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DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
Zion Room, Jeffrey R. Holland Centennial Commons
Friday, September 11, 2015

MEETING SCHEDULE
CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION (Trustees Only) – 8:00 a.m.
OPEN GENERAL SESSION (All Meeting Attendees) – 9:00 a.m.
TOUR OF CAMPUS IMPROVEMENTS (Trustees Only) – 11:00 a.m.
LUNCHEON/PRESENTATIONS (Trustees and Invited Guests Only) – 12:00 p.m.

AGENDA

*[Document Linked]*

I. CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION [8:00 to 9:00 AM]

II. GENERAL SESSION [9:00 to 11:00 AM] – WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS (Chair Christina J. Durham)

A. Welcome to the Following new DSU Employees:
   ▪ Cindy L. Cole, JD – Title IX Clery Act Compliance Director
   ▪ Dr. Richard Featherstone – Dean of the School of Humanities
   ▪ Dr. Carole Grady – Interim Provost
   ▪ Travis Rosenberg – Executive Director of Human Resources
   ▪ Courtney R. White, JD – Assistant to the President for Special Projects
   ▪ Patricia Wintch – Interim Dean of the School of Health Sciences

B. Welcome Gregory Soderberg, JD – Assistant Utah Attorney General

C. Welcome Kelle Stephens – President of the Dixie Applied Technology College

D. Welcome Representatives of the Press and Other Visitors

III. SWEARING IN OF NEW TRUSTEE, MATTHEW M. DEVORE (Chair Durham)

IV. PRESENTATIONS

A. *Accreditation Mid-Cycle Review Update [includes the 2014-2015 DSU Core Themes Results Report] (Dr. Debra Bryant)

B. *Academic Programs Research Committee Findings (Dr. David Wade)

V. REPORTS

A. DSU Student Association (Matt Devore)

B. Faculty Senate (Dr. Erin O’Brien)

C. Classified Staff Association (Deborah Millet)

D. Exempt Staff Association (Andrea Brown)

E. Athletics (Jason Boothe)

F. University Advancement/Alumni [includes the *Donation Report] (Brad Last)

G. Presidents Report (President Williams)
VI. BOARD OF TRUSTEES COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Audit Committee – David Clark/Elisabeth Bingham/Hal Hiatt
B. Finance/Investment Committee – Jon Pike/David Clark/Thomas Wright
C. Government Affairs Committee – Thomas Wright/Hal Hiatt/Jon Pike
D. Academic Programs Committee – Larry Bergeson/Julie Beck/Matt Devore/Chris Durham/Gail Smith
E. Policy Committee – Chris Durham/Julie Beck/Gail Smith
F. DXATC Board Liaison – Jon Pike
G. National Advisory Council (NAC) Representatives – Elisabeth Bingham/Chris Durham/Gail Smith

VII. ACTION ITEMS (Chair Durham)

A. Approval of Minutes (Chair Durham)
   - *Friday, April 30, 2015

B. Administrative Affairs
   - *Investment Report (Scott Talbot/Cheri Capps)

C. Attorney General’s Office Items
   - *DSU Policy 110 – Speech Policy (Greg Soderberg, JD, Assistant Utah Attorney General)

D. DSU Policy Office (Courtney White/Sylvia Bradshaw)
   - *DSU Policy 101: Policy Process
   - *Request to Retire DSU Policy 3-36: Faculty Staffing Advisory Committee [Note: This is not an action item] (Carole Grady)

E. Human Resources (Travis Rosenberg)
   - *Early Retirement Requests:
     - Karl Hutchings
     - Barbara Johnson
     - Dana Kelvington

F. University (President Williams/Courtney White)
   - *Strategic Plan – Dixie 2020 (Status to Stature)

VIII. TRUSTEES’ SIGNING OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS; NOTARIZED BY KALYNN LARSON (Chair Durham)

