industry, government, culture, and education within the college's service region to gain an understanding of the economic, cultural, and social environment in which the college operates. The
strategic planning committee used this information to establish a strategic plan and a mission statement that is responsive to trends in the college's environment (Exhibit A.18, Environmental Scan).

**Internal Scan.** Throughout 2003 and 2004, the strategic planning committee conducted a variety of activities to determine the college's sense of itself, its direction, and its ambitions for the future and created a timeline of activities that provided for input of three types:

First, faculty, staff and students completed a survey to list what they considered to be the college's core values (Exhibit A.19, Core Values Survey - Instrument and Core Values Survey, Results and Analysis). In January 2004, the college had produced an analysis of the feedback from over eighty responses. This analysis showed that the college community valued: (a) the teaching and learning process; (b) being "student centered" and personalized; and (c) mutual respect, citizenship, and service.

Second, the strategic planning committee sought the input of all faculty and staff via email. They invited all faculty and staff to comment on the identified core values (Exhibit A.19, Core Values Invitation for Input).

Third, the strategic planning committee hosted two all-employee meetings in February and March 2004, in which faculty, staff and students came together for open discussions and brainstorming sessions about the college's mission and its future. Participants were divided into sub-groups for the purpose of discussion, and the groups reconvened to share commentary and ideas. A large body of notes, ideas, and email resulted from both sessions.

Before its completion, this process would involve reviews by the college's Board of Trustees, the office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, and the Utah State Board of Regents, as well as Northwest Commission. In September 2004, a draft mission statement went out to the college community for final comments. Approximately forty individuals sent additional comments and reactions which were incorporated if appropriate. A final version was approved by the Strategic Planning Committee and College Council with small changes incorporated at that time. On December 3, 2004, a final draft was presented to the Board of Trustees, who further refined some language and unanimously approved the statement.

Subsequently, the Utah State Board of Regents approved the Dixie State College Mission Statement on June 10, 2005. Three days later, on June 13, 2005, the college notified the Commission of the mission statement adoption and the processes that led up to it (Exhibit A.20, Mission Statement Letter to NWCCU). The current Dixie State College Mission Statement is Appendix A.5.

**A Focused Interim Visit, April 2004**

On April 19, 2004, Dr. Tana Hasart, representing the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, visited Dixie State College to evaluate the College's responses to the four recommendations resulting from the October 2002 visit.

Dr. Hasart submitted a report of her findings, noting that the College had made improvements in every area. She concluded:

Dixie State College is an example of how accreditation can result in positive changes for an organization. The College began a systematic, thoughtful process to address areas of deficiency, planned their responses carefully, implemented the steps necessary, and learned from their work. They are to be commended for their honest, studied processes that uphold the Standards set forth by the Commission. (Exhibit A.20, Focused Interim Evaluation Report, April 19, 2004, page 8).
PART B: Questions Relating To Other Institutional Changes
Standards One through Nine

Standard One: Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

1. What changes, if any, have been made in the mission and goals of the institution since the last full-scale evaluation and why have they been made? How have these changes been reflected in the educational program and/or functioning of the institution?

Dixie State College of Utah’s new mission statement, its rationale and the processes for its adoption are discussed at length in Part A, General Recommendation Four. The comprehensive text of the new mission statement is presented as Appendix A.6 and can be found online at: http://www.dixie.edu/gen/vision.html

At this writing, Dixie State College is an institution in transition. With its mission to expand baccalaureate offerings while continuing in its community college role, and given its location in the fastest-growing area of the United States, the college is striving to accommodate its own growth and the challenges of a changing and growing service area. The convergence of events and circumstances herein described has left the college poised to take on exciting opportunities and meet daunting challenges.

Changing Governance: In December 2004, after eleven years as President of Dixie State College, Dr. Robert Huddleston announced his resignation, effective July 2005. Dr. Lee Caldwell was appointed president in July 2005, assuming full responsibilities immediately; he was formally inaugurated in May 2006. Within the first year, he had identified a core administrative team that included new vice presidents of academic services, of student services and of institutional advancement. Importantly, Dr. Caldwell brought a new direction and vision for Dixie State College. The new administration and governance will be addressed in detail in Standard Six.

Expanding Facilities Needs: Housing the growing number of programs, particularly in the health sciences, has prompted increased activity in campus planning. Highly specialized program needs in areas like dental hygiene, nursing, and communications have resulted in creative partnerships with community stakeholders. An inventory of existing and future facilities is discussed in Standard Eight.

Assessment of Effectiveness: The college has begun to develop a new set of benchmarks to assess the effectiveness of strategic planning at the institutional level and at the program level institution-wide. Up to this time, DSC has continued to use the American Association of Community Colleges’ Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness as the basis for institutional assessment, even though DSC has been approved and accredited as a baccalaureate-offering institution since 2001. At this writing, the Office of Institutional Research is developing a new set of assessment indicators more tailored to a four-year institution.

2. What existing plans for the future have been achieved and what new plans have been formulated?

Program Growth: Dixie State College is at a crucial point in institutional planning and assessing its effectiveness. Approved as a baccalaureate degree-offering institution by the State Board of Regents in 2001 and accredited as such by NWCCU in January 2003, DSC continues to bring new programs forward as fast as its governing boards will allow. The period between 2002 and 2004 might be viewed as an incubation period as the college nurtured its three original baccalaureate programs: Business Administration, Elementary Education and Computer and Information Technology. As the three programs
matured and a fourth baccalaureate in nursing was added in 2003, the pace at which the college has developed and proposed new degree programs and emphases within existing degrees increased dramatically; however, the college’s enthusiasm for growth has not been matched with support from the Board of Regents. Since 2005, only five new baccalaureate programs have been approved and five more are awaiting Regent’s approval during 2007-2008. An inventory of these changes is in Appendix B.2.2 and the programs will be addressed in detail in Standard Two. The Strategic Academic Plan is illustrated in Exhibit B.1.1, “DSC Strategic Plan.” The new comprehensive strategic plan is discussed in detail below in response to question 3.

Utah State Board of Regents’ Planning Directives: In October, 2006, President Caldwell, Academic Vice President Dillingham-Evans and two members of the college’s Board of Trustees were invited by the Commissioner of Higher Education to review a consultants’ report on the relationship and direction of Dixie State College and Southern Utah University, located in Cedar City, Utah. The report recommended the two institutions form partnerships for the delivery of academic programming that is “complementary rather than competitive." As a result of that meeting, DSC began a renewed effort to work with SUU on the delivery of a secondary education degree, a criminal justice degree, and others. The Dixie-SUU and other partnership initiatives are discussed in Chapter Two under “Academic Partnerships.”

Intercollegiate athletics: Along with the institutional mission change and the growth of academic programs, the college moved from junior college intercollegiate competition in the NJCAA to the NCAA, Division II. This change brought certain internal accommodations to meet NCAA requirements in athletic programming and academic standards for student athletes. The NCAA status will be discussed in Standard Three.

Faculty: Several plans affecting faculty have been implemented or are nearing realization. Among them are a new salary schedule, enhanced professional development, workload policy and rank and tenure policy revisions. Completed projects are detailed in Part A, Response to Recommendations, and in Standard Four.

Educational Assessment: In 2002, at the time of its full-scale evaluation, DSC assessed general education outcomes in two required courses: SSC 1000, Freshman Orientation and SSC 2000, Sophomore Capstone. Since that time, the two courses have been eliminated and the college has experimented with several differing approaches. By 2006, the consensus was that new courses should be developed. Additionally, each academic program has begun a review of its own assessment mechanisms. Additionally, a thorough review of the college’s general education programs was initiated and is nearly complete. The processes and plans are detailed in Standard Two.

Institutional Advancement and Capital Projects: The office of Institutional Advancement has embarked on a campaign to raise $100 million dollars by 2011, Dixie State College’s centennial year. To date, over $58 million has been raised toward that goal. A priority for the campaign is scholarships for students and endowment funding for educational programs; however, the college’s growth brings facilities needs as well. The Utah State Division of Facilities Construction and Management (DFCM) awarded the college $80,000 for development of a new campus master plan in 2005; subsequently, the college retained the firm of Sasaki Associates and VCBO Architecture for professional assistance. Details of institutional advancement activities and capital projects are in Standard Seven and Eight, respectively.

Financial Modeling: The Director of Business Services has developed a formal financial model to assist the college in assessing its current financial situation and historical trends; the model also serves as a basis for future projections. The college has also developed a number of scenarios to explore the consequences of its revised mission statement in order to focus college resources on activities that deliver the best value to students, the taxpayers and the community.
Benchmarking: The college has undertaken formal benchmark studies of institutions in other states undergoing similar changes. For example, the University of Arkansas at Fort Smith (formerly WestArk Community College) became a baccalaureate-granting institution in 2002, and BYU-Idaho (formerly Ricks College) became a baccalaureate-granting institution at the same time Dixie State did. Other peer institutions have been identified as well, and benchmarking against the college’s Carnegie classification peers is under way.

3. **Succinctly describe the institution’s current status in meeting the requirements of Standard 1.B-Planning Effectiveness.**

Along with Dixie State College’s Mission Statement, its Strategic Plan provides overarching direction to the college. The plan is the result of substantial input over many months from a broad range of campus constituencies and community stakeholders. It has varying degrees of specificity and generality, given the complexities of the institution; the document is dynamic, given the nature of change and growth at the college. In addition, Dixie State College’s planning activities are informed by official policy documents that require a regular and on-going review, assessment and revision, and by the production of the “Dixie State College Annual Report” which is reviewed and approved by the institutional Board of Trustees and made available to the public as a printed document and online. (Annual Reports are online at [http://www.dixie.edu/fac_annualReport/index.html](http://www.dixie.edu/fac_annualReport/index.html), and samples are in Exhibit B.1.2).

In 2006 the college adopted a new structure for strategic planning that would more effectively reflect the new mission statement and better articulate what Dixie does as an institution. The new Dixie State College Strategic Plan is characterized by four pathways with specific goals within each pathway. They are:

**Strategic Academic Planning**, whose goals are guided by the DSC mission to “offer baccalaureate degrees in high-demand areas or core foundational areas consistent with four-year colleges” while keeping its “ongoing commitment to its community college role, which includes transfer education, career and technical education, customized training for employers [and] developmental education.” Under the direction of the vice president of academics, this arm of strategic planning is charged with program and faculty development, library and information resources and adult education.

**Strategic Enrollment Planning** takes its direction from the DSC mission providing a “supportive learning environment,” as well as ensuring diversity, access and opportunity by “reaching out to under-represented populations.” The vice president of student services oversees this planning effort, including efforts to plan for admissions, advising and counseling, retention and enrollment management, intercollegiate athletics, and all aspects of student life.

**Strategic Campus Planning** has goals of planning and implementing the capital facilities and infrastructure required to support the college’s mission commitments to students and the community. The vice president of campus services presides over the development and implementation of a comprehensive campus plan with short- and long-term goals. (View this committee’s work online at [http://dsc.infowest.com/](http://dsc.infowest.com/). The comprehensive Strategic Campus Master Plan is in Exhibit B.1.3.

**Strategic Financial Planning, Institutional Advancement, Community Engagement and Economic Development** sets goals to secure the college’s fiscal well-being and to increase giving for scholarships in support of the college’s educational mission, to secure funding for capital improvements, and to create innovative community partnerships to enhance the quality of campus life for students and community. Institutional Advancement is online at [http://new.dixie.edu/giving/](http://new.dixie.edu/giving/).

In May 2007 the Dixie State College Board of Trustees met with college administrators and faculty representatives to work on revision and completion of the strategic plan, which was subsequently approved.
by the Board of Trustees on September 7, 2007. The plan is Exhibit B.1.1, “Strategic Plan” and is online at http://new.dixie.edu/academics/strategic_plan.php.

Long-term Planning Efforts:

In the autumn of 2006, in order to enhance planning efforts, President Caldwell commissioned the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), an applied research center in the David Eccles School of Business at the University of Utah, to conduct an analysis of the region’s economy and demographics in order to align college resources with southwestern Utah’s dynamic and emergent needs. The BEBR analysis will describe the scope of need for higher education in Washington and Kane Counties. To complement the analysis, the president charged a planning task force with examining the adequacy and alignment of college resources with current and future needs. Using the findings from the BEBR analysis, the planning task force will recommend a course of action. The BEBR study was completed August 31, 2007. (Exhibit B.1.4).

Response to Evaluators’ Concerns:

At the conclusion of its 2002 report on Standard One, the evaluation team recommended that Dixie State College pay additional attention “to planning for a more diverse student body (1.B.2) and that “further efforts be made to communicate planning outcomes” (Evaluation Committee Report, page 7). The concern for communicating planning outcomes sounded a larger note in General Recommendation Three, Institutional Integrity, and is addressed fully in Part A: Actions taken in regards to Recommendation Three.

Regarding diversity, the college finds the sentence in the recommendation to be syntactically ambiguous. Does the recommendation urge us to plan to recruit a more diverse student body, or does it mean that student diversity is not adequately addressed in our planning? Nevertheless, diversity is an issue at Dixie State College. Utah and much of the intermountain area has been historically homogeneous, and since DSC draws nearly 70% of its student body from Washington County and the surrounding areas of southern Utah, it is no wonder that diversity concerns persist.

At the time of DSC’s full-scale evaluation in 2002, its student diversity looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage of Students at DSC</th>
<th>Percentage of Utah’s Population*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands/Asian</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Diversity figures based on 2005 census reports and institutional records indicate that the racial and ethnic percentages show some upward movement, but remain unimpressive. While DSC’s diversity ratios reflect those of Utah’s as a whole, there is one notable divergence: Hispanic populations are vastly under-represented at Dixie, even in a state where less than eleven percent of the population is Hispanic:
Increasing diversity at Dixie State is never far from the minds of administrators, staff and faculty. Planning for a more diverse student population remains a priority, and the college’s draft Strategic Enrollment Plan devotes significant planning efforts to diversity (“Strategic Plan, Exhibit B.1.1”).

4. What are the institution’s expectations of itself and how does it assess itself regarding the achievement of those expectations?

The mission statement of Dixie State College (Appendix A.6) articulates the institution’s expectations of itself. The college “strives to help students to define, shape and achieve educational and life goals.” DSC’s mission statement and its expectations of itself are profoundly student-centered, as the document illustrates: Dixie “is dedicated to providing personalized and excellent teaching in a learning environment where all students can become passionate about their individual educational endeavors.”

The mission statement further describes the core values of the college:

- Academic rigor
- Access and opportunity
- Cultural and demographic diversity
- Life-long learning
- Civic engagement
- Community commitment and economic development
- Accountability and sound management

The college assesses itself regarding these institution-wide expectations in multiple ways. Primarily, it uses the fourteen indicators from *Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness for Community Colleges* (Alfred, et al.). Each indicator provides data and analysis describing strengths, challenges and plans for improvement. An annual report compiled by the Institutional Research office provides results which are compared with data from previous years. Ultimately, the annual report is published and posted online. http://www.dixie.edu/fac_annualReport/index.html. In addition, the president of the college writes a “Resource and Review Committee Report” for the State Board of Regents twice yearly. This general report describes educational programs, students, finances, human resources, governance and community outreach. Examples of these reports are in Exhibit B.1.5.

The college assesses its fiduciary integrity through regular audit procedures and an Internal Audit, mandated by the State Board of Regents. Dixie State College’s Internal Audit function is an independent systematic appraisal activity within the college to review operations and to measure and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of controls and operations. Results of a department-by-department audit are reported to the Board of Trustees. The Internal Audit is online at http://www.dixie.edu/iaudit/about.html.
Standard Two: Educational Program and Its Effectiveness

1. **What changes, if any, have been made in the requirements for graduation, and why?**

There have been no institution-wide changes in graduation requirements for baccalaureate or associate degrees; however, requirements have undergone minor aligning revisions from time to time. In May 2003, the policy was revised to clarify the way GPAs are computed for awarding Latin honors and valedictory status and to include minimum credits earned for baccalaureate candidates. This change was made in response to DSC’s baccalaureate status. Prior to becoming a four-year college, valedictorians had been graduating sophomores; now graduates include seniors with necessarily different requirements for earned credits. Revisions in May 2005 allowed for co-valedictorians, one representing the associate degree graduates and one representing the baccalaureate graduates, and it further refined the criteria for selecting valedictorians and awarding Latin honors. Policies are available online at [http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polstu.html](http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polstu.html) and are in Exhibit B.2.1.

2. **What new majors, minors or degrees/certificates have been added? Discontinued? What significant changes have been made in existing majors, minors or degrees?**

Dixie State College has created a number of quality academic programs in response to student and employer demands and in accordance with its mission to offer “associate degrees and certificate programs that meet the needs of students, the community and the state,” and to offer “baccalaureate programs in high demand areas and in core or foundational areas.” The programs are in various stages of the approval process; some have been approved, fully implemented and reported to the Commission, while others are working their way through the various approval processes. Degree programs that have presently received all internal approvals and are now awaiting Board of Regents’ approval are:

- Bachelor of Science in Aviation Management, an adult degree completion program
- Secondary Education Licensure
- Secondary Biology and Integrated Science Emphasis BS
- Secondary English Emphasis BS
- Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies

The DSC Strategic Academic Plan identifies a number of programs that are scheduled for development in the near future; the Academic “Clusters,” as they have been identified, are illustrated in Appendix B.2.2.

**New Majors, Degrees & Certificates:**

The college, through its strategic planning efforts, regularly conducts internal and external environmental scans to identify and poll stakeholders regarding educational needs; this provides the rationale for the creation of new certificate and degree programs. Certain clear needs for well-prepared college graduates in business management, elementary and secondary education and health sciences have emerged in the past decade. The college is moving to develop and deliver its own high-quality degree programs and to develop creative academic partnerships to deliver other programs, described later in Standard Two.

By 2005, the Washington County School District, which provides K-12 education to the fastest-growing county in the United States, acknowledged a teacher shortage in elementary, secondary and special education. In response, Dixie State College developed a strategy to bring forward baccalaureate degree programs that stand alone as core foundational disciplines with high student and employer demand while also supporting secondary education licensure. The first three programs, Biology, English and Communication and New Media, were developed and approved during 2004-2006. A fourth degree
program, a Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene, was approved by the Board of Regents in January 2007 and is scheduled for implementation fall semester 2008. In July 2007, a stand-alone BS in Accounting was approved to take the place of the Accounting Emphasis in the Business degree, and a BS in Communication was approved to replace the Communication and New Media degree. Brief summaries of each new program are provided below, and a chart detailing all certificate and degree additions and deletions since 2002 is Figure 2.1 and in Appendix B.2.1.

Bachelor of Science Degree in Biology: The biology baccalaureate is designed to provide students with a firm foundation and understanding of the unifying concepts of biology including those at the molecular, cellular and ecosystem levels. All biology students in the program complete a set of core courses focusing on general biology, genetics, ecology, evolution, cellular and molecular biology and data analysis designed to prepare them for further study in biology.

Upon completion of the core, students may select other upper-division biology courses in one or more areas of their choosing (organismal, ecological or molecular). The versatility of the biology degree will allow successful undergraduate majors to enter professional programs in medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine, enter other professional or graduate schools, or prepare for secondary education licensure.

A highly qualified faculty and advisement in the form of a newly created lecturer/advisor position ensure a first-rate program. If the college is approved to offer secondary education licensure, this program is poised to provide teachers with a Science Composite emphasis.