IX. CAMPUS IMPROVEMENT TOUR [Trustees Only] (Approximately 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)

X. LUNCHEON BY INVITATION – SERVED IN THE ZION ROOM (Approximately 12:00 p.m.)
   - Presentations:
     - DSUSA: Goals, Plans and Strategies 2015-2016 (Matt Devore and Executive Council)
     - Faculty Senate: Goals, Plans and Strategies 2015-2016 (Dr. Erin O’Brien, Dr. Nancy Hauck and Faculty Senate Group)
XI. NEXT BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING – FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015

XII. UPCOMING BOARD OF TRUSTEES DINNER AND MEETING DATES FOR 2015-2016

- Thursday, September 10, 2015 – 6PM Football Game vs. Central Washington University
- Friday, September 11, 2015 – 8AM Board Meeting in the Zion Room
- Thursday, November 5, 2015 – 6PM Board Dinner at the Williams’ Home
- Friday, November 6, 2015 – 8AM Board Meeting in the Zion Room
- Thursday, January 28, 2016 – 6PM Board Dinner at the Williams’ Home
- Friday, January 29, 2016 – 8AM Board Meeting in the Zion Room
- Thursday, March 17, 2016 – 6PM Board Dinner at the Williams’ Home
- Friday, March 18, 2016 – Board Meeting in the Zion Room
- Thursday, April 28, 2016 – Board Dinner at the Williams’ Home
- Friday, April 29, 2016 – Board Meeting in the Zion Room

XIII. CALENDAR OF UPCOMING MEETINGS AND EVENTS

- **DOCUTAH Documentary Film Festival** – Tuesday through Saturday, September 8-12, 2015
- **Board of Trustees Meeting** – Friday, September 11 @ 8AM, Zion Room
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Thursday and Friday, September 18-19 @ Utah State University
- **World Congress on Families St. George Reception** – Friday, September 18 @ 6PM, Zion Room
- **Homecoming Week** – Monday through Saturday, September 21-26, 2015
  - Monday, September 21 – **Classic Car Show and Waffle Supper** @ 6PM, Alumni House
  - Tuesday, September 22 – **Miss Dixie Pageant** @ 7:30PM, Cox Auditorium
  - Wednesday, September 23 – **Drive-In Movie** @ Ridge Top Complex-620 S. Airport Road
  - Thursday, September 24 – **Mega Prizes Bingo** @ 7:30PM, Gardner Center Ballroom
  - Friday, September 25 – **Alumni Assembly** @ 10AM, Eccles Concert Hall
  - Friday, September 25 – **50-Year Club Reunion** @ 12PM, Alumni House
  - Friday, September 25 – **Alumni Banquet** @ 6PM, Gardner Center Ballroom
  - Friday, September 25 – **Rebel 5K** @ 11:59PM, Hansen Stadium
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Homecoming Parade** @ 10AM, 700 E. to Main St. on Tabernacle
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Founders’ Day Assembly/Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony** @ 11:30AM, St. George Tabernacle
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Rebelette Reunion** @ 2PM, Zion Room
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Homecoming Tailgate Party** @ 3:45PM, Alumni House
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Homecoming Football Game** @ 6PM, Hansen Stadium
  - Saturday, September 26 – **Homecoming Dance** @ 9PM, Gardner Center Ballroom
  - Saturday, September 26 – **True Rebel Night** @ 11:59PM, the Fountain
- **Nursing Accreditation Site Visit** – September 22-24, 2015
- **Strategic Plan Kick-off** – Wednesday, September 23 @ 12PM, Cox Auditorium
- **National Advisory Council Meeting** – Thursday, September 24 @ 8AM, Zion Room
- **Athletic Excellence Silent Auction and Dinner** – Thursday, October 1 @ 5PM, Burns Concourse
- **Athletic Excellence Golf Tournament** – Friday, October 2 @ 8AM, The Ledges Golf Course
- **St. George Marathon** – Saturday morning, October 3, 2015
- **Huntsman World Senior Games** – October 5-17, 2015
- **Arizona Alumni Chapter Event** – Thursday and Friday, October 8-9, 2015
- **NAACLS Accreditation Site Visit** – Thursday and Friday, October 15-16, 2015
- **Fall Break** – Thursday and Friday, October 15-16, 2015
- **NWCCU Accreditation Site Visit** – Monday and Tuesday, October 19-20, 2015
- **Halloween** – Saturday, October 31, 2015
- **Board of Trustees Dinner** – Thursday, November 5 @ 6PM, Williams’ Home
- **Board of Trustees Meeting** – Friday, November 6, 2015 @ 8AM, Zion Room
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Thursday and Friday, November 13-14 @ Weber State University
- **Northern Utah Alumni Chapter Event** – Saturday Evening, November 15 @ The Gathering Place at Gardner Village in SLC
- **Thanksgiving Break** – Thursday and Friday, November 26-27, 2015
- **Final Exams** – Monday through Friday, December 14-18, 2015
- **Semester Break** – Monday, December 21, 2015 through Friday, January 8, 2016
- **Spring Semester Begins** – Monday, January 11, 2016
- **Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday** – Monday, January 18, 2016
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Friday, January 22 @ University of Utah
- **Board of Trustees Dinner** – Thursday, January 28 @ 6PM, Williams’ Home
- **Board of Trustees Meeting** – Friday, January 29 @ Zion Room
- **Valentine’s Day** – Sunday, February 14, 2016
- **Presidents’ Day Holiday** – Monday, February 15, 2016
- **USHE Legislative Luncheon** – Friday, February 19 @ 12PM, State Capitol
- **National Advisory Council Meeting** – Friday, February 26 @ 8AM, Zion Room
- **Fire & Ice Dinner & Gala** – Friday, February 26 @ 5:30PM, SunRiver Clubhouse
- **Spring Break** – March 7-11, 2016
- **Board of Trustees Dinner** – Thursday, March 17 @ 6PM, Williams’ Home
- **Board of Trustees Meeting** – Friday, March 18 @ 8AM, Zion Room
- **Easter Sunday** – March 27, 2016
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Friday, April 1 @ DSU
- **D-Week** – Monday through Saturday, April 11-16, 2016
- **Last Day of Class** – Wednesday, April 27, 2016
- **Board of Trustees Dinner** – Thursday, April 28 @ 6PM, Williams’ Home
- **Board of Trustees Meeting** – Friday, April 29 @ Zion Room
- **Final Exams** – Friday, April 29 through Thursday, May 5, 2016
- **Final Exams** – April 29 through May 5, 2016
- **Commencement Day** – Friday, May 6, 2016
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Friday, May 20 @ Snow College