At this writing, the Biology BS program has completed one full academic year and the chair assesses their efforts thus far:

- Program Revisions: Added BIOL 3100, Bioethics, to the choices of biology electives. Changed the cell biology course to a 3000-level course rather than a 2000-level course.

- Faculty: The addition of three part-time lecturer/advisors will help in advising students who are interested in the biology program. These individuals can also help students understand the versatility of the biology degree as a stepping stone to many other fields that they might not think of such as environmental law, art, wildlife film making, technical writing, consulting, and so on. The program needs additional full-time faculty. Because one full-time biologist was appointed Associate Dean, this essentially takes her out of the classroom setting. In the fall 2006 semester, enough credits were generated by adjunct and full-time overload to employ eleven additional full-time faculty. Administrators try to use adjuncts in the lower-division labs and for a few entry-level biology lectures and have full-time faculty teach the upper-division lectures and labs.

- Other Faculty Needs: The biology students are required to take a minimum of two years of chemistry (CHEM 1210 series and the CHEM 2310 series) along with a full year of physics. The science department expects enrollments in these courses to expand considerably once the program gains steam. They anticipate a need to hire an additional full-time chemist and an additional full-time physicist to meet the demands.

- Funding Needs: Lab fees help to offset the cost of consumable items. The academic division restructuring helped the program immensely with regard to finances. They estimate that their operating budget is about three times as large as it was under the old structure. As the biology program grows, it is essential that students have access to scientific journals which are very expensive. If the library can have some of these available on-line, it would help students when they need to gather information for research papers and theses.

- Assessment: A description of the program’s assessment activities is in Exhibit B.2.2

- Program Enrollment and Graduation: The program has an enrollment of between 20 and 30 students currently and it expects its first graduates in spring 2008. Dixie State’s Science Department has earned an excellent reputation over the past decades and the college expects to
continue this tradition. It intends to produce biology graduates who are successful in gaining entrance into graduate and professional schools or who are sought after by employers.

Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science Degree in English: The English BA and BS degrees are designed to give students skill in various forms of written communication and in interpreting and appreciating written texts. Students gain expertise in composition, rhetoric, grammar and linguistics and become familiar with literary works in and outside of the traditional canon. In addition to a set of core courses, students choose between a literature and a professional writing emphasis.

Students who successfully complete the baccalaureate requirements are prepared for immediate employment and for further study at graduate or professional schools; upon the approval of a secondary education licensure program, students may also be licensed to teach. The English department has one of the best-qualified faculties at the college, and new positions filled in 2006 and 2007 provide the sufficient breadth of expertise to support the degrees. The English program expects its first four baccalaureate students to graduate in December 2007.

After its first full year, the English Department has made several adjustments to its program. The department chair reports that they have revamped the requirements for literature classes and organized the literary offerings to reflect their new mission as a 4-year program. Specifically the department has:

- Streamlined the lower-division offerings: where twenty courses existed previously, the new list offers twelve 2000-level literature courses.
- Created nine 3000-level courses and added a senior capstone.
- Developed a pre-test/post-test for assessment for all literature classes. Ten questions are identical for all classes; ten questions are specific to the individual class.
- Created a new course, "Orientation for English Majors." This is one of the new pilot "Freshman Experience" courses to aid in retention and assessment efforts.
- Eliminated one of the professional/technical classes, Rhetoric of Business, because that emphasis can be met under the class titled "Writing in Professional Contexts."
- Advised instructors of the three World Literature courses to focus on non-Western literature in response to the 2002 accreditation team's suggestion.

The new degree program has created some burden in the areas of instructional staffing, departmental budgets, library resources and facilities. The department is actively recruiting qualified tenure-track and adjunct instructors and working with the library to expand holdings. Space to house faculty has vanished, with the most recent offices being located in renovated closets. The English Program Review, chair's report, and assessment documents are in Exhibit B.2.3.

Bachelor of Science in Communication: In 2006, the college was approved to offer a baccalaureate degree in Communication and New Media. This degree was an innovative applied degree, designed to provide knowledge and skills in three career paths through the development of specific competency tracks: 1) Digital Motion Picture Production and Broadcast; 2) Human (Business/Corporate Communication; 3) Web Design, Publish and Online Journalism. The competencies were designed to be isolated for one-year certificates, combined for two-year certificates, and integrated for the four-year degree.

As the degree program was implemented over a two-year period, it became obvious that the design was too narrow to meet the needs of many students. In spite of its flexibility in providing certificate and two-plus-two options for students, the college realized that the addition of a more traditional Bachelor of Science in Communication would serve students well, so the communication faculty developed and sought approval for a traditional degree program. In July 2007, the Utah State Board of Regents approved the new Communication BS to be implemented in Fall 2007, but stipulated that the Communication and New Media
degree be eliminated. The students currently enrolled in the Communication and New Media program will be accommodated and can continue class work in a teach-out program as per college policy, or they can opt to be integrated into a specific emphasis in the new degree. The new comprehensive communication degree features three emphases: Human Communication, Mass Communication and Digital Film. Human Communication will include educational tracks in interpersonal, small group, organizational and public (speech) communication. The Mass Communication tracks include print, communication technology, public relations and electronic media, while the Digital Film tracks will feature digital film production, digital film production management and compositing. The program and its assessment plan are Exhibit B.2.4.

Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene: A BS in Dental Hygiene was approved in January 2007, expanding the college’s excellent Associate of Science in Dental Hygiene. The baccalaureate program will accept its first cohort in fall 2008 when it moves into the new Taylor Health Science building. Students will receive training in education, community service practice, public health, research, advanced dental hygiene practices and early childhood dental care. Off-campus clinical experiences in this degree program will further develop the professional skills of students and provide supplemental oral health care to the elementary school children in the Washington County School District.

The dental hygiene program was once again nationally recognized, when its 2007 cohort scored among the top-five percent in the nation on the National Board Exam, a written exam that every graduate of every program in the country must pass in order to practice professionally. DSC dental hygiene students posted the fourth-highest pass rate on the 2007 exam, which was given in March. Students from 263 dental hygiene programs across the country took the exam this year. Dixie State’s program, which currently has 32 students enrolled, has finished no lower than sixth in the nation in eight years, with four top-five finishes, including a first place ranking in 2004 and a number two finish last year. In addition, DSC dental hygiene students passed the Western Regional Examining Board clinical licensing exam, which was administered May 16–19, 2007. The program as a whole scored a 93.3 percent pass rate with one student recording program-best 99.88 percent score.

The dental hygiene program has been awarded a $30,000 grant from the Utah Electronic College (UEC) to develop courses for an online bachelor degree completion program. Two-thirds of the grant funding will be used to pay stipends for four faculty program developers, while a $5,000 stipend will be earmarked for an instructional designer and an additional $5,000 will cover other expenses. The UEC is a collaborative project of the Utah System of Higher Education and will make additional grant funding available to the dental hygiene program as it successfully develops its online degree program. In 2006 the program received a $20,000 grant from Utah’s State primary Care Grants Program to help bolster its dental hygiene services, while the college and St. George’s Southwest Community Health Center received an additional $20,000 from the state for the Center’s dental services to address the dental needs of the underserved and uninsured.

In addition, the dental hygiene program christened its new Mobile Dental Hygiene Clinic in November 2006, which also serves as the centerpiece of the project under contract with Southwest Community Health. The mobile clinic, which is the result of over $400,000 in private donations, has four operatories on board and will serve Washington and Kane Counties in addressing the dental health needs of the community. The clinic is used to reach transportation-limited populations of southwestern Utah, including visits to qualifying elementary school children, rest homes, several Paiute reservations, and various community health centers. Exhibit B.2.5 showcases this program.

Bachelor of Science in Accounting: The Business Administration degree had proved so popular in its short tenure that the expansion was warranted; by the 2006-2007 academic year, the accounting emphasis had approximately one hundred students clamoring for a baccalaureate in accounting. In 2007 the college sought approval for an independent degree which will effectively grow the Accounting Emphasis in Business
Administration BS into a full-scale degree in its own right and eliminate the necessity for that emphasis. The proposal was approved by the Board of Regents in July 2007 and a Bachelor of Science in Accounting will be implemented for Fall 2007. The BS in Accounting program proposal is Exhibit B.2.6.

**Discontinued Programs:**

The entire drafting program, comprised of an AAS and two certificates, was discontinued at DSC in 2004, and the college completed total program phase-out by the end of Spring Semester 2006. As DSC discontinued its program, a drafting program was adopted by the DXATC. Students who wanted to complete the AAS degree or certificate programs in drafting at DSC coordinated closely with the program advisor and successful certificate/degree completion was achieved for all who wished it.

Likewise, the auto body program, comprised of an AAS and five certificates, was discontinued at DSC in 2005, and the college completed total program teach-out by the end of Spring Semester 2006. Simultaneously, an auto body program was adopted by the DXATC. DSC provided a successful total teach-out for all students who wished to complete the degree or certificates.

An AAS degree and certificate in office administration was also discontinued, largely for lack of enrollment. The popularity of the BS in Business Administration effectively eliminated the interest in this associate of applied science degree. A teach-out plan was not implemented because the program had no enrollment at the time it was discontinued.

**Figure 2.1: New and Discontinued Programs, 2002-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Certificate/Degree</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phlebotomy</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Management</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT Intermediate Advanced</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST Satellite Academy</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (collaborative)</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiography</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BSN</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; New Media</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA and BS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2008</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Added (replaces CNM)</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; New Media</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Drafting</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Drafting</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Mechanic Technology</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Repair</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinishing</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-structural Repair</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Administration</td>
<td>AAS &amp; Certificate</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What significant changes have been made in existing majors, minors, or degrees/certificates?

In response to student demand, the Business Administration BS added two emphases to the program in 2004, Accounting and Visual Technology. The Accounting emphasis has recently evolved into a complete degree program as discussed above under “New Degree Programs.”

4. What changes have been made in special programs providing academic credit and why have they been made?

While no significant changes have been made in existing special programs, the college has entered into a number of academic partnerships since 2002 and introduced opportunities for enhanced learning experience, such as a service learning initiative and an Institute for Business Integrity. Following is a summary update and a description of new academic partnerships that have developed since 2002.

 Hurricane and Kanab Educational Centers: DSC continues to offer lower division courses at its Hurricane and Kanab Centers. The Hurricane Center welcomed its new director, Becky Smith, a 25-year veteran instructor and administrator at Dixie State College at the beginning of the 2005-2006 AY, and the Hurricane Education Center began offering daytime classes in addition to its regularly scheduled evening classes. Prior to this change, the Hurricane Center rarely, if ever, offered daytime courses; now, approximately one-third of the courses taught have a start-time of 4:00 p.m. or earlier. The director is working on developing a morning curriculum.

The Center has added concurrent enrollment courses for Hurricane High School students in general education subjects and a part-time community education staffer has been assigned to Hurricane and the offerings in the area of adult and continuing education have been expanded.

In 2007, the college also located its Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) Satellite Academy at the Hurricane Center, with the first cohort entering the academy in July 2007. Details of this program are below in “New Academic Partnerships.”

During the 2006-2007 AY, the Hurricane Center began conversion of all classrooms into “smart” classrooms. It will have two IP Video rooms starting in the fall of 2007—one for delivery/receiving and one for receiving. With this, the Center hopes to expand both morning offerings and major offerings in smaller courses where enrollment can’t currently justify offering the course. Courses offered via IP Video from Hurricane Center to Kanab will also enhance curriculum in the more remote location. This will ensure that students at both venues are receiving course offerings with more breadth.

The Kanab Center remains a modest partnership between the City of Kanab, the Kane County School District and the Kane County Commission to offer general education classes in the neighboring county. Plans are under way to begin offering concurrent enrollment general education courses at the Kanab Center in fall 2007.

Furthermore, as a result of state legislative funding in January 2007, the prospects for substantial positive change for the college and the Kanab Center have improved. The legislature provided $50,000 for the planning phase of a Center for Education, Business and the Arts to be located in Kanab. The proposed multi-purpose CEBA would serve the educational needs of the community and be the focal point for economic development in the region. The facility will house three “sub-centers,” including an educational center for the delivery of post-secondary and continuing education courses, a meeting and cultural center, and a business development center. While this is not a college project, staff from the Dixie State College
Small Business Development Center will assist with planning, and the Dixie State College Vice President of Advancement, Christina Schultz, has been appointed to serve as project manager.

Institute for Business Integrity:

The Institute for Business Integrity at Dixie State College was created in 2006 to provide a special ethics resource to the college and community at large. The Institute schedules a series of business forums during the year to address issues of integrity and ethics in the business community. Featured speakers are drawn from the business community as well as the academic faculty and administration of the college. The Institute further serves as a resource for promoting business ethics in a partnership with local chambers of commerce, economic development councils and small business organizations. Located in the Udvar Hazy School of Business, its web address is http://www.dixie.edu/business/businessintegrity/mission.html.

Service Learning Initiative:

The mission statement of Dixie State College articulates a commitment to producing “citizen-scholars.” It states: “[Graduates] will make responsible and meaningful contributions to society, in part through service to others.” DSC students have historically organized and participated in service projects. In Fall 2001 an institutional-wide, “Campus-to-Community” committee of student leaders, faculty, and staff was formed in to sponsor a significant campus-wide service project each semester. “Campus-to-Community continues today and has become part of the DSC culture. The Associated Students of Dixie State College (ASDSC) established a Vice President of Service position to oversee DSUN, the service club, and promote service. DSC has offered UCAN Serve AmeriCorps service scholarships for many years, further encouraging health sciences and education majors to serve the community.

In spring 2004, the college began to participate in the statewide service learning and civic engagement organization, Utah Campus Compact, with faculty member Candace Clark Mesa volunteering as the unofficial faculty coordinator of service and representing DSC. She worked with DSC students and faculty to promote service learning and civic engagement for two years; in 2006 the college formalized the position and the role of service learning by granting the official title and providing two credits release time each semester, creating a formal faculty committee, and a providing for an on-going budget.

Professor Mesa’s goals were to institutionalize service learning as a teaching pedagogy, encourage faculty to experiment with experiential learning, and engage as many students as possible in service activities, both in and outside of the classroom. After attending and presenting at numerous DSC, state, and regional conferences and training sessions, she presented the “big picture” to the college in Spring 2007 and began to develop a long-range plan for DSC service and a template for measuring semester-to-semester faculty-led service activities by tracking numbers of instructors, students, and total number of service hours.

New plans include offering Alternative Spring Breaks to DSC students, considering the possibilities of service in orientation and capstone courses, forming firmer service partnerships with local governmental and non-profit agencies, expansion of the number of UCAN Serve AmeriCorps scholarships, and establishment of a Learn and Serve Center on campus. A long-term plan has been detailed and distributed.

End-of-semester information is collected and reported annually. For Fall semester 2006, faculty reported that 324 students did 5,297 hours of service (volunteerism or service learning) with various courses. Athletes, in compliance with NCAA policy, were actively engaged in service projects as well, with 134 athletes performing a total of 578 service hours. For the entire academic year, 2006-2007, a total of twenty-two academic courses or programs (excluding dental hygiene, elementary education and athletics) offered service projects as part of course requirements. A total of 464 students enrolled, performing 4,178 hours of community service. In addition, thirty dental hygiene students provided 11,232 hours of service.
Expectations for the service learning program are that DSC students, faculty, and staff will further embrace the concepts of service, volunteerism, and civic engagement. [http://www.dixie.edu/reg/service-learning.html](http://www.dixie.edu/reg/service-learning.html).

**ROTC:**

Dixie State College of Utah initiated an ROTC (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) program in 2007, with courses offered for the first time in fall semester. The ROTC program is a college-based, officer commissioning program offering academic credit in elective courses that focus on leadership development, problem solving, strategic planning and professional ethics.

DSC's ROTC program is a reserve branch of Southern Utah University's program, and is under the direction of the Utah National Guard. In addition, the DSC and SUU programs are affiliated with the active-duty ROTC program at Brigham Young University. The program provides leadership training experience, which includes rappelling, military weapons training, land navigation, survival training and first aid training, among other opportunities. The ROTC website is [http://new.dixie.edu/rotc/](http://new.dixie.edu/rotc/).

**New Academic Partnerships**

**Success Academy**

In 2002 the State of Utah created of six public charter high schools designed to provide early college educational programs which focus on math, science, computer science and engineering. One of the six, the Success Academy, entered into a partnership with Dixie State College, the Washington County and Iron County School Districts, and Southern Utah University in 2006. Utilizing classrooms and offices on the DSC campus, the Success Academy provides college-ready students the opportunity to earn an associate degree while completing their high school graduation requirements.

Through this unique partnership, students attend academic classes on the DSC campus in classrooms designated for Success Academy use for a portion of the day during their sophomore and junior years and then have the option of going full time on the college campus during their senior year. The coursework is rigorous and challenging in this structured concurrent enrollment program. Students take the college classes taught by DSC instructors in small cohort groups. Progress is monitored daily by the program director and staff, and academic support services are provided when needed.

The 2006 cohort consisted of 50 sophomore students from throughout the Washington County School District who applied and competed for placement in the program. In 2007, a second cohort of 50 sophomores was added, and a third sophomore cohort will be admitted in 2008, at which point the academy will reach its maximum enrollment.

Success Academy students who complete an associate degree with a 3.0 GPA or higher by the end of their high school senior year will be eligible to receive a “New Century Scholarship” from the state of Utah. This scholarship will pay for 75% of the students’ college tuition for their junior and senior college years. The Success Academy website can be visited at [http://successacademyonline.com/](http://successacademyonline.com/).

**Intermountain Health Care and Dixie Regional Medical Center:**

The rapid population growth in southern Utah, southern Nevada and northern Arizona has prompted accelerated planning efforts by Intermountain Health Care (IHC), the region’s major health care provider. IHC plans to expand into a regional tertiary care facility and it projects the need for 3500 new employees over the next few years. The college and IHC have developed a unique partnership to provide the needed educated workforce.
IHC has made significant financial commitment, investing in the college’s programs. In April, 2005, IHC donated $600,000 to DSC to help train an additional 233 registered nurses. In February 2007, IHC invested $720,000 to be awarded over the next three years in the college’s health education programs. The gift will fund hiring of directors for Dixie State’s respiratory therapy, medical technology and physical therapy assistants programs.

In March 2007, construction was begun on the 78,000 square foot Russell C. Taylor Health Science Center on the Dixie Regional Medical Center campus on land donated by IHC and a local family. The state appropriated $17 million dollars in funding and private donations have exceeded $3.5 million so far.

Dixie Applied Technology College

Established in 2001 by the Utah State Legislature, DXATC is part of the Utah College of Applied Technology which consists of nine regional campuses throughout Utah. DXATC serves Washington County through a partnership with the Washington County School District and Dixie State College. The technology college provides individualized training programs and training that leads directly to good-paying careers; DXATC offers certificates in a wide variety of programs tailored with cooperation of local employers to meet their training requirements. Most programs have an open-entry, open-exit structure and the college runs year round. Students may enroll any time in these open programs. In addition to serving traditional-aged students and adults, DXATC also offers its courses tuition-free to selected high school students.