XIV. **MEETING ADJOURNED**
DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY

MID-CYCLE
SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2, 2015
Compiled by Debra Bryant, Accreditation Liaison Officer
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DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

Dixie State University (DSU) is a publicly funded, open-admission, state university, governed by the Utah State Board of Regents and a governor-appointed Board of Trustees. In 2011, DSU marked its 100th anniversary of service. Though starting as a private church academy, the institution transitioned to a public community college, then to a baccalaureate college and in 2013, gained university status. DSU is Carnegie classified under “baccalaureate colleges and universities.” According to Regent policy, DSU is responsible for providing training and educational programs through a continuum of opportunities that includes certificates, associate and baccalaureate degrees, and continuing education responsive to its economic region. In the near future, DSU plans to also offer master’s degree programs, dependent on Regent and NWCCU approval.

The University is located in St. George, a city of just over 65,000 people, situated in the high desert, southwest corner of Utah. It is 120 miles north of Las Vegas, Nevada, and about seven miles from the Arizona state border. The region and DSU have experienced rapid population growth over the past ten years, except for a slight decline in enrollment after the recession. Fall 2015 enrollment is expected to be flat, with student headcount approaching 8,300 students.

While change and growth are facts of life for the institution, other essential hallmarks of DSU have also endured for a century. Most notable among those hallmarks are: a commitment to student-centered education; maintenance of a strong relationship with the community; and the desire to instill in its students values that strengthen citizenship.

Changes in Leadership: Summer of 2014, President Richard B. Williams became the eighteenth DSU president. As is common with the initiation of a president, the institution is taking a fresh look at itself and its future. Aggressive strategic planning is underway as DSU begins its second century. Though the mission and core themes defining the purposes of the institution are in the process of being modified, those identified in 2009/10 still capture its fundamental essence.

DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT
(Revised with university status attainment and approved by the Board of Regents May 17, 2013)

Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.

Core Theme 1 A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

Core Theme 2 A Culture of Values
Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.
Core Theme 3: A Culture of Community
Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and the community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.

PART I: Overview of Dixie State University’s Institutional Assessment Process

Dixie State University’s (DSU) Northwest Commission on Colleges and University’s (NWCCU) accreditation was reaffirmed after its Comprehensive Self-study and Site Visit in 2012. In 2013, DSU’s Year One Report was also approved for reaffirmation. The date of the current seven-year cycle’s comprehensive self-study and site visit has been extended to the Fall of 2020. The following is a Mid-cycle Evaluation (MCE) self-study report intended to demonstrate DSU’s readiness to provide evidence of mission fulfillment and sustainability in the Comprehensive Self-study. To see DSU’s NWCCU accreditation documents go to http://dixie.edu/accreditation/.

Many changes have taken place and continue to take place across DSU to improve student learning and the institution’s assessment of mission fulfillment as a system. Assessment is a continual process towards improvement: each member of the campus community—which includes faculty, staff, administration, trustees and students—are to contribute to mission fulfillment and continuous improvement. Because student learning is the main focus of mission fulfillment, this report will emphasize that aspect of assessment. The assessment system illustrated below represents how the DSU community works together to improve and assess mission fulfillment: Figure 1 shows the general process of using department or program data to determine outcome achievement, which can lead to improvements; Figure 2 shows how data regarding student learning flows into decisions throughout DSU, assessing mission fulfillment.

![Departmental/Program Assessment Model](image-url)

*Figure 1*
Some parties involved in the formal processes in academic institutional assessment at Dixie State University include:

- Those who conduct classroom assessment, such as faculty and department members. Note: classroom assessment occurs in individual classes, but it is not currently systematically reported at the institutional level at DSU.
- Those who collect student artifacts from randomly selected courses to assess at the program level. They assess program learning outcomes, act on their data for improvement, keep records, and report for accreditation and program review purposes. Individuals involved include faculty, assessment coordinators, and chairs/program directors.
- Those who conduct General Education Assessment. They use student artifacts randomly selected from GE courses to assess GE learning outcomes, act on their data for improvements, keep records, and report for accreditation purposes. These include those on the G.E. and G.E. Assessment Committees. Their findings inform key stakeholders such as faculty members from multiple disciplines and administration.
- Those who conduct institutional assessment. They include those on the Institutional Strategic Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC), who assist in adhering to NWCCCU policies and procedures by aggregating and analyzing data from all sources, generating reports, and recommending actions (closing-the-loop). Student support staff
also gather data which provide indirect measures of students learning, such as engagement and satisfaction.

- Those stakeholders who make institution-level decisions, such as the President, Trustees, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Deans, and the Faculty Senate. Findings and recommended action plans from program and institutional assessment processes are reported to decision making stakeholders. These stakeholders are key to the process because they can have significant impact on how the loop is closed.

Assessment is not only about data collection, but more importantly, it includes answering questions stakeholders care about. Data collection is important, but the processes only become meaningful when the results and information from those data are in the right hands and used to inform decisions made to improve the institution. Every entity who conducts assessment processes is looking for meaningful information, and should inform each other of their findings to make assessment processes more efficient and results from data available to more participants in the system. This process of information dissemination for use and improvement throughout the institution should include all relevant stakeholders.

**Taskstream**

As of Fall 2014, Dixie State University has utilized Taskstream, an assessment management software system, to streamline the assessment processes that occur throughout the institution. “Taskstream supports strategic assessment planning, data collection, action planning, curriculum mapping, reporting and analytics to create a coordinated and robust assessment system” (Taskstream.com). Faculty, staff and administration have begun to use Taskstream to record, document, report, coordinate, and plan assessment activities. This system allows users to store documents, define and align learning and department outcomes with department and organizational goals, and create outcomes-based assessment plans. The system includes rubrics in which assessment coordinators from each program receive regular feedback from the Director of Academic Assessment (see Appendix A: Program Assessment Report Rubric worksheet). Due to the relative newness of Taskstream to the institution, there has been the typical learning curve for implementation.