The college and DXATC work closely to provide seamless educational opportunities for students. Dixie State College and DXATC meet formally on a quarterly basis, and more often if necessary, on program coordination issues. For example, in 2005 the partnership determined that DSC would phase out its drafting, auto body and diesel mechanics programs and they would be picked up by DXATC. During the transition period, students had the option of moving over to DXATC or participating in a scheduled teach-out of the program courses at DSC.

Response to Evaluators’ Concerns: In 2002, the college’s evolving relationship with the newly created DXATC triggered a swarm of recommendations from evaluators in the “Final Evaluation Report;” therefore, this particular academic partnership requires a more detailed discussion. In the five years since the college’s full-scale evaluation, DXATC has matured and all of the evaluators’ concerns have been addressed by DXATC’s fully independent status and its own accreditation process.

The evaluators noted the following in the 2002 Report:

- A need for “clearer lines of responsibility and understanding between programs that operate at DXATC and Dixie State”;
- A need for “more faculty participation in the institutional assessment process”;
- An absence of “published learning outcomes for the Apprenticeship programs”;
- Need for a “formal procedures for facilitating the closing of a program and formal teach out plan”;
- Inaccuracies in “information regarding specialized accreditation/certification”;

In response to the recommendations, the college and DXATC have undertaken the following:

- A formal partnership agreement between the two institutions and a signed memo of understanding to describe and confirm the relationship and to document the various responsibilities and services of each institution. See Exhibit B.2.8.
A formal policy for closing academic programs and a teach-out plan with details described in Part A, Response to General Recommendations, Recommendation Three.

Formal accreditation of DXATC in June 2007 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As part of that accreditation process the school met all standards for program assessment that had previously caused concern for the Commission’s evaluators.

DXATC is located on the Dixie State College campus and the relationship between the two institutions is flourishing. Its website is www.dixieatc.org.

SkyWest Airlines:

SkyWest Airlines has emerged as the number one regional carrier in the world, and its growth has spurred an urgent need to provide educational opportunities for its employees, not only at its company home here in St. George, but at regional SkyWest offices around the country. The corporation has provided resources, materials and facilities to the college for development of an adult degree completion program leading to a BS in Aviation Management. Initially, the program will be strictly for SkyWest’s approximately 18,000 employees; of that number, surveys indicate that over 7,000 are likely to enroll in the accelerated degree completion program at some point. The degree proposal is complete, internally approved, and currently awaiting approval by the Utah State Board of Regents. Upon its approval and implementation, it will become the model for similar accelerated adult degree programs to be offered by the college. The degree proposal is Exhibit B.2.9.

POST Satellite Academy

In response to requests by Utah’s Police Commissioner and the Utah Director of Public Safety, as well as local sheriffs and police chiefs, the college established a Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) Satellite Academy. Local, state and federal agencies have combined to create an advisory board and commit instructor and physical resources to the program. The satellite academy, the sixth in the state POST system, is located at the college’s Hurricane Education Center. The program provides two modules of instruction, including basic and advanced basic training, along with knowledge, skills and scenario application courses. The first session began in July 2007.

The fourteen-week satellite academy training provides basic training geared towards those students not hired by a law-enforcement agency, but who wish to gain certification, and for students who intend to matriculate to the Utah Police Academy. The training mirrors that of the regular academy, with the same curriculum and level of rigor for all learning objectives and training. Once a student has graduated, he or she receives the same certification as regular academy students. Information is online at http://new.dixie.edu/post/.

Students can earn a certificate of completion as a Special Function Officer (SFO), and they are then eligible to move on to the Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) block and complete training. Completing the LEO block will make students “certifiable” in Utah to become a law enforcement officer with full police powers. Those graduating from the LEO block earn a separate certificate. The SFO block requires 193 hours of training and the LEO requires 360 hours, with a curriculum providing a balance of academic coursework and physical training.

Positions requiring SFO training include constables, auxiliary officers, bailiffs, reserve officers, and other special function officers, as approved by the hiring agency. The LEO training curriculum provides the remaining training necessary for certification of a peace officer with full police powers. Positions requiring both levels of training include police officers, highway patrol troopers, and deputy sheriffs. The program director anticipates that the first students will be certified in SFO by October 12, 2007, and the LEO cohort
will graduate in April 2008. The program is offered in the evenings (Monday - Friday from 6:00 P.M. - 10:00 P.M.) to accommodate working students.

To further meet the identified educational needs of law enforcement, Dixie State College and Southern Utah University have created a partnership to offer a BS in Criminal Justice on the DSC campus, with SUU providing the upper-division instruction. This partnership is discussed below under “Southern Utah University.”

University of Utah:

In 2007 Dixie State College and University of Utah partnered to create a permanent University of Utah Graduate Center on the DSC campus. The Center will provide degrees in critical programs not locally available in fall 2007, with initial plans for a Nursing MS, Special Education MS and an executive MBA for non-business degreed graduates with five or more years of experience.

The creation of the University of Utah Graduate Center prompted interest in a more significant alliance between the two institutions. The DSC Board of Trustees and influential community members initiated discussions beginning in June 2007 with the University of Utah to explore the possibility of Dixie’s becoming a member of a University of Utah system. Subsequent meetings included the trustees, administrators from both institutions, members of the Utah State Board of Regents, and the region’s legislative delegation. These meetings resulted in the joint creation of a “white paper” to guide negotiations for an alliance, setting out the principles, goals and issues that needed to be addressed, and included a plan of action.

On September 7, 2007, the DSC Board of Trustees voted to petition the University of Utah to enter into an expanded affiliation, tentatively called the University of Utah at St. George. This proposal would not create a branch or satellite campus; however, preliminary discussions describe a relationship that would:
- Preserve the respective independence of the two institutions in terms of governance, budget and program development;
- Provide strengthened academic and administrative support to Dixie State College;
- Allow Dixie to maintain its current mission as a community college and a baccalaureate-degree institution with an emphasis on teaching undergraduates and not on research.

A rough time line has been developed in which the college would seek student, faculty and staff, and public comment for a period up to October 1, at which time the Board of Trustees would finalize the details of the proposal and present the request to the University of Utah. Assuming approval by the U of U, the plan would be forwarded to the Board of Regents before the end of 2007. Upon approval there, Dixie State College, University of Utah and the Board of Regents would jointly present the plan to the Utah State Legislature in January 2008 for authorization and funding. More detailed information will be available to the Commission evaluators in October; preliminary information is provided in Appendix B.2.4.

Southern Utah University:

Although Dixie State College and SUU occasionally teamed up in the past decade up to provide academic programs on the DSC campus, the relationship between the two institutions has often been uneasy. The 2006 partnership directive from the State Board of Regents, discussed above, created a renewed determination on the part of DSC to deliver needed programs to its students in cooperation with SUU. To that end, the two institutions agreed to deliver a traditional criminal justice degree which began fall 2007. Dixie State offers the lower-division courses and any upper-division courses that fulfill the degree’s electives requirement; SUU provides the upper-division criminal justice courses on the DSC campus. Details of the degree partnership are at: http://www.dixie.edu/reg/BS-CJ-07.html.
In January 2007, the Utah State Legislature passed a bill (SB 90) funding a partnership between Dixie and SUU for the delivery of secondary education licensure on the DSC campus; however, negotiations between the institutions have not been easy, and while an agreement for delivery of some coursework is in place, the college is continuing to ask for stand-alone programs for secondary licensure in English and biology for which it is fully prepared, with staffing, funding and curriculum in place. SUU has agreed to bring coursework to DSC in majors not currently offered by the college. The partnership, which includes the Washington County School District (WCSD), is to develop content support for secondary licensure in the social science composite, physical science composite, mathematics and family and consumer science endorsements. The delivery of the coursework will include IP video through SUU and on-site instruction in some disciplines. In addition, WCSD will provide practicum experiences, student teaching opportunities and internships. The partnership agreement between the two schools is Exhibit B.2.10.

5. **What are the intended educational outcomes and how does the institution assess student achievement of those intended outcomes?**

6. **In light of the requirements of Commission Policy 2.2 – Educational Assessment, how does the institution regularly and continuously assess its educational programs and use the results of assessment in planning?**

**General Education Reform**

In November 2004, a General Education Task Force, later to become a standing committee on General Education, was appointed to assess the state of general education at DSC. The task force was charged with reviewing the general education requirements, the general education mission and philosophy, and making recommendations for revisions, as well as reviewing the general education programs at other state and peer institutions for alignment purposes. By the spring of 2005, the first of the task force’s recommendations began to make their way through the internal approval processes. The committee recommended five major changes, summarized here:

- Students would be required to take a new information literacy course, Library 1010, one-credit class, focused on library research skills, specifically outlining online research.
- A required oral communications course would be eliminated.
- A designated diversity course would be required.
- Only two science courses instead of three would be required; one course in life science and one course in physical science.
- The social science and fine arts/humanities requirements would be reconfigured to require a total of three instead of four courses.

Essentially, these changes removed the differences between an associate of science degree (AS) and an associate of art degree (AA) except for a foreign language requirement in the AA. There would be a 31-credit minimum for the AS while 39 credits would be needed for the AA, including the two language courses. The old and the new AS and AA degree requirements are in Exhibit B.2.11.

In July 2005, the revision of the general education requirements was approved and implemented for the 2005-2006 academic year. The General Education Committee continued its work, and by the beginning of Fall Semester 2006 it began a curriculum mapping exercise. Each academic program conducted a survey of all general education courses in its curriculum to determine if the courses continued meet the newly established mission and philosophy of general education offerings. A significant number of course reviews were completed by April 2007, with a few still incomplete; the deans and academic vice president will present their recommendations for courses that should continue, continue with changes, or be removed.
from the general education curriculum in autumn 2007. The “GE Course Review” procedures and form are Exhibit B.2.12.

The general education outcomes at Dixie State College are consistent with a broad set of general education objectives established by the Utah System of Higher Education http://www.utahsbr.edu/AA/Goals1299.htm . General education at Dixie State College strives to help students define, shape and achieve their educational and life goals. The “General Education Philosophy” of the college states:

The General Education program at DSC offers a curriculum designed to meet the objectives outlined in the college’s general mission statement. Essentially, a general education at DSC involves an intellectually rigorous process of broad and sustained investigation into the knowledge, skills, and values vital to an educated and responsible citizen. To achieve this goal, the general education curriculum is structured according to a set of distinct outcomes that stress fundamental knowledge, perceptions, and skills as well as breadth in the disciplines.

An ultimate goal of the program is to motivate students to become citizen-scholars by providing them with the foundational knowledge and skills that will enable them to embark on a lifetime of responsible and informed service in the world. Successful students will learn how to learn in a way that transcends self as they acquire the virtues of citizenship. As scholars, students will value curiosity and knowledge for its own sake, and they will ultimately see learning as a lifetime commitment.


Program Review: While effective assessment of learning takes place at the individual program level through institution-mandated program reviews, Dixie State College continues to assess its general education program, to analyze results, and to institute changes to improve teaching and learning. The Utah State Board of Regents Policy 411-R, “Review of Existing Programs,” is online at http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/r411.htm and Dixie State’s Policy 3.43 “Program Review,” is online at http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html . Exhibit B.2.14 includes the “Ten-year Matrix for Program Review.”

Regular and systematic assessment occurs in the form of the DSC Annual Report, which continues to measure outcomes against the Core Indicators for Institutional Effectiveness for Community Colleges. Annual Reports are online at http://www.dixie.edu/fac_annualReport/index.html and in Exhibit B.1.2.

Institutional Effectiveness: The Institutional Effectiveness Committee at DSC is charged with issues of accreditation, assessment of student academic achievement, and measurement of institutional effectiveness. The committee began a systematic review of every academic program’s assessment plans in 2006. The purpose of the review was to affirm that assessment was taking place and that the results of assessment were being used for improvement. A second, but equally important, purpose was to glean good assessment strategies from effective programs in order to communicate those strategies across the college’s academic community. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee has also adopted a review and evaluation template for program assessment in order to standardize assessment review throughout programs. This form is available in Exhibit B.2.15.

Specialized Accreditation: A significant number of DSC’s programs offer professional degrees that require regular accreditation or licensure from independent specialized accrediting agencies. Examples of such programs include, but are not limited to, nursing, dental hygiene, emergency medical technician and paramedic programs, business administration, automotive technology and elementary education. The assessment requirements for these and other similarly accredited programs are strenuous, methodical and
regular. A schedule of specialized accreditation of degree and certificate programs in Business, Health and Sciences is Exhibit B.2.16, “BHS Accreditation Schedule.”

Elimination of Freshman Orientation and Sophomore Capstone:

At the time of the 2002 evaluation, Dixie State College required a “Freshman Orientation” (SSC 1000) course for all entering freshmen and a “Sophomore Capstone” (SSC 2000) course for all sophomores graduating with an associate’s degree. These courses, while fulfilling learning objectives crucial to student success, were also used for assessment. In Freshman Orientation, all students took the “Critical Literacy and Skills Test,” (CLST). The CLST, created by college faculty, was designed to measure value added in writing, quantitative reasoning and reading. Graduating sophomores took the CLST again in the Sophomore Capstone course.

However, with a very crowded general education curriculum and a number of degree programs with very structured and heavy course requirements, there were considerable objections to SSC 1000 and SSC 2000. Students, likewise, expressed only measured satisfaction with the course. Indeed, the evaluators noted in the 2002 “Final Evaluation Team Report,” that the course “was given mixed reviews by students interviewed by the committee” (page 40). In 2004 both the freshman orientation and sophomore capstone courses were eliminated from the curriculum and from that point until 2006, general education assessment was done program-by-program using the VASA for quantitative reasoning and the CLST for writing and reading.

In 2006, in response to falling retention rates and to fulfill the need for uniform assessment of general education outcomes, the vice president of academic services initiated efforts to create a new “Freshman Experience” course. After a review of scholarly work and examination of existing courses at other institutions, and after lengthy debate among faculty and administrators, the consensus was that, instead of a single required course, each program would enhance an existing introductory course in its curriculum to include a freshman experience. The course learning objectives would include crucial new student success skills as well as assessment and placement tests. The Freshman Experience project is further discussed in Standard Three under “The Retention Challenge.”

Response to Evaluators’ Concerns:

In the 2002 Dixie State College Self Study, the college assessed each discipline as representing the concept of a program, even though many of the disciplines did not—and still do not—entail a unit of study that terminates in a degree or certificate. In an effort to be consistent with the college’s format for self-study, the evaluators expressed their concerns on a discipline-by-discipline basis. Many of the concerns were similar across several disciplines while some were very discipline-specific. They are addressed in Appendix B.2.3.

Assessment: In the Final Evaluation Report of 2002, the accreditation team, while offering no general recommendations on Standard Two, said that Dixie State College’s efforts at assessment were “uneven” but improving. Specifically, they said:

“There is work to be done at the program and course assessment level. Efforts should be directed at facilitating a dialogue among programs and departments with strong assessment efforts and those that still need help to address the use of assessment activities to improve teaching and learning” (page 35).

At this writing, the college must admit that while improvements continue, they have been incremental and they have yet to result in an institution-wide commitment to assessment. There is still work to be done.
This report would be lacking, however, if it failed to take note of significant successes in closing the assessment loop. For instance, the 2002 “Final Evaluation Team Report” noted that the Fine and Performing Arts program “faculty’s assessment efforts do not reflect an understanding of the importance and value of a well-designed assessment process” and their assessment plan does not “…get into the critical assessment process that can be meaningful in improving the quality of teaching and learning in the individual units” (pages 21-21). Since 2002, the faculty have undertaken efforts to create and tailor assessment tools to their particular programs. Evidence of improvement came from the art program and the dance program in 2004 and 2005, respectively, when they prepared program self-studies for Utah Board of Regents’ Program Review. Both programs had developed clear, appropriate learning outcomes tied to the institutional mission and general education mission; they had created multiple assessment mechanisms and applied them in a methodical manner, and had used them to restructure curriculum and develop new instructional modules. Other programs in Fine Arts and Performing Arts had made similar progress. Sample assessment tools are in Exhibit B.2.17.

Similarly, the composition program, whose assessment strategies have always been among the strongest on campus, found that students had substantial weaknesses in information literacy. As a result, the program faculty teamed with the Browning Library instructional librarian to develop a course, Library 1010, “Information Literacy,” in 2005. This one-credit course is now taken concurrently with English 1010. Designed to introduce students to college-level research, the course fulfills the general education requirement for information literacy. After successfully completing this course, students meet the Association of College and Research Libraries basic "Information Literacy Standards for Higher Education." The course is competency-based and offered online. http://library.dixie.edu/courses/LIB1010sylSP07.htm

7. What are the institution’s expectations regarding achievements of its students and what reliable procedures are used to assess student achievement of those expectations?

Dixie State College articulates its expectations for student achievement in a number of ways. The mission statement, as the over-arching institutional guide, outlines these expectations:

Students will develop the skills and knowledge needed for the next phases in their lives, whether productive employment that contributes to society and economically sustains the student, further education at a transfer or graduate institution, or some other unique and personal aspiration. They will prepare to be life-long learners.

Graduates will be able to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve problems. Through exposure to the breadth of human knowledge and experience, they will investigate and enhance their world views to achieve a global perspective. They will make responsible and meaningful contributions to society, in part through service to others. Graduates will become citizen-scholars (Dixie State College Mission Statement, Appendix A.6).

The General Education mission statement further articulates expectations for students. Those students should be able to understand, evaluate and effectively communicate identified core knowledge, methods of inquiry and modes of discourse, and fluency in the principal intellectual and communicative practices.

Finally, at the program and department level, faculty develop and refine the unique learning objectives and outcomes for their specific discipline. All courses at Dixie State College are required to have consistent learning outcomes that relate directly to the institutional mission statement, to the general education philosophy, and to individual discipline standards. The course objectives and outcomes are published conspicuously in every course syllabus. The General Education Committee has provided a template or sample syllabus for instructors to use (Exhibit B.2.18).
Standard Three: Students

1. What changes have been made in undergraduate admissions, grading, non-academic programs and student support services? Why?

Changes to admissions policies: Since 2002, admissions policies were changed to accommodate three specific student groups:

- Language was added to adequately describe the requirements for admitting home-schooled students and students privately educated in non-accredited programs. The policy had failed to address admission for such students previously.
- A policy for early-admissions students, such as high school students who participated in summer camps and institutes for credit, or high school students who were released from high school ahead of schedule. Previously, the policy required that students had to be sixteen years or older to be admitted; however, an audit picked up several instances when younger students had been admitted, so the policy brought the institution into alignment with existing practices.
- Policy language was added allowing transfer students to waive the requirement to submit a high school diploma if they had 25 or more college credits. This change made transfer students' admission process easier.
- In May 2007, admissions policies were changed to allow for the acceptance of associate degrees from other accredited institutions in their entirety as meeting Dixie's requirements for the same degree.

Other policy changes relating to students:

- Policies regarding confidentiality of student records were revised to align them with FERPA regulations.
- The Student Rights and Responsibilities policy was amended to include a student responsibility not to endanger “the health or safety of self, any member of the college community, or others.”
- The Student Appeal and Grievance policy was amended to clarify the procedure for filing a grievance.
- The academic assessment policy was amended to indicate that when a student had multiple test scores, the highest score would be used for placement. These policies may be seen at [http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polstu.html](http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polstu.html) and in Exhibit B.3.1.

Transcript Evaluator:

The increasing number of transfer students and the new NCAA requirements for student-athlete eligibility threatened to overwhelm the college’s part-time evaluator, so a new full-time transcript evaluator position was created in student services in 2006.

Financial Assistance and Scholarships:

Scholarships at Dixie State College have been traditionally divided into three main areas: merit, talent, and leadership. With changing federal guidelines for financial assistance, the policies were brought into alignment and simplified in April 2005. The institution felt strongly that it should be awarding more needs-based scholarships so, while keeping the three original types of scholarship it has added a fourth emphasis—needs-based. The philosophy includes ensuring that every student can have financial access to

The college is currently in the third year of this program and its procedure is as follows: Upon admissions to Dixie State College, student services evaluates the student’s GPA and ACT scores as indicators of college preparedness and awards merit scholarships to those who are eligible at the criteria level set each year by the vice president of student services. Students are encouraged to complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) which the college uses to determine eligibility for need-based scholarships. They award the student federal aid first and supplement with institutional funds if the student needs additional help. The internal motto of the scholarship program is “Enough but not too much.” Talent scholarships were not impacted and are still being offered by those departments who are recruiting talent to help them with their programs—primarily Fine Arts and Athletics.

Another important change came with offering merit scholarships to students for four years rather than two, in response to needs for baccalaureate-seeking students. The required GPA was lowered to 3.0 to help students retain their merit scholarships and encourage them to stay at Dixie until their goals here are met. Student Services intends to conduct a study to determine if the persistence of students receiving the four-year scholarship is higher than the two-year scholarship students; preliminary assessment of the new program indicates it will be successful.

The college website directs students seeking information about eligibility and availability of federal financial aid to The Student Guide which is available through high school guidance counselors, college federal financial aid offices, or on line at http://studentaid.ed.gov/students/publications/student_guide/index.html.

Financial aid, always a priority for Dixie students, continues to flow. In the 2001-2002 AY, at the time of the college’s full-scale evaluation, Dixie provided a total of $9,178,342.25 in aid to students. By the 2005-2006 AY, that amount had increased to $14,214,709.32, an expenditure growth of $5,036,367.07. The 2005-2006 financial aid went to a total of 3,635 students, of whom 89% were white; 5% were non-white; 6% were undeclared. Females constituted 54% of the recipients.

The Retention Challenge:

Dixie State College has struggled with retention for a number of years and several efforts had been implemented to prevent serious attrition; however, dropout rates have tended to increase rather than decrease. A number of factors may influence retention, among them: insufficient financial resources; an open admissions policy which brings in many students with inadequate academic preparation for college-level work; failure of students to become engaged or to find an “academic home” at the college; a strong economy and vigorous construction industry; and the prevalent practice of the college’s very large Latter Day Saint (Mormon) student population to interrupt college for a two-year religious mission upon turning nineteen. Whatever the reasons, the problem is significant. In his 2006 proposal to implement a midterm grade report strategy, the registrar noted:

- From the ACT institutional data file (2006), the average freshmen retention rate for 2-year public schools was 52.5%. For BS/BA public institutions, the average was 69.9%. Dixie State College’s retention rate last year was 43.5%.
- According to Noel Levitz, 86% of students who say that they need help do not seek out the service voluntarily. Given the college’s open admissions standard, it attracts more of a high-risk population who are in need of additional interventions and assistance.
- From Fall 2005 to Spring 2006, the college lost 492 of its freshman class (1477 to 985), or over 1/3 of the class left the college after only one semester.
As part of a major retention initiative, the college implemented midterm grade reports as an academic early-warning system in January 2007. Previously, midterm grade reports had met some resistance on the part of faculty; however, a compromise that mandated midterm grade reports for some courses while exempting others was adopted with faculty support: The compromise plan provides for the following:

Courses with mandatory midterm grade reports are all courses numbered below 2000 (excluding CO-OP), and all courses of three credits or greater; block courses are also exempt. Instructors have the option of entering grades only for those students with D or F grades or entering midterm grades for all students, regardless of their grades. Midterm grading is in effect only during Fall and Spring semesters. The deadline for entering midterm grades is the end of the 8th week of the term, and the registrar’s office sends a reminder out to faculty one week prior to the deadline.

Using the alerts at midterm, the DSC counseling team begins “intrusive advisement” with a letter to each student offering advice and providing resources. Any student with two or more D or F grades will be personally contacted by college advisors. The first midterm grade reports were produced spring semester 2007. Student Services will collect retention data through the 2007-2008 academic cycle to assess the effectiveness of the program and determine what additional early interventions by counselors should be employed.

**Freshman Experience:**

In addition to midterm grading, the vice president of academics assembled a task force in January 2007 to design a “Freshman Experience” course for first-time students and transfer students with fewer than 25 college credits. By the middle of February, several models had been reviewed and plans were underway to create Academy 1001, a mandatory freshman course. The major goals of the course would be to improve the likelihood of persistence by focusing on student study skills and college academic expectations; providing orientation to the campus community; and developing an academic plan within each student’s chosen major. The course would also provide opportunities for pre-testing in critical skills areas like writing, math and critical thinking for general education assessment purposes.

However, the concept of such a course garnered opposition among faculty for several reasons. Some professional programs, like dental hygiene, elementary education, CIT and nursing, don’t have retention problems and they saw the mandatory freshman course as an unnecessary burden for their students. Other programs had differing concerns about such a course, and the ultimate decision was to create a pilot course that integrated the goals of the freshman experience course described above into an introductory course in the major area of study. A handful of programs will launch pilot courses in the 2007-2008 academic year. Sample syllabi are in Exhibit B.3.

In late February, 2007 the college retained a Noel Levitz enrollment management consultant to assess current practices and provide recommendations. After two days on campus, he made presentations to the student services staff and to the administration in which he outlined Dixie’s strengths and challenges and presented recommendations for retention strategies. His executive summary and PowerPoint presentation are at [http://vpss.dixie.edu/Docs_2006-07/enrollment/Hopkins_Exec_Summary_03-16-2007.pdf](http://vpss.dixie.edu/Docs_2006-07/enrollment/Hopkins_Exec_Summary_03-16-2007.pdf). The Student Services Retention/Enrollment plan link is: [http://www.dixie.edu/reg/sem/sem.html](http://www.dixie.edu/reg/sem/sem.html), and a graph illustrating DSC enrollment data below:
In October, 2004 the college submitted a proposal for membership in the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Division II and was granted exploratory status beginning in 2005-2006. Dixie State College began competing against Division II institutions in 2006-2007 with provisional approval from NCAA, and began a year of self-assessment and a year of compliance verification. The 2009-2010 AY would have marked DSC’s first as an official member of the NCAA; however, because of the college’s exemplary record and performance to date, the NCAA is considering waiving the provisional period. One of the primary
objectives behind the move is to align the athletic department and the mission of the college as a whole as it continues its transition as a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

Previously, the college’s athletic department had included programs in football, men’s basketball, baseball, men’s golf, women’s volleyball, women’s basketball, women’s soccer, and softball. In order to comply with the NCAA’s 10-sport standard with an equal balance of men’s and women’s programs, the college moved to increase the number of women’s sports by adding a women’s tennis program and a women’s cross-country program which began competition in fall 2006.

In addition to the new programs, the more rigorous academic requirements of the NCAA for member schools in the areas of GPA, admissions standards and scholarship eligibility, have brought several notable changes to the college. NCAA requires initial- and continuing-eligibility standards that are much higher than NJCAA standards; for example, eligible students must complete fourteen core courses in high school, including three years of English, two years of mathematics (algebra or higher), two years of physical and life sciences and two years of social sciences. They must have a minimum of a 2.0 GPA and earn a combined SAT score of 820 or an ACT sum score of 68. (Exhibit B.3.4, NCAA).

NCAA regulations required the implementation of several policies for student athletes: a policy concerning missed class time for athletic activities, Policy 5-23; and “progress toward degree” Policy 5-50 (Exhibit EB.25). Academic integrity and eligibility are monitored internally by the college president, the Faculty Athletics Representative and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee as well as the NCAA. Currently, the athletic department must conduct an annual provisional report to the NCAA, as well as produce a comprehensive self-study. The report and study are in Exhibit B.3.5.

Another change came in the area of financial aid. The new NCAA affiliation requires a rigorous review of scholarships for athletes. Prior to DSC’s admission to Division II, athletic scholarships had been handled entirely by the athletic program; now, the financial aid office reviews, approves and administers all athletic scholarships.

Ironically, Dixie State College’s membership in NCAA D-II has diminished student diversity on campus. The focus on academic achievement and higher eligibility standards for admission and scholarship, combined with the county’s already homogenous population and the state of Utah’s resistance to needs-based financial aid for education, have created dim prospects for diversity. The diversity issue is discussed more fully in Part A of this report.

Student Government:

The 2002 “Final Evaluation Report” noted that students actively participate in the decision making process at Dixie State College. That continues to be the case, and with the addition of baccalaureate programs, upper-division students added significantly to the maturity of student government. The president of the Associated Students of Dixie State College sits as a full voting member on the Strategic Planning Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Fee Allocation Committee, as well as the College Council and Board of Trustees, and in consultation with the ASDSC, advocates for student concerns. Students are also represented by elected ASDSC officers on other campus committees.

Diversity Initiatives:

National Science Foundation Grant: In November 2006, Dixie State College was awarded a grant of nearly a quarter-million dollars from the National Science Foundation to help bolster interest in science, computer science, engineering and mathematics among minorities and women. Dixie State has designed a joint-funded scholarship program between the college and the NSF’s S-STEM program (Scholarships in Science,
Technology, Engineering and Mathematics). The NSF funds will be focused on recruiting and funding need-based scholarships for first-year academically gifted but underrepresented freshmen in the S-STEM disciplines.

This project will allow the college to serve a greater number of incoming freshmen, an estimated 37 students overall, while it will increase the number of S-STEM graduates by 57 and with appropriate academic progress, ensures their financial support through graduation with four-year degree. In addition, Dixie State will fund upper-division scholarships. During this program the students will be engaged in collaborative learning opportunities including internships within industry, participation in discipline (i.e. engineering and computer science) club activities, and seminars presented to students by practicing professionals. An external industry advisory board will evaluate, offer advice and help promote the program.

The four-year project grant will support approximately 39 students for 2-4 years. In fall 2007 the college offered 13 full scholarships, which covered tuition, books and fees. As long as each student maintains a 3.0 GPA, the scholarship can continue for up to four years. Prospective students who are incoming female or minority freshman and who maintain appropriate academic progress are eligible for the program.

Multicultural and Diversity Center: A Multi-Cultural and Diversity Center is currently in the development stage. The vice president of student services is also seeking funding for Multi-Cultural and Diversity advisor. This would be a full-time position with $2,000 budgeted for some travel expenses and nearly $10,000 for other amenities. Currently, an Underserved Population Adviser is charged with recruitment and retention of culturally diverse students, primarily with local Hispanic communities. Unfortunately, the position is a part-time with only ten hours a week allotted.

Further discussion of student diversity is in Standard One, Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness.

2. Compare the current enrollment figures with those reported in the last institutional self-study report.

The Enrollment Challenge:

Even though each new baccalaureate degree that the college introduces substantially increases the enrollment of students declaring a major and aiming for a four-year program, and each commencement reveals an increasing number of degrees awarded (see Figure 3.4), the number of new freshman students enrolling at the college has been flat and or falling:

Figure 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL TERM</th>
<th>THIRD WEEK ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>BUDGET-RELATED HEADCOUNT</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall '02</td>
<td>6807</td>
<td>4161</td>
<td>7251</td>
<td>4260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '03</td>
<td>6177</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>7490</td>
<td>4425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '04</td>
<td>6177</td>
<td>4253</td>
<td>8373</td>
<td>4518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '05</td>
<td>6286</td>
<td>4219</td>
<td>8996</td>
<td>4495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '06</td>
<td>5249</td>
<td>3877</td>
<td>5723</td>
<td>3983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures from DSC Institutional Research Office
At first glance, the table suggests a dramatically declining enrollment pattern but the reality is very complex. It is notable that the total headcount figures for fall term 2006 show a marked decrease in enrollment. In fact, this disparity is in part the result of a change in the way Dixie State College counts enrollment. Prior to 2006, the practice had been to count Dixie’s robust summer camp and workshop programs enrollment as part of the fall term enrollment for that year. As of fall 2006, those enrollments are no longer included.

Excluding summer camp and workshop numbers from fall term enrollment count makes sense. There appears to be a national trend to exclude such programs from reported enrollment numbers, and, more importantly, the college wanted to dial back enrollment to a level that was supported by the State of Utah. Camps and workshops were entirely self-supported, so the institution was not actually benefiting from their inclusion in the count. Furthermore, if the State of Utah should begin to fund enrollment growth, the institution wants its enrollment to match the funding that it currently receives from the state. The previous way of counting created an artificially high, and therefore misleading, enrollment picture. Wisely, the college chose to endure what appears on the surface to be an enrollment decline in order to bring the figures into alignment with the realities of state funding and reporting practices.

A snapshot of the summer workshop and camp enrollments in isolation gives some perspective. For example, if Dixie State College had continued to report enrollment by the same method, the total unduplicated headcount for fall term 2006 would have been 8,649 instead of 5,723. (See Figure 3.3, below.)

**Figure 3.3 Summer Camp/Workshop Enrollments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors have affected enrollment as well, such as the establishment of state-mandated technology colleges. Shortly after the establishment of the Dixie Applied Technology College in 2001, Dixie State College began to slowly dismantle its own applied technology programs and move its students into the DXATC; the result has been a steady, if small, decrease in enrollment as DXATC grew to accommodate more programs.

Additionally, the strong economy in southern Utah provides many jobs, but low overall wages; Utah Department of Workforce Services research indicates that the Washington County average wage is 77% of the state average. Thus, students often have to work more to make ends meet and put educational plans on the back burner. For example, the average number of credits for part-time students in fall 2002 was 13.84, compared to 11.93 in fall 2005, about 14% fewer credits on average.

Still other factors figure in to the enrollment picture. In 2005, in an effort to increase access to scholarships, the college reduced the credit load requirements from a minimum of thirty credits per academic year to twenty-four, equating to a potential loss of FTE of up to 20%. If the previous limits were still in place in 2005-2006, 1025 scholarship recipients would have taken 15 credits fall semester; however, the average load was 12.5 credits, a 17% decrease in FTE. After a review of the scholarship program and a determination that the lower credit limit had not accomplished its intended outcomes, the college is currently planning to reinstate the thirty-credit limit for scholarship recipients.
Lastly, the college had contracted services to the Washington County School District for vocational courses; however, by 2004, the district was unable to pay the college for the courses because of cuts in vocational funding received at the district level, and the college was forced to discontinue the program, resulting in a loss of an additional fifty-four FTE.

Although the college believes the enrollment decline is a short-term anomaly and not evidence of a serious downward trend, it acknowledges that a flat or declining enrollment in a service area that is growing rapidly is a problem that must be addressed. Dixie State College has rededicated itself to vigorous recruiting and public relations efforts. The vice president of student services and his staff have detailed their strategy in the Strategic Enrollment Plan. That plan is in comprehensive Strategic Plan, Exhibit B.1.1.

In May 2007, President Caldwell and the Dixie State College Board of Trustees reviewed a draft of the strategic enrollment plan. The president pointed to recent statistics indicating that, at 17 percent, Washington County’s young adults with baccalaureate degrees ranks lowest in the state and far below the national average. He observed that, in addition to traditional college-aged students, Dixie’s enrollment future is likely to be with students in the 25-34 age range; that is, students who are currently in the workforce and who, for whatever reason, want to return to college a traditional degree or for a degree-completion program. The trustees indicated that they were interested in participating in a formalized recruitment campaign to complement the renewed efforts of the college student services staff and faculty.

Student Services embarked on a new campaign to be more of a presence on district high school campuses by scheduling visits to all area high schools and devising a telephone campaign to contact high school students. They also began to offer services in registration and advisement on Wednesday nights until 8:30 p.m. to accommodate working students.

The table below provides still more perspective on the enrollment issue. While the college’s enrollment seems to have declined or remained flat, the number of degrees that the college awards continues to rise. While certificate programs have shifted to the DXATC, overall bachelor and associate degrees awarded are beginning to compensate for their decline.

**Figure 3.4 Degrees and Certificates Awarded, 2002-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (BS)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Art (AA)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science (AS)</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of Science in Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Science Criminal Justice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Science Pre-Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Applied Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Degrees</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
<td><strong>908</strong></td>
<td><strong>913</strong></td>
<td><strong>940</strong></td>
<td><strong>922</strong></td>
<td><strong>998</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of fewer than 30 credits</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of more than 30 credits</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Certificates</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td><strong>456</strong></td>
<td><strong>667</strong></td>
<td><strong>338</strong></td>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Evaluators’ Concerns: The 2002 Evaluation Committee Report noted three concerns at the conclusion of Standard Three, Students: 1. The need for technical support for the pending implementation of BANNER; 2. The use of student services staff for instruction in Freshman Orientation, SSC 1000; and 3. The lack of evening hours of operation for student services on campus.

The BANNER conversion was a difficult process—some staff called it an ordeal—and it has been implemented, but some believe it is not necessarily utilized to its capacity. Student services staff find BANNER to be adequate but they complain that they are not able to use it for proactive initiatives that could aid student success. One example is the production of “picture class lists,” requested by some faculty members. The staff knows it is possible to generate such lists on BANNER, having seen them at other institutions using the software; however, they are unable to duplicate the service. Another example of inadequacy comes from academic programs whose faculty would like to track their students as they transfer to other institutions but cannot. The problem is, as the evaluators noted in 2002, the need for technical personnel. The computer and information services department is excellent but understaffed, and their colleagues hesitate to make additional requests for special reports of the type described above. Some of the understaffing may be alleviated by the 2007 approval of a new data researcher position to supplement the Office of Institutional Research.

As discussed in Standard Two, the Freshman Orientation course has been eliminated and is to be replaced with a new faculty-instructed Freshman Experience course beginning in fall 2007. The use of any staff employee for adjunct instruction is addressed in Part A, Response to General Recommendation Two.

Student Services recognizes the needs of the college’s many non-traditional and fully employed students and effective July 2007, the Student Services offices are open until 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday nights, providing advisement, counseling, registration and financial aid support. Likewise, the bookstore and testing center are open until 8:00 p.m.

Standard Four: Faculty

1. **What significant changes have been made in policies affecting faculty?**

According to Dixie State College President Lee Caldwell, one of the college’s greatest challenges and, therefore, one of his top priorities, is the recruitment and retention of a diverse and qualified faculty. As part of his initiatives, the following changes have been implemented or are currently under way.

Dixie State College moved from a unified salary structure to a market-based structure in 2006. On March 17, 2006 the trustees approved a new Faculty Salary Schedule, Policy 3-18. The policy connects salaries to national survey data for like institutions that are indexed by rank and discipline for each faculty member. In an effort to align Dixie State College’s historically low salaries with national averages, the policy stipulates that base salaries for incoming faculty must be within 10% of the benchmark data; furthermore, it provides for both rank advancement increases and equity increases for continuing faculty. This policy and all policies concerning faculty are online at [http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html](http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html) and in Exhibit B.4.1.