**General Education Assessment**

A weakness identified by the 2012 NWCCU comprehensive self-study peer evaluators was the lack of a cohesive assessment plan for General Education, including integrated goals and learning outcomes across fields. Dixie State University’s academic division immediately intensified its attention on General Education assessment with significant results. The General Education Committee spawned a General Education Assessment Committee to assist in improving the General Education program. Results from General Education Assessment can inform improvements in GE classes, program requirements, or outcomes. GE committees learn from prior assessment experiences to improve upon their assessment processes, and inform programs, administration, and faculty of their findings. Courses in the GE program are evaluated based on Area Course Criteria and by General Education Program Learning Outcomes. Currently, the two committees are working towards mapping and aligning the area course criteria and the GE PLOs in order to improve the assessment and accuracy of the goals of the program.
Each year, the GE Assessment committee chooses one to two General Education learning goals (Critical Thinking, Effective Communication, Quantitative Reasoning) to evaluate. Each of these goals are assessed by selecting those G.E. courses that identify the goal as a G.E. Program learning outcome. Next, the committee contacts instructors of those courses and requests student artifacts from which raters can evaluate how well students attained these goals and thus make an assessment about how well DSU students are doing at each of these goals. The committee decided to adopt rubrics researched and published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that align to the DSU GE learning goals. When the AAC&U rubrics are used to assess the GE learning outcomes, the committee calibrates raters and oversees faculty reads to score the student artifacts. After the student artifacts are scored, the committee analyzes the data and presents the findings to the GE committee, those from whom they collected the data, and other decision-making stakeholders (see Figure 2). Results are also uploaded onto the General Education program’s workspace on Taskstream.

Program Assessment
Results from Program assessment can inform improvements for practices within the program and future assessments of that program. Results from findings are communicated to stakeholders such as faculty, General Education committees, administration and Faculty Senate. A new assessment cycle is initiated each academic year for each DSU degree program. Figure 3 shows a timeline of this process.

![Assessment of Student Learning at the Program Level – Annual Timeline](image)

Figure 3

The Office of Academic Assessment, established in Fall 2012, has made significant advances in educating the campus community about proper program assessment through individual and departmental consultations. This office has also been providing training and information about program assessment and the process. In addition, the Director of Academic Assessment has been facilitating intra-program communication and planning for program assessment during a week of
in-service training prior to the beginning of classes each Fall. The goal of these trainings and meetings is to have faculty from within respective academic programs take time before the beginning of a new academic year to review the findings from prior assessment cycles and plan their assessment process for the current academic year. Resources are made available on the Academic Assessment website to support the in-service training sessions (see website: http://dixie.edu/academics/quick_reference_guide.php). Note: The Director of Academic Assessment left DSU in August 2015 and a search for a replacement has begun.

In addition to internal academic program assessment, the Utah Board of Regents conducts an assessment of each program every five years, as well as an evaluation three years after the start of a new program. These evaluations are based on a self-study completed by the department following a Regent template which is similar to the NWCCU’s template for defining a new program for substantive change approval. An external evaluator is also consulted. It is the goal of the Institutional Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC) coordinators to have all assessments follow similar templates so that reports generated by Taskstream will suffice for institutional annual reports, accreditation reports and Regent reports.

As part of this assessment effort and in order to streamline the workload, each academic program has been assigned an assessment coordinator from among their faculty. Additionally, assessment coordinator leads have been assigned to each school, and are also assessment coordinators in their own departments. Coordinators report to these coordinator leads who sit on the university assessment committee. The leads report to the Director of Academic Assessment, primarily through the university assessment committee. Assessment coordinators set up and schedule assessment activities within departments and programs and then ensure that schedules are followed. Coordinators also facilitate assessment readings and reporting within given departments or programs.