Another important change for faculty, prompted by General Recommendation Two, was a revision of the professional development policy in April 2005 to provide for individual funding limits to assist current faculty to complete terminal degrees or other education as required or desired by the institution. Professional development funds are generally limited to $2,000 per person each year. However, with the change, applications up to $6,000 may be recommended under special circumstances. Recommendations for an individual faculty member will not exceed $6,000 in a three year period. This is faculty policy 3.9.6, Professional Development, Exhibit B.4.2.
Workload, Policy 3-10, revised May 2, 2003, is addressed in Part A: Response to General Recommendation Two. New President Lee Caldwell has made reducing workload a major priority during the first years of his administration. In an address at his Spring All-Faculty-Staff meeting on April 26, 2007, he reiterated his commitment that the college was determined to “buy back” faculty’s time. The tireless efforts of the president and his administrative team resulted in 2007 legislative appropriations and internal reallocations that funded 58 new faculty and academic support staff positions for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Faculty Evaluation, Policy 3-8, revised 05/02/03, is addressed in Part A: Response to General Recommendation One.

Elimination of Academic Programs, Policy 3-46, revised 05/02/03, is addressed in Part A: Response to General Recommendation Three.

Policy 3-30, “Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships, was revised in May 2003 to update language and add a section on consensual relationships; it also spelled out more explicitly the procedure for addressing complains of sexual harassment, online at http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polfac.html or in Exhibit B.4.3.

Policy 3-41, Curriculum Creation, Approval, Change and Review, was revised in March 2006. The revision formalized the dates for curriculum changes, so that changes to curriculum may be implemented only on July 1st or January 1st. The need to supply students with timely and accurate information is a direct response to General Recommendation Three.

2. **Have the characteristics of the faculty changed?**

The creation of new degree programs at the baccalaureate level and the need to bring workload levels down necessitated significant changes in faculty numbers, degree level and area of academic study. In 2002, at the time of Dixie State College’s full-scale evaluation, the institution boasted ninety full-time and roughly 225 part-time faculty members. Of the full-time faculty, thirty-four had doctorates, fifty-two had master degrees, and 6 held bachelor degrees. Faculty members tended to be remarkably loyal to the institution, the average number of years at the college for full professors being twenty-four years; associate professors averaged fourteen years at the college. See Figure 4.1, Faculty Profile 2002, below.
Today, the faculty profile looks much different. As of July 1, 2007, the number of full-time faculty had grown to 118, and seventy-four, or 63%, hold a terminal degree (the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees in 2002 was about 37%). Salary levels for all ranks are higher and the faculty as a whole has remarkably fewer years of experience at the institution. Figure 4.2 below shows the July 2007 faculty profile.

Figure 4.2: Faculty Profile, 2007
3. How have faculty salaries and other benefits improved?

In his 2006 inaugural address President Lee Caldwell said, “Today Dixie State College operates on a state allocation that is approximately two-thirds that of peer institutions in the state. The college did so by relying heavily on adjunct faculty members, paying faculty and staff at rates far below market rates and demanding a heavier workload. This cannot continue, given the current cost of living in Washington County” (“Inaugural Address of President Lee G. Caldwell, May 4, 2006” http://inauguration.dixie.edu/inauguration1.pdf).

Thanks to initiatives begun by the prior administration and sustained under current leadership, Dixie State College has been able to maintain a “rich” benefit package and develop a new faculty salary plan. Implementation of the salary plan was a two-year endeavor completed in 2007. The college was able to increase the overall faculty average salary to meet the national average by 2006. The table below, Figure 4.2, Annual Average Faculty Compensation, shows the compensation increases since 2002.

Figure 4.2: Average Annual Faculty Compensation, 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Total Average Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>$43,453</td>
<td>$62,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>$43,532</td>
<td>$60,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$43,323</td>
<td>$61,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$45,107</td>
<td>$64,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$52,300</td>
<td>$74,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average dips from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 because at the end of 2004, several long-time faculty members took an early retirement option and their larger salaries dropped from the total; of course, new, less expensive faculty members were hired to replace them, and those lower salaries were added to the total. The increase from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007 is a result of approximately $600,000 added to faculty salaries for equity (rank) adjustments and general salary increases. The total compensation numbers above are actual figures as the information was calculated on the exact benefit cost of each faculty member and not an average benefit cost (i.e., a person on single insurance cost would have a lower benefit cost than a person on couple or family coverage).

4. How does the institution conduct a substantive performance evaluation of all faculty?

This question is addressed in Part A: Response to General Recommendation One.

5. Other changes:

Librarians:

In March 2005, the professional librarians at Dixie State College were formally approved as members of the faculty. This change will be discussed in Standard Five, Library and Information Resources.

Visiting Professor:

Dixie State College hosted its first-ever visiting professor as Dr. John Farrington, Scientist Emeritus of the Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry Department at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, accepted appointment for Spring 2007 semester. Professor Farrington is a distinguished international expert in oceanography recognized nationally for his extraordinary service as an advisor to the
nation in matters of science, engineering and health. During his time at Dixie State, Professor Farrington taught and worked in the science department and lectured at the Dixie Forum. His teaching included a new course, “Introduction to Oceanography”, which covered the essential principles of ocean sciences.

Creation of a lecturer-advisor position:

Effective July 1, 2007, a new non-tenure-track faculty position, Lecturer-Advisor, was instituted. This faculty position, as the name suggests, serves dual function within the baccalaureate degree programs. The lecturer-advisor is masters-prepared in the discipline and her or his responsibilities are divided among teaching lower division courses and program advisement.

The challenge of faculty sufficiency:

Historically low salaries and heavy workloads have made the recruitment and retention of highly qualified faculty at Dixie State College problematic. While the college has been fortunate in building a faculty of well prepared and extremely dedicated individuals in the past, market realities have made it increasingly difficult to staff new degree programs and fill the vacancies created by retirement of an aging faculty. President Lee Caldwell believes that DSC should operate with a full-time faculty complement of 140 to adequately meet the needs of its existing students and programs; in 2005-2006, the college operated with 107; in 2006-2007, there were 113 full time faculty members, including librarians.

Budget surpluses in the state coffers, approved tuition hikes, and internal reallocations allowed the college to fund a record number of new faculty positions for 2007-2008. Including twelve faculty hired with the previous year’s funding, the college would be able to bring fifty-two new faculty and six new program staff to the campus for the 2007-2008 academic year, however, recruiting efforts filled only about half of the funded position by July 2007.

The challenge of qualified adjuncts and full time-adjunct faculty ratio:

Although the 2002 evaluation team found that “Dixie State College’s programs are staffed with professionally qualified faculty” (page 43), President Caldwell reported to the State Board of Regents in October 2005 that “32% of the DSC adjuncts are unqualified by USHE standards” and “55% of DSC courses are taught by adjuncts or [by full time faculty] on overload” (“Resource and Review Committee Report,” October 2005, Exhibit B.1.4). The initiative to bring faculty salaries into alignment with peer institutions put the college into a position to hire much-needed full time faculty and the adjunct crisis has begun to diminish. The Utah State Board of Regents’ “2007 Data Book” reveals an improving picture for Dixie State College:

Figure 4.3: “2006-2007 Data Book” [http://www.utahnbsr.edu/new05e.html]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part Time Faculty Headcount</th>
<th>Average Faculty Contact Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Institution Total</th>
<th>Average Instruction Credit Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Institution Total</th>
<th>Average Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Institution Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty Overload</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Adjunct Instructors</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part Time Instructors</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>82.16</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 2007, adjunct instructors comprised 34.9% of the institution’s total faculty; they supplied 38.6% of the total instructional credit hours and 35.4% for the total student credit hours at the college. With the addition of new full time faculty members, the college was able to replace many under-qualified adjuncts, thus improving the situation on two fronts.
Response to Evaluators’ Concerns:

Standard Four concerns expressed by evaluators in the 2002 Evaluation Committee Report found full expression in general recommendations which have been addressed in Part A.

Standard Five: Library and Information Resources

How have the library/learning resources and laboratories been maintained to keep pace with the growth of instruction or with significant program changes?

LIB 1010, Information Literacy:

A new required academic course to address information literacy implemented in 2005 is discussed in Standard Two. The addition of the new course, while educationally positive, has created additional burdens for library staff. Since fall 2005 when the course began, over 6,000 students have enrolled and statistics show an increase in the use of many library resources, including databases and e-book collections. The added workload that LIB 1010 created was far beyond any expectations. The instruction librarian dedicates almost all of her time on the class; furthermore, full-time professional librarians teach one section of the class each semester (50 students), and the remainder of the sections are staffed by adjuncts, most of whom are located at a distance from DSC. These adjuncts must be hired, trained, and supervised. With LIB 1010 courses set at 50 per section and the pay at $500 per section, it is difficult to retain good instructors or ask them to engage at the level required to make online courses successful. The anticipated addition of a librarian to oversee the day-to-day administration of the class will equalize the workload somewhat and allow the instruction librarian to concentrate on content and delivery.

Additionally, librarians have seen a change in the number and type of reference questions. Whereas most academic libraries continue to experience a decrease in reference transactions, that is not the case in the Browning Library. Reference questions have increased exponentially, and the quality of the questions is much higher than before LIB 1010. Students come with very specific questions, usually already having completed at least a portion of the research process. Face-to-face reference is supplemented by 24/7 digital chat reference, but this service is more helpful with traditional reference questions than with questions regarding LIB 1010.

However, many students have expressed dissatisfaction with the course, and some faculty have been disappointed that the face-to-face library instruction previously offered to all English writing classes had to be discontinued. The LIB 1010 curriculum requires constant adjustment as resources evolve and change, which has precluded much of the outreach work formerly done. The delivery method for the course, which is currently text-based, must be updated to focus on more audio-visual content, a process that is very time consuming.

Staffing and Salaries:

Library staffing continues to be problematic in some areas, but substantial progress has been made in others. The library continues to suffer because of a lack of continuity in the position of library director. Beginning in 2001, the library has seen a series of three interim directors and one permanent appointment that lasted only two years. Currently, the position is open again, and the first two candidates who were offered appointment declined.
The lack of consistent leadership has produced problems for the library. Although the director’s salary has been raised to be more comparable to national averages, the amount of work required in this position combined with the high cost of living in the St. George area has made filling the position with a well-qualified individual very difficult. The library suffers from the absence of a director to oversee the day-to-day operations and has made long-term planning very difficult. The library director, who used to be a de facto dean, now is recognized as less than the chair of an academic department. Combined with the lack of staff, not having an effective, ongoing director hampers the long-term evaluation and assessment programs in the library.

However, several improvements in staffing have also occurred.

- Professional librarians were granted full faculty status and received salary increases that brought them to at least 95% of equity.
- As a result of special legislative funding and partnerships with the University of Utah and Southern Utah University, significant improvements in staffing and funding began in July 2007.
  - Specifically, two additional professional librarians will be hired who will share collection development and reference duties along with specific responsibilities to meet current needs. One librarian will focus on education and library instruction and one librarian will focus on providing reference service in the evenings and managing interlibrary loan.
  - One part-time paraprofessional will be hired to allow the library to expand its hours of operations in the evening and on weekends.

The biggest remaining issue is salary equity for paraprofessional staff. Currently, the staff are woefully underpaid, especially for the qualifications required. The college president has promised to address this in the upcoming budget cycle.

Quality of Print Materials in Support of Baccalaureate Programs: The 2002 accreditation visit resulted in several recommendations regarding library and information resources. Primary among them was “that the college continue to build its library collections to support the baccalaureate programs while maintaining support for the entire spectrum of materials which underpin its two-year programs.” Since the report was written, new baccalaureate degrees have been added, some with dedicated library funding and others without.

- Business, Computer Science, and Elementary Education are adequately funded, although no projection for cost increases has been made.
- The Bachelor of Science in Nursing has a lower level of funding not commensurate with the price of resources in the health sciences, but the dean of the School of Business, Health, and Technology has supplemented the ongoing funding with one-time funding when possible. An increase in the ongoing funds supporting the health sciences is absolutely necessary, especially since the library must purchase almost all of these materials in the more expensive electronic format because the programs are moving off campus.
- The Communication program has the same level of funding as the BSN program, which is adequate at the current time. The college is presently proposing a reconfiguration of the Communication degree that will include three emphases which will require more advanced resources than current funding allows.
- The newest degrees, including Biology and English have no dedicated ongoing funding which is problematic. Biology, in particular, requires substantial funding because of the specialized and expensive information resources needed to support the varied curriculum.
- The college allocated over $50,000 in ongoing funds as of July 2007 (from S. B. 90: Higher Education Enhancements) to support proposed baccalaureate degrees in Secondary Education, Music, Theater, Dental Hygiene, Health Care Management, and Aviation Management, as well as certificate and associate’s degree programs in Respiratory Therapy.
Restructuring the current collection development budgets should create an equitable distribution that will serve the lower-division classes and satisfy the basic needs of the baccalaureate programs at the same time.

Although the relationship between the librarians and the faculty is good, most faculty either do not have an interest in collection development activities or they have not kept current in the publications in their fields. For a teaching institution, course syllabi are useful in discovering what is needed in individual courses. The library staff proposes a library liaison for each department. These individuals would then serve on the Library Committee and would provide a consistent method of communication regarding collections.

Another concern of subject-area evaluators was the level of the materials in the library collections. The need for more academic, as opposed to general or popular, items is being addressed by a newly instituted approval / notification plan for monographic purchases that will focus on research-oriented titles.

Stable Funding within the College Base Budget for Collection Development: The accreditation report noted that the college should develop a contingency plan to pay for the databases currently purchased through the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC). This is currently a non-issue as UALC receives funding directly from the legislature and there do not appear to be any problems maintaining current resources although cost increases are sometimes difficult to accommodate. It would be almost impossible for the college to individually license the array of databases currently available to DSC through UALC. The college is better served to focus instead on supplementing those resources with additional print and electronic items that support specific programs.

Faculty Status for Librarians: In the 2002, evaluators noted that: “The question of faculty status for the professional staff should be addressed. The need to encourage collegial communication with the instructional faculty on library development and library instruction and research would be facilitated by a decision to move librarians to faculty status” (Full-scale Evaluation Report 2002, p. 47). On April 21, 2005, the Board of Trustees approved a recommendation by the college that professional librarians receive faculty status. The most significant change for professional librarians was an instantaneous salary increase to bring them in alignment with national salary averages.

Library Strategic Plan: Although the library, like the entire college, faces many challenges, some of them have been met. The academic administration of the college is committed to helping improve the resources and services of the library. The current discussions regarding the proposed Centennial Commons have produced doubts for librarians and library staff as to how the 25,000 square feet allocated to the library in that new building will be integrated with the two existing buildings. The library staff suspects that because the Computer Center, the Testing Center, the Tutoring Center, and the Writing Center will remain in their current locations, it indicates that the “information commons” model will not come to fruition. A creative use of space will be needed to effectively utilize three separate but linked buildings in order to meet the needs of a new generation of students.

The library plans the following changes and improvements in the next year:

- Restructure collection development budgets within restrictions to allocate funding equitably between subject areas and programs.
- Urge academic departments to appoint one individual as a library representative who will serve as a liaison and appoint those individuals to the Library Committee.
- Allocate funds to allow librarians to host liaisons at lunches several times each year.
- Improve student experience in LIB 1010 by honing content and expanding delivery methods to emphasize audio-visual learning. Some of this content could also serve as publicly accessible online tutorials.
- Reorganize library into departments (Public Services, Technical Services, and Special Collections) in order for professional librarians to work more closely with paraprofessionals. It is hoped that this would also mitigate the disruptions caused by any future changes in the director’s office.
- Continue to work closely with the college administration and individual departments to improve funding for information resources. Produce an annual report that clearly delineates the successes and unmet needs of the library, with conclusions supported by statistics.
- Conduct a variety of outreach activities, including sending monthly New Acquisitions lists sorted by call number to academic departments, Inviting all faculty to the library for an open forum, department meetings, or other meeting at least once a year to discuss program needs as well as library collections, services, and facilities, and encouraging subject-specific library instruction in upper-division courses in a variety of formats.
- Perform surveys (online, telephone, or in person) of students (library users, non-library users, and specific majors) to determine student needs.
- Implement an electronic reserve system that will assist all students and faculty in accessing important information in support of the curriculum.
- Request one-time funds to complete the Dewey-to-Library of Congress reclassification project. Library staff needs a coordinated effort utilizing outside help. Although progress has been made, the pace needs to be accelerated to minimize the disruption of this project to library staff and patrons.
- Increase the use of external notification and approval programs from academic vendors to ensure the purchase of quality academic resources.

The additional staffing and increased funding should allow for many of these goals to be accomplished. However, librarians urge continued attention to the role of the library on campus.

**Standard Six: Governance and Administration**

*Explain significant changes in the governing board, leadership, and management of the institution.*

Dixie State College’s governance structure is defined by Utah Code, Title 53 B, Chapter Two. The statute establishes the Utah System of Higher Education, governed by a State Board of Regents and a Commissioner of Higher Education who delegate governing authority to institutional boards of trustees and presidents. Title 53, as it relates to Standard Six of this report, has not been amended since the college’s last full-scale evaluation in 2002.

**The Board of Trustees:** Dixie State College policy 2.1, “Board of Trustees: Ethics and Responsibilities,” serves to guide the institutional Board of Trustees. While the board membership has changed as terms expire and replacements are appointed, the policies and procedures of the Board of Trustees have not changed. Policy 2.1 is at [http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polorg.html](http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/polorg.html). The current Board of Trustees roster is Appendix B.6.1, Organizational Charts.

**New Institutional Leadership:** In June 2006, Dixie State College welcomed a new president, Dr. Lee G. Caldwell. Dr. Caldwell is the college’s sixteenth president in its ninety-five years. To more effectively pursue institutional mission and goals, the president has initiated a number of important administrative and leadership changes, described below.
**Academic Reorganization:**

The academic divisions have been reorganized to provide better leadership. Prior to the change, the college's administrative structure consisted of three academic divisions, including the Division of Continuing Education. The two primary divisions were the Division of Arts, Letters and Sciences (ALS) and the Division of Business, Technology and Health (BTH). The ALS division was home to eight of the academic programs and over 75% of the teaching faculty, while the BTH division housed five programs and 25% of teaching faculty (see figure 6.1, below). This imbalance created a perceived disproportionate work load for the two division deans, as well as the appearance of potential for funding inequities.

**Figure 6.1: Old Academic Division Structure**

The reorganization moved the Sciences and Mathematics from the ALS division to the BTH division and created a more equitable program and faculty balance. It also seemed to appropriately place crucial mathematics, life sciences and chemistry programs in proximity to the degree programs in business, technology and health sciences. With these changes, the two divisions were renamed: the School of Education, Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (EDHASS) and the School of Business, Sciences and Health (BSH), respectively. See the new academic structure in figure 6.2, below.
While the new academic realignment has created more equity in supervision for administrators, program growth was such that additional administrative assignments became necessary. As part of an overall restructuring, academic administration was enhanced with the addition of five associate deans. Implementation was made possible, in part, by a funding windfall as a result of a state budget surplus in February 2007, when the Utah State Legislature approved funding increases to the entire higher education system. The new positions were effective July 1, 2007.

The new associate deans are teaching deans, and are selected from the pool of department chairs from the division programs who apply. Their duties are split between teaching assignments and administrative assignments as necessary, with up to 50% of their time reassigned to administrative duties.

Finally, planning and development for new baccalaureate programs has necessitated the creation of new departments where, in the past, some disciplines had been combined into a single department. Notably, one department grouping included fine and performing arts and communication; now the disciplines have become the Department of Communication and the Department Fine and Performing Arts. Likewise, elementary education, family and consumer sciences and physical education were a single department, but they are now three departments: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Family and Consumer Science/Physical Education. Likewise, in 2002, the disciplines of mathematics and sciences were combined; today, they are the Department of Biological Sciences, the Department of Physical Sciences and the Department of Mathematics. The chart below, Figure 6.3, illustrates the new governance with associate deans and the new department configurations:
Restructuring the Office of Institutional Advancement:

In early 2007, the executive director of cultural affairs resigned and the college administration used the vacancy as an opportunity to reorganize the administrative structure of the Office of Institutional Advancement. The changes were approved in May 2007 by the Board of Trustees. The restructuring combined the director of institutional advancement and the executive director of cultural affairs into one position: associate vice president of advancement and cultural affairs. It also changed the alumni coordinator to an alumni director and created two new junior-level positions: marketing coordinator and events and grants coordinator. The new administrative chart is below, Figure 6.4.
Standard Seven: Finance

What significant changes have been made in the financial structure and condition of the institution?

The Challenge of Chronic Under-Funding:

When the college received approval for a new mission to offer baccalaureate degree programs in 2001, it anticipated funding for the change to come from three primary sources: new enrollment growth funding from the state, the elimination of languishing academic programs, and a transfer of funds previously earmarked for the provision of baccalaureate programs by Southern Utah University on Dixie’s campus, no longer necessary. While the latter two sources of funding materialized, the state’s economic downturn and subsequent budget deficits caused enrollment growth funding to dry up. Dixie State College soon found itself seriously under-funded. The college’s Executive Director of Business Services determined that the funding gap between the college and other institutions in the system amounted to at least $4 million by 2005. Additional calculations based on funding models using Institutional Credit Hour Equivalents (ICHE) showed that the college was actually under-funded by over $6.5 million for FY 2005-2006.

The college resorted to its two available avenues for correcting the deficit: tuition increases and state appropriations.

One-tiered tuition: Since beginning to offer baccalaureate degrees in 2001, and in keeping with its dual role as a community college and a baccalaureate institution, Dixie State College had used a two-tiered tuition structure with one tuition rate for lower division courses and a different rate for upper division.

The college determined that tuition increases typical of those throughout the system could make up $2.1 million of the shortfall, and the college’s financial advisors recommended a single-tier tuition rate for upper- and lower-division students. Acting on the recommendation, the college implemented for the 2006-2007 academic year a single tuition rate that effectively lowered upper-division tuition by 9% and raised lower division tuition by 31%. This now places DSC at the WICHE regional averages for community colleges, but still leaves the college well below the levels of its peer institutions. Administrators stress the importance of the new single structure to improve accounting purposes and to more appropriately align Dixie State College with peer baccalaureate institutions.

Since 2002, Dixie State College has increased tuitions on a yearly basis to more adequately fund instruction. Figure 7.1 below shows the five-year tuition increases by percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 7.1 Yearly tuition increases, 2002-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition percentage increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-res. 5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even with regular tuition increases over the past five years, the college still offers students an educational bargain. Historically Dixie State College has been the most affordable college in the Utah State System of Higher Education; however, as the 2002 accreditation evaluators noted, low funding would eventually undermine the institution’s ability to provide quality instruction. Efforts to prevent erosion of quality through tuition increases have been strong and effective, but have failed thus far to bring DSC in line with institutions in the state system and the region. Comparison data from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher
Education (WICHE) showed that Dixie’s resident tuition ranked at the very bottom when compared to twenty peer institutions in 2005-2006, and its non-resident tuition ranked nearly at the bottom (Exhibit B.7.1). Among sister institutions in the Utah higher education system, Dixie’s tuition is second-lowest and the third least expensive in the United States.

Appropriations from the Utah State Legislature: The second avenue for relieving its financial crisis was the pursuit of state appropriations, and the February 2007 Legislative session was generally good for higher education in Utah. A budget surplus of over $1.6 billion left lawmakers feeling more generous. While Dixie State College did not fare as well as some of her more visible and politically powerful sister institutions, compensation and funding for new programs was at an acceptable level. The hallmark of the funding, however, was a senate bill, SB 90. The bill authorized a $4.2 million bond pay-off of the DSC Gardner Student Center remodeling and addition. This pay-off results in an annual on-going $490,000 in the college’s coffers. The bill also created an “institutional partnership” between Dixie and the University of Utah and provides $1 million in funding, to be administered by the U of U. As described in Standard Two under new academic partnerships, the University of Utah will bring three programs to the Dixie State campus: an MS in Nursing, an MS in Special Education, and an MBA. Figure 7.2 below summarizes the increased funding.

Figure 7.2. Funding Summary, Utah State Legislature, February 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Item</th>
<th>On-going</th>
<th>One-time</th>
<th>Shared</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1,232,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5% and 1.5% (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFCM – Health Science Building</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Partnership U of U and Dixie</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS Nursing, MBA, MS Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Priorities</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Partnership U of U and Dixie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Payoff</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gardner Center 1 &amp; 2 and Abby Apartment – results in $490,000 on-going funding after payoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Power</td>
<td>147,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Computer Initiative</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT and Software</td>
<td>~90,000</td>
<td>~130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Video</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hurricane and Kanab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanab Study</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEBA Project in Kanab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>62,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals</strong></td>
<td>3,367,700</td>
<td>4,835,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,5203,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Secondary Licensure; Dental Hygiene; Respiratory Therapy; Music; Theater; Health Management; Aviation Management

The funding gap has been substantially improved; however, the college anticipates that continued tuition increases, the addition of high-demand degree programs, and vigorous efforts to secure state.
appropriations will be necessary to ensure long-term financial health. In May 2007, the Executive Director of Business Services presented a Strategic Financial Plan draft to the president and the Board of Trustees. The completed plan will be reviewed for approval by the Utah State Board of Regents before the end of the year, and as part of the overall Dixie State College Draft Strategic Plan, can be viewed in Exhibit B.1.1.

Internal Audit Committee:

Another priority for the new college president, Lee Caldwell, has been financial integrity and efficiency. He charged the Dixie State College Internal Audit Committee the task of auditing and evaluating every college department and the process is under way. The mission and function of the Internal Audit is described online at [http://www.dixie.edu/iaudit/about.html](http://www.dixie.edu/iaudit/about.html).

Fundraising and Development:

Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Christina Schultz, was appointed in August 2005. Ms. Schultz brought impressive credentials and a vigorous approach to development for Dixie State College. In September 2006, Vice President Schultz presented the DSC Board of Trustees with plans for the final phase of a $100 million, four-year capital campaign to culminate in 2011, the college’s centennial year. The centennial campaign had begun in 2000 with a “silent phase” that had brought in $58 million by early 2007. Links to campaign literature are at [http://new.dixie.edu/giving/index.php](http://new.dixie.edu/giving/index.php). Institutional Advancement website is [http://www.dixie.edu/advance/](http://www.dixie.edu/advance/) and details of the capital campaign and strategic plans may be viewed there; additionally, the “Dixie State College of Utah Campaign Plan” is Exhibit B.7.2.

Response to evaluators’ concerns regarding the Banner conversion:

In the 2002 final analysis of Standard Seven, the evaluators observed that “reports are the product of an increasingly antiquated SCT BANNER financial software system” which the state had committed to upgrade to a newer version in July 2003. Evaluators noted that “the Business Services staff will be challenged to implement the conversion to ensure report-writing packages are in place while continuing to manage an expanding workload” (page 52).

The conversion to the new BANNER finance software did occur. Reporting remains a problem with the new software because it doesn’t report all the necessary information, according to business services staff. Business Services has had to create their own reports using Microsoft Access, Crystal Enterprise, and other software to retrieve the necessary data. Compounding the problem are continued salary disparities between the marketplace and the college. Salaries for accounting staff are still below market, making it hard to keep trained staff and hire experienced staff.
Standard Eight: Physical Facilities

New Buildings

A complete inventory of new projects, acquisition and capital improvements is on page 63. Some of the highlights for the college include the following:

Dolores Doré Eccles Fine Arts Center:

The college and the community celebrated the completion of the Dolores Doré Eccles Fine Arts Center in October 2004. This state-of-the-art facility houses classrooms, faculty offices, and the college’s performing arts programs as well as the Dixie State College art collection in a beautiful and spacious museum and exhibition space. Furthermore, in keeping with DSC’s mission of community service, the Eccles has also become the performance home for the St. George Musical Theater, an excellent non-profit community-based theater company with a twenty-year history in the community. The college has also entered into a similar arrangement with the Southern Utah Heritage Choir. DSC’s partnerships with these two entities have greatly enhanced learning opportunities for students in music and theater.

Russell C. Taylor Health Science Center:

In December 2006, construction began on the new Russell C. Taylor Health Science Center. This 78,000 square foot building will house programs in nursing, dental hygiene, emergency medical services, medical radiography, respiratory therapy, surgical technology, phlebotomy and certified nursing assistants. It will also be home to future programs such as the physical therapy assistant and the medical laboratory technician and technology programs. Completion is scheduled for April 2008.

Future Buildings and Facilities Planning:

DSC recently received Board of Regents’ approval to seek programming funding for a new “Centennial Commons,” a proposed 300,000 square foot facility to house an updated library, student services, and several academic departments. This facility is intended to replace cramped and aging buildings; it will be designed to expand over the next 20-25 years with growing enrollment and programs.

With the entire strategic plan under revision in 2006-2007, the facilities planning effort became critical. Given the growth of programs, enrollment trends and Dixie State College’s land-locked location, it became obvious that traditional facilities approaches would be inadequate. Key college personnel visited a number of other campuses to identify trends and approaches not currently used in Utah. Campus master planning funding in the amount of $80,000 was obtained from the state DFCM and professional planners were engaged to help the college develop a campus master plan to meet the challenges of the future.

VCBO Architects and Sasaki Associates were retained and during 2006 and early 2007, met several times with the Campus Planning Committee. Details of their work may be viewed at http://dsc.infowest.com/. Exhibit B.8.1 is the Final Campus Plan.
Inventory of Capital Projects 2002-Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Racquetball Court</td>
<td>Remodeled &amp; converted to Weight Training Room</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>$36,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Community Education Bldg.</td>
<td>Remodeled &amp; converted to Campus Security office</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>$16,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Jennings Building</td>
<td>Remodeled &amp; converted to nursing &amp; dental hygiene</td>
<td>28,113</td>
<td>$1,454,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Gardner Student Center</td>
<td>Addition &amp; remodeling</td>
<td>11,000 new, 5000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Dixie View Apartments</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ATC Shop</td>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>American Towers Condo</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Dolores Doré Eccles Fine Art Center</td>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>78,372</td>
<td>$14,602,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Graff Fine Arts Center</td>
<td>Remodeled</td>
<td>6,822</td>
<td>$1,138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hansen Stadium Concessions Building</td>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>Remodeled</td>
<td>38,063</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Softball Building</td>
<td>New construction</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Abby Apartments</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>20,054</td>
<td>$1,674,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Russell C. Taylor Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>Under construction; completion</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$18,330,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link to Campus history of buildings [http://ds.dixie.edu/physplant/History/YEAR%20FOLDER/index.htm](http://ds.dixie.edu/physplant/History/YEAR%20FOLDER/index.htm)

Response to Evaluators’ Concerns:

Renovation on 100 South: The 2002 Evaluation Report cited safety concerns for pedestrians on 100 South. The safety factors revolved around the increasing automobile traffic on a street that students traditionally crossed at any point along a two-block section without the benefit of traffic controls to access classrooms on the north side of the campus. While the college had been concerned as well, and had sought funding and municipal cooperation to redesign the streetscape for safety, it was 2004 before the project was approved by the city, funded and completed. The renovation included a traffic signal and new crosswalk, new lighting, and a decorative barrier wall to direct pedestrians to the signal light and crosswalk, effectively eliminating opportunities to cross the street randomly along the two-block section. Details are available in Exhibit B.8.2.

While addressing the safety issue, the college opted for still more improvements, including a widening of the north sidewalk to create an “area of refuge” around the traffic signal and desert xeriscaping along the parkway strip. The final phase will be the completion of desert xeriscaping of the north side of the street to match the completed south side.

Diesel Program Facilities: A second concern of the evaluators regarded the cramped and poorly equipped diesel mechanic facility. Since the time of the 2002 report, DXATC has leased a very adequate facility with ample space to house the diesel program. Located at 843 Red Rock Road, this 4,500 sq. ft. building is leased from Rocky Mountain Company who originally designed it to serve as its own diesel service facility. The three-bay garage has been remodeled and new equipment and tools are available for students. DXATC built a 2,400 square foot modular classroom building on the property to provide classroom, office, and restroom space for the program. A facility description and photographs are available at [http://www.dixieatc.org/AuxillarySites.htm](http://www.dixieatc.org/AuxillarySites.htm).
Standard Nine: Institutional Integrity

How does the institution ensure high ethical standards in its treatment of students, faculty, and staff?

Because questions of institutional integrity were raised in General Recommendation Three, the substantial narrative is in Part A, Actions Taken Regarding Recommendations.

Policies and Procedures:

Dixie State College maintains a comprehensive Policies and Procedures manual. The college employs a “bottom-up” process for creating or revising, approving and implementing policies. Proposals come from committees upward through a series of reviews and approvals to the college’s Board of Trustees, which gives final approval for all policies. The policies and procedures are subject to regular review for effectiveness and legality.

The college addresses ethics in its Policies and Procedures manual for trustees, administrators, students, faculty and staff. The college ensures the ethical treatment of students through policies on sexual harassment, filing grievances and appeals, and confidentiality of records, among others. Dixie State College Policies and Procedures are online at http://www.dixie.edu/humanres/pol.html. No changes of policy have occurred since 2002.

Internal Audit:

Dixie State College’s Internal Audit function is an independent appraisal activity within the college for the review of operations as a service to management. It is a managerial control that measures and evaluates the effectiveness and efficiency of controls and operations. The Internal Audit Department assists college management, the Dixie State College Board of Trustees and its Audit Committee in the effective discharge of their responsibilities and in identifying, avoiding and, where necessary, mitigating risks. See Internal Audit discussed in Standard Seven, Finance.

The “Silent Whistle” Program:

In 2004, Dixie State College initiated a whistleblower plan and policy designed to protect any employee who engages in good faith disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body or to a college official. More specifically, the program encourages employees to disclose serious breaches of conduct covered by college policies or violations of law. The policies governing Silent Whistle provide employees with guidelines for disclosing wrongful conduct and they protect employees from reprisal as a result of disclosure. This program has become a model for other institutions and is now being emulated statewide. Silent Whistle is online at http://www.dixie.edu/iaudit/whistle.html. The Dixie State College Internal Audit program also maintains an “Ethics and Compliance Hotline” at http://www.dixie.edu/iaudit/hotline.html. It is independently operated to ensure confidentiality.
CONCLUSION

Five years after its October 2002 full scale accreditation evaluation, Dixie State College is a different institution in many respects. In 2002, the orientation of the institution remained largely that of a junior college or a community college; today, the priorities of the administration, the composition of the faculty, the curricular design, and the planning for the future combine to represent the characteristics of a baccalaureate-granting state college, and potentially, the University of Utah, St. George with opportunities for expanded degree programs and graduate degree programs provided by the University of Utah.

While the college still maintains its commitment to its community college mission, it is strategically prepared to expand its four-year programs and adult degree completion programs to meet the educational needs of the fastest-growing county in the United States. Dixie State College is poised to fill a unique niche in the evolving Utah State System of Higher Education, otherwise comprised of universities, community colleges and technical schools, in that it is the only institution in the system that might be described as a four-year liberal arts college.

Dixie State College is satisfied that it has responded with positive improvements to the four General Recommendations resulting from its accreditation evaluation.

- A new mission statement created with campus-wide participation is in place;
- Faculty evaluations are uniform, universal and regular;
- Faculty professional development policy is revamped and funding reinstated with particular emphasis on funding faculty members who seek to complete terminal degrees;
- A new faculty salary schedule has been implemented and salaries have been brought to a level with the college’s peer institutions nationally;
- A workload policy and model has been adopted and is widely supported by the faculty;
- Diligent efforts have been implemented to ensure the highest standards of integrity with its students, its employees and its community;
- A plan is in place to provide the necessary resources for planning and implementing assessment and developing a “culture of assessment” at the institution.

Challenges that remain before the college include:

- Increasing retention and maintaining enrollment levels and increasing student diversity;
- Committing to ongoing assessment for improvement of learning and teaching;
- Developing degree programs that meet the needs of a growing population;
- Increasing funding to meet deficiencies;
- Recruiting and retaining well-qualified faculty, including adjunct faculty;
- Recruiting and retaining well-qualified staff.

Needless to say, there is little possibility that the institution will ease into complacency. Dixie State College recognizes that it faces a number of challenges and it resolves to meet the future with a clear sense of its mission and purpose.
### APPENDICES, PART A

#### Appendix A-1: Accreditation Recommendation Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Recommendation</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Date to be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Faculty Evaluation - The accreditation team recommends that Dixie State College review and revise its faculty evaluation process, paying specific attention to policy 4.1. While the team did find evidence that Dixie applied its evaluation policy in a number of departments, the lack of consistent application across all departments was apparent. Recommendation number two in the 1992 Northwest Accreditation report indicated, “the faculty evaluation process is inconsistent and fragmented, lacking clear direction and conformity.” This is still the case in 2002 (4.1). | 1.A: Review Faculty Evaluation Policy to ensure that it is consistent and applied across the campus.  
1.B: Create a matrix that lists all faculty names, dates of all past and future evaluation activities.  
1.C: Centralize the Faculty Evaluation procedures, and  
1.D: Implement all procedures for all faculty during the coming year. | VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans | Feb. 15, 2003  
Feb. 15, 2003  
May 1, 2003  
Aug. 2003 – May 2004 |
| 2. Workloads - The Committee recommends that Dixie State College engage in a process that will bring faculty workloads into compliance with Standards 2.A.1 and 4.A.3. In order for the institution to demonstrate its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning (2.A.1) it is essential that sufficient human resources be provided to support the educational programs and facilitate student achievement of program objectives wherever and however they are offered. Current full-time faculty workloads are high; however faculty have willingly taken on additional burdens of teaching overloads and additional assignments that have exceeded the amount where the high standards of teaching and learning can be sustained. Further, there are too many instances where the burdens on faculty and staff workloads come to the point that there is not sufficient time and support allowing for professional growth and renewal (4.A.3). | 2.A: Revise workload policy to limit overload instruction for full-time faculty to two courses per term and twelve credits per year.  
2.B: Revise workload policy to ensure that no faculty is required to take overload instruction.  
2.C: Revise workload policy to vest department chairs with responsibility to evaluate credentials. If no qualified faculty (as determined by department chair) can be found, the instruction will not be offered.  
2.D: Reinstate full professional development funding next year.  
2.E: Discontinue required use of staff employees as teachers. | VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans  
VP Academics and Academic Deans | May 2003  
May 2003  
May 2003  
July 1, 2003  
May 2003 |
| 3. Institutional Integrity - The team found inconsistencies, inaccuracies and omissions in information presented to Dixie’s constituents (including the Commission) and some lapses in ethical treatment of undergraduate students. Whether its failure to “teach out” a discontinued program to ensure fair student treatment, publication of inaccurate information about the current accreditation status of programs, communication of inaccurate information in schedules and catalog, or failure to document compliance with policies, the institution has had lapses in its attempts to adhere to high ethical standards. Any institution undergoing rapid change in size, mission, or personnel is prey to lapses, and the Committee understands that. Taken individually, these instances vary in their significance. Although | 3.A: Create a policy on discontinued programs, specifying the College’s obligation to “teach out” students in the pipeline.  
3.B: Establish more formal procedures to review publications for accuracy.  
3.C: Review decision-making process in a variety of settings. The president will review it in his visits to departments. The executive director of human resources will review it in | VP Academics and Academic Deans  
Public Relations Office  
All offices, especially the president and HR. | May 2003  
March 15, 2003  
Ongoing |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Recommendation</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Date to be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional on the institution’s part, the number of such occurrences indicates inadequate review of publications, and inadequate communication among those responsible for making, documenting and publicizing administrative actions and decisions. No single action or procedural change can correct this array of problems. The Committee recommends that the college re-evaluate the means by which policies and procedures are disseminated, their application monitored, and their results implemented and reported in college documents. (Standard 9, 9.A.2 and 9.A.3)</td>
<td>3.D: Publish a catalog addendum which includes major curriculum changes.</td>
<td>VP Academics and Academic Deans</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.E: Write and submit prospectuses for substantive change for the Hurricane and Kanab Educational Centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Continuing Education</td>
<td>Sept. 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.F: Write and submit prospectuses for substantive change for the College’s online courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Continuing Education</td>
<td>Dec. 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recommendation on Mission: The mission statement of Dixie State College of Utah was created amidst change that is still unfolding. It does not appear that the internal community was fully engaged in its creation. While it is published widely and widely recognized by the campus community, it is not as widely understood, perhaps because it does not capture the unique characteristics of Dixie State College or give clear guidance as to the next changes. The evaluation team therefore recommends that the campus review the current statement to both reaffirm its general content and to implement whatever adjustments would make it fully consonant with current institutional realities and reflect Dixie’s unique characteristics (1.B.3 and 1.B.9). Dixie can use that process to its advantage so it decides how to resolve its resource dilemmas.</td>
<td>4.A: Discuss the mission at all of the president’s visits with campus units during coming year.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.B: Discuss the mission at the All Employee meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>President and other executive staff</td>
<td>March and August each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.C: Ask all persons serving on the Strategic Planning Committee to report about whether they have carried information back to the campus units they represent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>President and Strategic Planning Committee</td>
<td>April 2003 and December 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.D: Conduct a survey of to evaluate faculty and staff understanding of the current mission and gather suggestions about its use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Lojko</td>
<td>March 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.E: Develop and implement a process for writing a new mission statement such that the entire campus community is involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Lojko</td>
<td>Aug. 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A-2: Current Faculty Evaluation Student Opinion Survey; Supervisor Evaluation Form; Peer Exchange Form

DIXIE STATE COLLEGE OF UTAH COURSE EVALUATION

Semester
- Fall
- Spring

Faculty ID# 1 1 1 1

Banner # 1 1 1 1

Year
- 2005
- 2006
- 2007

Like this... Not like this

1. I am a (an):  ☐ Freshman   ☐ Sophomore   ☐ Junior   ☐ Senior   ☐ Other

2. This class was:  ☐ Required or recommended for major   ☐ General Education   ☐ Elective Credit   ☐ Other

3. On average I spent the following number of hours each week studying for this class:
   - 0 - 2 hours
   - 3 - 5 hours
   - 6 - 10 hours
   - 11 or more hours

4. I sought the instructor during his or her regular office hours:
   - Usually
   - Occasionally
   - Seldom
   - Never

5. In this class, the grade I expect to receive is:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

6. My overall Dixie State College GPA is:
   - 4.00 - 3.50
   - 3.49 - 3.00
   - 2.99 - 2.50
   - 2.49 - 2.00
   - Below 2.0

7. A syllabus was provided.
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - No Opinion

8. The syllabus communicated course objectives, requirements and grading standards.
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - No Opinion

9. A class schedule was provided; changes were announced in class.
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - No Opinion

10. The instructor's out-of-class assignments helped me understand the course content.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

11. Assignments were returned in a timely fashion.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

12. The instructor provided helpful feedback on graded assignments.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

13. I was informed of my grade standing in the class.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

14. The instructor held class at the scheduled time(s), including beginning and ending class on time.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

15. If the instructor was absent; a substitute taught the class and/or an assignment was given.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

16. The instructor explanations and/or demonstrations were clear.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

17. The instructor attempted to be fair and respectful towards students in class.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

18. Required course materials (such as texts) were helpful.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

19. I respect this instructor as a source of information in this field.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

20. Overall, this class increased my knowledge, confidence, and/or abilities in this area.
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - No Opinion

Frequently, written evaluations are our most valuable source of information. On the other side of this sheet, please make written comments on the following two questions.

21. What were the greatest strengths of this instructor and this class?
22. How can this class be improved?

Thank you for completing this survey!
Sample Summary Sheet for Semester Evaluations

Dixie State College
Class Report for Course / Instructor Evaluation
Fall 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>I am</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>This class was:</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Required or recommended for major</th>
<th>General Education Credit</th>
<th>Elective Credit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>On average I spent the following number of hours each week studying for this class:</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>The instructor during his or her regular office hours:</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>In this class, the grade I expect to receive is:</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>4.00 - 3.50</th>
<th>3.49 - 3.00</th>
<th>2.99 - 2.50</th>
<th>Below 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.612</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q6  | My overall Dixie State College GPA is: | No Response | 4.123 | 4,637 | 1,482 | 359 | 79 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>A syllabus was provided</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>The syllabus communicated course objectives, requirements and grading standards</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>A class schedule was provided; changes were announced in class.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>49,911</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>The instructor's out-of-class assignments helped me understand the course content</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>49,778</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Assignments were returned in a timely fashion.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>49,875</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>The instructor provided helpful feedback on graded assignments.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>52,754</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>I was consistently informed of my grade standing in the class.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>68,604</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>The instructor held class at the scheduled time(s), including beginning and ending class on time.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>If the instructor was absent, a substitute taught the class and/or an assignment was given.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>65,815</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>The instructor explanations and/or demonstrations were clear.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>40,792</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>The instructor attempted to be fair and respectful towards students in class.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>19,908</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Required course materials (such as texts) were helpful.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>31,870</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>I respect this instructor as a source of information in this field.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>9,972</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Overall, this class increased my knowledge, confidence, and/or abilities in this area.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>14,8,702</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall mean for questions 8 - 20 is: | 1.26 |
## Sample Individual Instructor/Individual Course Summary of Evaluation:

### Dixie State College

**Class Report for Course / Instructor Evaluation**

**Spring 2007**

**Course Name:** ENGL-2010-16  
**Banner Number:** 20531  
**Instructor:** 1,093

### General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 I am a:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 This class was:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Recommended for major</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Elective Credit</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 On average I spent the following number of hours each week studying for this class:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 I sought the instructor during his or her regular office hours:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 In this class, the grade I expect to receive is:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4.00-3.50</td>
<td>3.49-3.00</td>
<td>2.99-2.50</td>
<td>2.49-2.00</td>
<td>below 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 A syllabus was provided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 The syllabus communicated course objectives, requirements and grading standards.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 A class schedule was provided; changes were announced in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 The instructor's out-of-class assignments helped me understand the course content.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 Assignments were returned in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 The instructor provided helpful feedback on graded assignments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 I was consistently informed of my grade standing in the class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 The instructor held class at the scheduled time(s), including beginning and ending class on time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 If the instructor was absent, a substitute taught the class and/or an assignment was given.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 The instructor explanations and/or demonstrations were clear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 The instructor attempted to be fair and respectful towards students in class.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 Required course materials (such as texts) were helpful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 I respect this instructor as a source of information in this field.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 Overall, this class increased my knowledge, confidence, and/or abilities in this area.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall mean for questions 8 - 20 is: **1.40**
**Peer Exchange form for Peer Evaluation:**

**Peer Exchange Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Observing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above individuals met to informally discuss the visit and exchange information about teaching on: ____________________________ (Date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Observing</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member Observed</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign, photocopy for your records, and send a copy to the division dean.
Supervisor Classroom Visits:
Each new faculty member will also be evaluated by the Department Chair, a full-time faculty member, and/or the Division Dean. The evaluator will contact the instructor and notify him or her of the visit. The evaluator will complete an evaluation form. After the visit, the evaluator will go over the form, ask if the instructor has any questions, and allow the instructor to respond to the evaluation in writing. The instructor will then sign and return the evaluation form. Additional classroom visits may be performed at the discretion of the Department Chair and Division Dean. The instructor will be notified of the visit in advance. The following is the most current form used to evaluate instructors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniform Supervisor Classroom Evaluation Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the following code: (1) agree (2) agree somewhat (3) disagree somewhat (4) disagree (5) not applicable or no opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 1. Presentation well organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 2. Speaks audibly and clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 3. Seems aware of classroom physical environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 4. Class time used well, including starting and stopping on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 5. Maintains a productive learning environment in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 6. Assignments specified clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 7. Explanations are clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 8. Uses well chosen examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 9. Periodically summarizes information given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 10. Keeps contact with class reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 11. Seeks to identify students' points of confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 12. Attempts to clarify points of confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 13. Is careful and precise in answering questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 14. Uses a variety of teaching techniques where applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 15. Encourages pertinent discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 16. Skillfully facilitates student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 17. Treats students with respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 18. Uses a variety of media where applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 19. Uses demonstrations effectively when applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 20. Presents facts and concepts from related fields when applicable or feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 21. The syllabus is well prepared and used in class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Observations and Comments:

Evaluator's signature/ Date
I have read this report and am aware that my signature does not necessarily indicate that I concur with the evaluation.

Instructor's signature/ Date
### Appendix A.3: Professional Development Awards, 2002-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albertini, Diane</td>
<td>668.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,497.00</td>
<td>1,498.00</td>
<td>623.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alger, Shanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,145.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Patti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplanalp. Karmen</td>
<td>1,535.00</td>
<td>553.00</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>4,263.00</td>
<td>905.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry, Brad</td>
<td>1,182.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,481.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, Clare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,842.00</td>
<td>1,411.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Sue</td>
<td>1,513.00</td>
<td>2,031.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>974.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biniaz, Darl</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>1,052.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,240.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakley, Glen</td>
<td>1,066.00</td>
<td>1,191.00</td>
<td>1,225.00</td>
<td>1,240.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythin, Barbara</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringhamurst, Kelly</td>
<td>1,475.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>1,561.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton, Terre</td>
<td>741.00</td>
<td>907.00</td>
<td>310.00</td>
<td>288.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bywater, Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell, Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Janet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750.40</td>
<td>2,164.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>428.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon, Virginia</td>
<td>1,448.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>902.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>535.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, Varlo</td>
<td>647.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Shirley</td>
<td>1,258.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,395.00</td>
<td>1,240.00</td>
<td>1,328.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker, Ross</td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
<td>704.00</td>
<td>1,451.00</td>
<td>1,068.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eicher, Tim</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,328.00</td>
<td>1,068.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertel, Susan</td>
<td>1,914.50</td>
<td>1,273.10</td>
<td>1,065.00</td>
<td>1,047.80</td>
<td>2,303.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans-D, Donna</td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
<td>1,318.00</td>
<td>1,460.00</td>
<td>1,925.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett, Addison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feller, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner, Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godwin, Douglas</td>
<td>1,220.00</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>1,347.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady, Carole</td>
<td>1,925.00</td>
<td>1,080.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,412.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Janet</td>
<td>439.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Brent</td>
<td>1,855.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>2,066.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Jerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Matt</td>
<td>952.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasfurther, Victor</td>
<td>832.00</td>
<td>1,302.00</td>
<td>1,060.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>790.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauck, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>666.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinton, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,978.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Lynn</td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
<td>1,136.00</td>
<td>1,475.00</td>
<td>1,425.00</td>
<td>1,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>970.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionita, Costel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>388.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jantzen, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine, Randell</td>
<td>590.00</td>
<td>300.14</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>987.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, Melvin</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>2,025.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>784.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
<td>Amount 4</td>
<td>Amount 5</td>
<td>Amount 6</td>
<td>Amount 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Demaree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolley, Gordon</td>
<td>2,823.00</td>
<td>1,420.00</td>
<td>1,084.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, John</td>
<td>1,136.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killeen, Michael</td>
<td>1,393.00</td>
<td>279.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koeven, Gary</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahrman, Matt</td>
<td>1,406.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen, Curtis</td>
<td>784.02</td>
<td>1,991.56</td>
<td>1,086.00</td>
<td>1,474.00</td>
<td>935.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Philip</td>
<td>273.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei, Li</td>
<td>1,170.00</td>
<td>804.00</td>
<td>1,366.00</td>
<td>1,375.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,590.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounsbury, John</td>
<td>1,517.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>714.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod, Chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMicken, Robert</td>
<td>890.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa, Candace</td>
<td>165.71</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Jayne</td>
<td>1,146.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Sarah</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortensen, Scott</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson, Diane</td>
<td>1,517.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nill, Dawn</td>
<td>1,255.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson, Del</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedersen, Eric</td>
<td>4,490.38</td>
<td>2,820.47</td>
<td>1,676.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Joe</td>
<td>165.71</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilkington, Ace</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prine, Shane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen, Kathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reber, Ed</td>
<td>1,222.00</td>
<td>2,306.00</td>
<td>1,237.00</td>
<td>1,146.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Linda</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>456.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Gordon</td>
<td>287.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>332.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabey, Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,620.00</td>
<td>1,725.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandberg, Sandra</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>395.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler, Carole</td>
<td>1,416.80</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,590.40</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,906.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouten, Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,347.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slade, Jay</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,770.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Lahrman, Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stander, Barton</td>
<td>4,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>351.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, Betty</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift, Phyllis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanValkenbury, Pete</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Curt</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>1,309.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>878.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Donald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,995.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Kyle</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler, Tracey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Lucille</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,246.54</td>
<td>1,814.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wignall, Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,246.54</td>
<td>1,814.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooland, Ron</td>
<td>2,306.47</td>
<td>1,078.50</td>
<td>1,598.04</td>
<td>4,082.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrede, Theda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,114.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Eric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A-4: Old Mission Statement, 2001

MISSION
Dixie State College of Utah, a publicly supported state college with two interdependent tiers, functions as a comprehensive community college while offering a limited number of quality baccalaureate programs.
Dixie State College of Utah helps students achieve their academic, career, and life goals, including goals related to basic skills, core content knowledge, and knowledge that broadens and enriches students' lives. The College's educational programs help students establish and expand their worldviews.

With a lower-division open-door admission policy, the College welcomes students both young and old who represent diverse educational, ethnic, national, and economic backgrounds. The College's students are predominantly residents of southwest Utah and other western regions, both in and out of Utah, and are predominantly of traditional college age.

A member of the Utah System of Higher Education, Dixie State College of Utah is assigned the task of providing and coordinating higher education for Washington and Kane counties.

GOALS
Dixie State College of Utah will provide —

1. Developmental Education that forms a foundation for success in either a work setting or lower-division coursework.
2. Lower-division Education that leads to career- or transfer-oriented associate degrees or baccalaureate degrees, at Dixie State College of Utah or elsewhere.
3. Upper-division Education as part of select baccalaureate programs, resulting in graduates who can effectively respond to local and state needs.
4. Applied Technology Education that meets training needs for students desiring certificates and/or Associate of Applied Science Degrees and for members of the community, business, and industry desiring job preparation, short-term or upgrade training.
5. Community Services and Continuing Education that responds to the needs of local communities, educational institutions, government and industry.
6. Student Support Services and Student Life that enhances students' individual growth and allegiance to the College and promotes student success, including assessment, advising, career counseling and library support.
Appendix A-5: New Mission Statement, June 2005

Dixie State College of Utah (DSC) strives to help students to define, shape and achieve educational and life goals. It is dedicated to providing personalized and excellent teaching in a learning environment where all students can become passionate about their individual educational endeavors.

**DSC is a publicly supported institution**—authorized by the Utah State Board of Regents—with two interdependent tiers. DSC offers associate degrees and certificate programs that meet the needs of students, the community and the state. The College also offers baccalaureate programs in high demand areas and in core or foundational areas consistent with four-year colleges. Dixie State College enhances its campus climate by promoting cultural and demographic diversity, and by inviting students to participate in its open-door, post-secondary educational programs.

**DSC is committed to quality general education and student success:**

DSC is committed to open enrollment and developing student learning capabilities. Lower-division courses are primarily open admission, while students must meet prerequisites for upper-division courses and programs.

Students will develop the skills and knowledge needed for the next phases in their lives, whether productive employment that contributes to society and economically sustains the student, further education at a transfer or graduate institution, or some other unique and personal aspiration. They will prepare to be life-long learners.

Graduates will be able to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve problems. Through exposure to the breadth of human knowledge and experience, they will investigate and enhance their world views to achieve a global perspective. They will make responsible and meaningful contributions to society, in part through service to others. Graduates will become citizen-scholars.

**DSC is a community college:**

DSC has an ongoing commitment to its community college role, which includes transfer education, career and technical education, customized training for employers, developmental education, and strong student services.

DSC also contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the community and the state. Local citizens and alumni will enjoy educational, economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities provided by DSC that enhance the community’s quality of life. They will feel ownership and pride in the College, sustaining it through donations and promoting it among their associations.

**DSC is a state college:**

DSC offers bachelor’s degree programs in selected high demand areas and in core or foundational areas consistent with its mission as a four-year institution. It also partners with other institutions in the Utah System of Higher Education in ensuring that quality graduate programs are available to Washington County residents.

DSC is committed to accountability and creativity in delivering quality higher educational opportunities within its service area. The College will be a cooperative and conscientious partner with other public and higher education institutions, responsibly using public funds to meet the state’s needs.
Dixie State College’s goals and values are:

Academic Rigor in a Challenging, Supportive Learning Environment
DSC focuses on quality teaching and learning, and will be resolute in maintaining high academic standards and rigorous expectations for faculty and students. DSC will also nurture student confidence, retention and success by attracting and retaining dedicated employees, and by maintaining small classes, academic freedom and quality service.

Access and Opportunity
DSC will invite members of the community with varying preparation for higher education, reaching out to under-represented populations, and meeting individuals’ needs with offerings ranging from developmental education to an honors program.

Diversity
DSC will promote diversity among its employees and student body to enrich the teaching and learning environment. DSC will provide diverse educational, economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Workforce and Economic Development
DSC will cooperate with the local community, region, and state to identify and meet the demands of business and industry. The college will provide leadership and support to economic development.

Sound Management and Responsible Stewardship
DSC will be accountable in its stewardship over public resources and students’ trust, using state, tuition, and donor resources to promote the College’s mission.
APPENDICES, PART B:

Appendix B.2.1: Inventory of Certificate and Degree Changes since 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Certificate/Degree</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phlebotomy</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Management</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT Intermediate Advanced</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST Satellite Academy*</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (collaborative)</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiography</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BSN</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; New Media</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA and BS</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Beginning Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Added (replaces emphasis in Business BS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Added (replaces Comm. &amp; New Media BS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Drafting</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Drafting</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Mechanic Technology</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Repair</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinishing</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-structural Repair</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Administration</td>
<td>AAS &amp; Certificate</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. 2.2: Strategic Academic Clusters

[Diagram of strategic academic clusters]

- Health Sciences: Nursing BS, Respiratory Therapy AAS, Medical Laboratory Technology AAS, Medical Radiologic Technology AAS, Medical Assisting BS, Dental Hygiene BS, Allied Health, Criminal Justice AS, RN/BSN BS, Allied Health AAS, Allied Health BS
- Core Degrees: Education BS, English BS, Biology BS, Mathematics BS, Social Sciences BS, Psychology BS, Physics BS, Chemistry BS, Early Childhood Education BS
- Integrated Studies: Business, Business BS, Business Management BS, Accounting BS, Aviation Management BS, Adult Studies
- Public Safety & 22% Student Response: Health Sciences, Business, Business BS, New Media BS, Communication BS, Health Care Management BS
- Business & Technology: Business BS, Business Management BS, Accounting BS, Aviation Management BS, Computer Science BS, New Media BS
- Education: Core Degrees & Education BS, Elementary Education BS, Secondary License BS, Art Education BS, Fine Arts BS, Adult Studies, A.S. Business

Small Solid Outlined Circles: Current Degrees
Small Solid Circles: Current Proposals
Rainbow Circles: Future Proposals
February 2007
Appendix B.2.3: Educational Program Responses to 2002 Evaluators’ Concerns

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM RESPONSES TO 2002 FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Elementary Education Program:

Evaluators’ Concern: "Make provision for the specialized elementary education advisor to have enough time to work with pre-education majors, upper division students, and seniors preparing for licensure, as well as to keep current on state requirements, forms, and to provide the documentation for each student needed to receive their level 1 certificate (Standard 2.D.10).”

Response: This recommendation was addressed by the recent creation of a new position and the subsequent hiring of an advisor/lecturer in the elementary education department. This is a non-tenure track full-time faculty member whose role is to advise all education students from freshman year to graduation, and to manage all details related to state licensure. In addition, the advisor/lecturer will teach the Introduction to Education (EDUC 1010) classes as a means of recruiting and supporting students interested in becoming teachers. The college filled the position with a highly qualified individual who holds two masters degrees in education with emphases in human relations and counseling, and with extensive experience in the public school system as a teacher, literacy specialist, principal, and district office administrator.

Humanities and Social Sciences:

Evaluators’ Concerns: Many of the smaller programs have no full-time faculty members (anthropology, criminal justice), or have only one full-time faculty member (sociology, foreign languages).

Response: This is still a concern. In some disciplines, the course offerings and/or student demand for courses do not justify hiring a full-time faculty member or increasing the number of current full-time faculty; however, as the college develops more baccalaureate degree programs, this will change. The college is closely monitoring staffing in these areas. As for some of the more high-demand disciplines, efforts are ongoing to correct deficiencies. As the cooperative efforts of the college and Southern Utah University implement the new BS in Criminal Justice, it is the humanities and social sciences department’s hope that some of this money will be used to hire a full-time faculty, by the fall of 2008. This faculty member would then teach classes, coordinate the CJ offerings, and advise students. In addition, a full-time faculty member in Spanish will join the DSC faculty beginning with the 2007 AY. This faculty member is a native speaker of Spanish with a Ph.D. Also, a new adjunct faculty member has been hired who also is a native speaker of Spanish and is well qualified academically. With these changes, new courses have been added to the curriculum, and others will be added in the future.

Evaluators’ Concern: A) Some programs need to further develop assessments and some programs lack assessment that is truly useful to faculty members. B) Faculty need the ability to track their transfer students’ successes at other institutions.

Response: A) All programs are working to refine existing assessment tools or develop new ones. All programs understand that assessment strategies must be in place if courses are to be offered. B) As for collecting data on transfer students, the Office of Institutional Advancement advises that they have no ability to collect such data because the system does not have a universal student identification for tracking from institution to institution. The college has brought the need to the attention of the Commissioner of Higher Education, and has urged that a system-wide database to track transfer students be an initiative.
History and Political Science:

Evaluators’ Concerns:  A) American History should be taught over two semesters instead of one. B) The program should offer more courses that enhance students’ global perspectives.

Response: A) The program recognizes that a two-semester American History change is important, but until a new faculty member can be hired, there is no flexibility to expand the course or to offer more courses in the curriculum. At such time as DSC offers a baccalaureate degree in history, teaching American History over two semesters will be the first change to the curriculum.  B) Over the last few years, some History 2990 (Seminar in History) classes have been offered to accommodate diversity issues, but with varying degrees of success. A few have had sufficient enrollment to carry the classes while others have been cancelled for low enrollment. Two new upper division courses in US History have been approved by the Curriculum Committee, and one will be taught each semester this coming year: History 3670, Slavery and the American Republic, and History 3730, The American Civil War and Reconstruction. Two new political science courses were approved so that DSC now offers the needed lower division courses for majors. These courses are POLS 2200 Introduction to Comparative Politics, and POLS 2300 Introduction to Political Theory. In addition, as part of a cooperative effort to provide social science composite secondary education licensure, upper division social sciences courses will be provided by Southern Utah University.

Sociology and Psychology:

Evaluators’ Concerns: A) There are some redundancies in courses offered in these two disciplines and courses offered in the Family and Consumer Sciences program. B) More courses in psychology should be offered to meet the high demand.

Response: A. The question was raised as to whether or not FCS 1500 should fill a Social Sciences GE requirement based on the assumption that the human development class taught in the Family and Consumer Science Department counted as a psychology equivalent. The evidence is that FCS 1500 counts as a general education filler in most of our sister institutions; therefore, counting it as a GE filler has a precedent. It should be noted that a Psychology Department would not need to count FCS 1500 as the equivalent to Psychology 1010 for majors. Furthermore, the same rationale holds for FCS 2400 and Sociology 1200 for majors.

B) Sufficient sections of Psychology 1010 have been added to meet the demands of students. In addition, PSYC 1100, Human Development, is taught on the main campus one semester and in the Hurricane Center the following to accommodate students. In addition, two upper division courses have been developed and are taught once each year: Psychology 3400, Abnormal Behavior, and Psychology 3410, Introduction to Social Psychology. Variations of these classes were taught as lower division classes, and as a result of the majors’ alignment meetings held at the state level, have now been made into upper division classes.

Developmental Education:

Evaluators’ Concerns: A) Infuse more reading instruction into other general education to reinforce the reading instruction in Developmental Education. B) Reinstate the Writing Center. C) Over-loading developmental education courses is “deleterious.” D) Review Standard 2.A.1 regarding staff teaching courses.

Response:  A.) The Developmental Studies reading faculty member, Jack Lounsbury, has presented a couple of workshops for faculty concerning reading techniques which could be incorporated into general education courses that require reading assignments. This has not been a formal process, and from year to
year, there is no consistency in scheduling these sessions as pre-service workshops in the fall. The Developmental Studies department would like to offer more formalized training in reading instruction for the faculty at large in a series of workshops and working sessions before the fall semester begins and maybe as on-going workshops. These could be held in conjunction with the instructional librarians as co-presenters.

In addition, Jack Lounsbury would like to prepare reading instruction materials (reading tips, textbook strategies, marking and highlighting suggestions, etc.) to be included in the faculty packet to be handed out at the beginning of the fall semester workshops or for use in the new Freshman Experience courses. The information will include handouts which the professors can reproduce for their students. He can also include discipline-specific tips and be available to consult with any interested faculty or students.

B) Although the Writing Center is under the supervision of the English Department, this comment appeared in the recommendations for the Developmental Education. Since the visit by the Accreditation team, the Writing Center has in fact been re-established and seems to have a healthy clientele and staff. The secretary for the Developmental Studies department has recently taken over the managerial work for the Center which allows the faculty supervisor more opportunity to work on curriculum and pedagogy with the tutors rather than time cards and pay dates.

C) The cryptic comment puzzles Developmental Studies faculty. If they are to assume that “overloading developmental education courses” means having too many students in individual sections of developmental math, reading, or composition, they would agree. They have looked to national organizations like NADE, NCTE, and AMMATYC for guidance concerning course limits. They agree that 24 students in a developmental composition course is about 5 to 8 students too many, yet there are not sufficient resources (both space and people) to offer more sections with fewer students in each. This is a goal to keep striving for. If they assume that “overloading developmental courses” means that the campus as a whole has too many developmental course offerings, there is not much that can be done about this as long as open-door admissions remains one of the keys of the college mission statement. The program does provide mandatory placement, yet students may challenge their placement scores in order to enroll in a higher-level course. Offering test preparation courses or reviews for students taking the CPT or ACT would help numerous students place more accurately into either developmental courses or college-level courses. The developmental of these review courses is a goal of the department. Additionally, in previous years, the course limits were set as follows: 25 in MATH 0900, 35 in MATH 0930, and 45 in higher-level math courses. Over the years, these course limits have disappeared. The Developmental Studies faculty would suggest they be reinstated.

D) Currently, the only classes taught by staff in the Developmental Studies Department are those student services courses like Student Ambassador Leadership, Student Government, and Re-Entry Forum. Developmental Studies recommends that these classes come under serious review concerning course objectives, assignments, and academic rigor. These classes receive academic credit and should reflect an academic environment. The staff who teach these courses are qualified for their respective campus positions. They further recommend that the instructors for these student-services courses should work in conjunction with the developmental studies department chair and faculty to re-examine their course content, assignments, and rigor, and to make adjustments where necessary.

Science and Mathematics:

Evaluators’ Concerns: Evaluators commended the math and sciences on their efforts at assessment, noting that the math department, in particular, “closed the loop.” They recommended a continuation of these efforts. They expressed a concern about whether peer review was taking place among the math and science faculty and suggested that they find an evaluation procedure that would work to promote teaching effectiveness. They further expressed concerns about the unpublished elimination of the lab component of science courses.
Response: Assessment continues but with a new instrument, the Value Added Skills Assessment (VASA). The math department hopes to administer the VASA as a pre-test in all Freshman Experience courses and in selected general education courses as a post-test. The means of doing so are being explored. All faculty members are participating in the required peer evaluation process as detailed in Part A; in addition, within the departments, veteran faculty members are assigned as mentors to new faculty and adjuncts, so each new or adjunct instructor has at least one senior faculty advisor/consultant. This practice has been in place for three years and the results are satisfactory. The lab as a component of the non-majors science course, Biology 1010, has been reinstated, but will not be implemented until Spring 2008 when a new catalogue comes out.

Health Sciences:

Evaluators' Concern: Evaluators urged a review of the surgical technician curriculum and implementing changes to include coursework in human relations and computation.

Response: Since the 2002 evaluation, the surgical tech curriculum has been enhanced to meet the specialized accreditation requirements of the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) and the Accreditation Review Committee on Education in Surgical Technology (ARC-ST). The program was fully accredited in 2005, the only such program in the nation to be accredited with only part-time faculty. In its SURG 1050 course, the program addresses special populations, cultural diversity and recognition of psycho-social needs and cultural influences on patients. In addition to a prerequisite of MATH 1010 for all students, first semester curriculum includes work in basic calculations as part of its pharmacology coursework.

English and Literature:

Evaluators' Concerns: Evaluators commented on three areas of concern: A) Assessment and the Critical Literacy Skills Test (CLST); B) the ratio of full time to adjunct faculty teaching composition; and C) the limited number of non-western authors represented in the literature curriculum.

Response: A) Since the 2002 accreditation report, DSC's English Department has made significant improvements, specifically addressing the areas of concern in the report. They revamped the standardized syllabi in freshman composition, making the writing requirements more specific to encourage consistency and continuity among various faculty members. They continuously work to improve instruction in proofreading, editing, and source integration; for example, they now require a five-page research paper in 1010 and a ten-page research paper in 2010. In addition, they have added a one-hour library skills class as a co-requisite with 1010, as described above. They are confident that more practice with proofreading, editing, and source integration will help students overcome the deficiencies revealed by assessment using the CLST.

Furthermore, the placement process seems to be working well. The students who complete developmental English are usually well prepared for 1010; likewise, students who complete 1010 and the companion library skills class have the competencies necessary to succeed in the 2010 research class. Because more classes are being taught by full-time, tenure-track faculty, grade inflation should decline, and the department is tracking grades. As recommended by the accreditation team, the faculty continues to revise and improve the CLST, and is still evaluating effectiveness by way of pre-tests and post-tests in both English 1010 and 2010.

B) One major concern from the 2002 study was the fact that eleven full-time and thirty adjuncts were teaching the composition courses; the accreditation team was concerned that such reliance on adjunct instruction may have deteriorated the quality of writing instruction. Because of administrative support, the department has added more full-time faculty and reduced dependency on part-time faculty. The ratio is now
much improved, and is closer to thirteen full-time and thirteen adjuncts teaching the composition courses. Part of this improvement is due to a new departmental commitment to having full-time instructors teach a three-composition-per-one-literature assignment each semester. For example, in Spring 2007, they offered twenty-two sections of ENG 1010; only nine were taught by adjuncts. They had twenty-eight sections of ENG 2010 with only four taught by adjuncts. In other words, almost 75% of freshman composition classes were taught by full-time, tenure-track faculty members.

C) The faculty has also revamped the requirements for literature classes and organized the literary offerings to reflect the new mission as a 4-year program. For instance, they streamlined the lower-division offerings and now have twelve 2000-level literature courses instead of twenty. Furthermore, they created nine 3000-level courses and added a senior capstone. All literature classes take a pre-test/post-test for assessment purposes. Ten questions are identical for all classes; ten questions are specific to the individual class. In response to the accreditation team’s suggestion, the instructors of the three World Lit classes are encouraged to focus on non-Western literature.

Finally, the program has developed a two-part departmental leadership structure with an overall Department Chair and a Director of Composition. Consequently, the Director can focus on English 1010 and 2010 issues, thus freeing the Chair to attend to all other matters tied to literature and the baccalaureate program.

Fine Arts:

Evaluators’ Concerns: 1) Evaluators noted that faculty members were teaching far too many courses per year. 2) A second concern involved assessment. Evaluators noted that assessment was not well-designed and meaningful and that faculty members were not invested in the assessment process. 3) Finally, the evaluators recommended that the Theater program design, seek approval and implement a series of technical theatre courses since they were listed in the catalogue but not offered.

Response: Since the 2002, significant progress has been made in the Fine Arts Department in addressing many of the challenges noted in our accreditation report. Positive steps have been taken to improve factors related to faculty workload, program funding, assessment, and technical theatre offerings. In July of 2007, Communication, previously included in Fine Arts, became an independent department. This organizational change promises more attentive management for both areas.

1) The report noted that some fine arts faculty members were teaching as much as 42 credits in a two semester academic year. Thanks to new administration policies, full-time faculty no longer teach more than 33 credits a year. This has enabled faculty members to work more effectively and avoid burn-out. The limits on teaching, coupled with aggressive faculty salary increases produced immediate benefits in morale. The full benefits of the new workload policies are yet to be measured in terms of impact on program quality.

The Fine Arts program has been able to secure the services of highly qualified adjuncts in most fine arts areas to absorb the workload dropped by full-time faculty and to facilitate program growth. In Dance, however, it has been difficult to find degree-qualified adjuncts, and an additional full-time faculty member is an urgent need in that program.

Securing adequate funding for program activities remains a priority. In an unusual line-item move, the 2007 Utah State Legislature provided funds for bachelor’s degrees in Music and Theatre at DSC. That infusion of funds promises to make a major difference in the quality of student experience in those programs. The funding windfall has allowed for the hiring of three additional faculty members in both Music and Theatre. Those new faculty members report to campus in fall of 2007. The State Board of Regents has yet to approve the new degrees, but the proposals are moving through the required process, and approval is expected in the very near future.
Budget requirements for four-year programs are obviously significant compared to the two-year programs currently in place. Even with the generosity of the state legislature, the overall budget picture will still require very careful management of resources. There has been no infusion of funds for art and dance programs, and there is urgent need for additional resources to support excellence in those programs.

2) Fine arts faculty are becoming more proficient and sophisticated in course assessment techniques. There is stronger commitment to effective assessment and clearer understanding of ways to demonstrate value added. Pre- and post-tests, portfolios, and other tools are much more commonly used now than five years ago. Major work has gone into developing an assessment tool for fine arts general education courses. Dissatisfaction with the tool they developed several years ago is positive evidence of increased skill in assessment. There is still work to be done in establishing effective assessment tools for every course in the curriculum.

3) The projected bachelor’s degree in theatre will include both the curriculum and the faculty resources to meet the need for a well-developed technical theatre program. The current two-year program is still deficient in this area. Although new lower division technical theatre courses have been added to the curriculum, faculty resources in that area have actually decreased, due to increased administrative duties for the current technical theatre faculty member. Two of the three new faculty members coming on board in connection with the hoped-for bachelor’s degree will have exclusive responsibilities in technical theatre.

In summary, workloads for faculty members have improved significantly. Assessment is improving, but needs ongoing attention. Funding for bachelor’s degrees in Music and Theatre promises major positive developments in those programs, including technical theatre. Faculty and administrators hope that Art and Dance will soon see the kind of funding support and program development now being implemented in Music and Theatre.

**Business**

Evaluators' Concerns: Evaluators recommended that business faculty members should review current library holdings and their procedures for recommendation of acquisitions, to assure the adequacy, in depth and relevance of the print collection.

Response: The business faculty meet with a representative from the library annually (every fall semester) and review all current library holdings in their area, both print and electronic. These holdings are evaluated for their adequacy, depth, and relevance to the business program and students. Faculty are then encouraged to update or expand these holdings as needed. This has been the process used for several years and plans are to continue the process.

As for significant changes in the business program since 2002, highlights are:

- Accounting emphasis for BS in Business Administration approved in 2002
- Hired a full time Finance Professor in 2006
- Created the Udvar-Hazy Institute for Business Integrity in 2006 and began holding forums for DSC and the community.
- Expanded the Accounting Faculty and curriculum in 2006 and now offer all the accounting courses necessary for a Bachelor's degree in Accounting
- Have applied for permission to award BS in Accounting; approval is pending.
- Added the Army ROTC program housed within the management department on campus in 2007.
- Completed a minor re-organization of the business department and now have an associate dean.
Computer and Information Technology:

Evaluators' Concerns: The 2002 evaluators advised that the program review and revise as needed its curriculum, assessments and faculty workloads. It also recommended that new faculty be involved in departmental discussions.

Response: Mission Congruence: The college created a new mission statement in 2005 and the CIT program finds that its own mission is in agreement with the college mission statement in its key aspects: The program is committed to academic rigor in a challenging supportive learning environment; the program is open access at the introductory level, through enrollment in the introductory courses; the faculty are in contact with the local employers, and monitor regional, state, and national needs in the industry to assure proper preparation of graduates.

Assessment: Program assessment is conducted through the evaluation of senior projects each student is required to complete before graduation, and through periodic interviews with previous graduates and their employers.

Faculty Workloads: The college’s workload model now eliminates the need for faculty to teach five separate preparations, a practice that was common in the CIT program. Provisions have been made to allow faculty to participate in recruitment activities, mentor discipline specific clubs, and administer the degree program without causing excessive workloads.

New Faculty Involvement: All CIT faculty meet frequently as a group to discuss matters of the program. All faculty are encouraged to participate in the discussions.
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