Once data has been collected and analyzed for a given assessment cycle, it is the job of the coordinators to present the findings to the faculty within their department or program, get consensus on a plan for improvement, and input appropriate information into Taskstream. Within Taskstream, the coordinators should generate all appropriate reports, including department/program action plans for improvement. These reports and action plans are reviewed annually by the assessment coordinator/lead and the dean in the appropriate school (see worksheets of their Taskstream reporting template: http://dixie.edu/academics/program_assessment_of_student_learning.php or Appendices B, C, and D, the Program Assessment Report Forms (PAR) A, B, and C). In addition, assessment coordinator leads are responsible for organizing and facilitating department or program assessment training during the annual pre-semester faculty in-service meetings. During the summer, assessment coordinator leads and the assessment committee also plan fall training workshops for the faculty at large.

Annual Program Assessment Reports

Assessment Coordinator
During each year, the assessment coordinator, in collaboration with faculty and the department chair, assess student learning, decide on a plan of action to improve student learning, and report
the results (Reports A, B & C). Reporting involves the assessment coordinators inputting and/or updating components of their program’s Taskstream workspace by the deadlines set below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report A – Program Learning Outcomes, Core Theme Alignment, and 5-Year Plan</td>
<td>September 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report B – Curriculum Map</td>
<td>October 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report C – Assessment Results and Action Plan</td>
<td>March 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report D – Chair’s/Program Director’s Assessment Results and Recommendation Report</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair / Program Director
Department Chairs and/or Program Directors are also heavily involved in the annual assessment process. The Assessment Results and Action Plan report (Report C) are reviewed by the Chair/Program Director. The Chair/Program Directors share their findings with their respective Deans, archives the report, and uses cumulative annual reports to conduct their periodic 5-year program reviews. (The form for Report D can be found in Appendix E.)

Dean
The Dean is responsible for reviewing the results and recommendations of the various programs in his/her school. Results from program assessment assist Deans in completing institutional annual reports and in running and improving their school. (See Appendix F for the Dean’s Annual Report Template)

Non-Academic Support Departments

All departments, whether academic or support, participate in the assessment process. As the Director of Academic Assessment assists academic programs to strengthen their assessment processes, so the Director of Institutional Research and the Accreditation Liaison Officer help the support programs and the institution as a whole to develop and improve their assessment. Useful data gathering processes and reports very similar to those used in academic assessment are developed by support departments. The assessment they conduct is relative to their sustaining DSU’s mission fulfillment and their own departments’ missions and goals. Support departments were trained during spring and summer of 2015 to develop and use better and more standardized data to assess mission and goal fulfillment. They have also been trained to analyze data using a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) approach to achieve an informed perspective on their departments’ services. In the spring and summer of 2015, support programs also received trainings on and began to use Taskstream (see training worksheets: http://dixie.edu/academics/File/assessment/Worksheets%20for%20Support%20Department%20Assessment%20Training.pdf).

Institutional Assessment

In 2012, a new standing committee was formed, the Institutional Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC). ISAAC, with representatives from across academic and support divisions and from student, staff and faculty associations, is a voice of institutional assessment and accreditation to the campus. The committee also supervises accreditation and institutional
assessment practices and makes recommendations to their colleagues and the administration. At its inception, ISAAC reviewed and revised the institutional mission and initially established core themes, indicators, measures and benchmarks, delivered them to their divisions for discussion, and recommended the current version. For the academic year 2013-14, ISAAC’s main work was to improve benchmarks as recommended by the Year One Report evaluators. In 2014 and 2015, the committee’s responsibility was to divide into workgroups to find or create and pilot valid surveys for gathering some of the much needed data identified as indicators of outcome accomplishment. Members of the administration and ISAAC also worked on the first institutional set of recommendations (closing-the-loop) based on DSU core theme indicator data. (See Appendix G for the 2014-15 mission statement, core themes, institutional objectives, measures, rationale and benchmarks. The 2014-15 institutional assessment findings and recommendations report, based on DSU core theme indicator data, is found at https://dixie.edu/accreditation/File/Institutional%20Core%20Theme%20Assessment%20Report%202014-2015.docx)

To answer the question of whether the core themes and objectives revised in 2013 are still valid, there would have to be a conditional “yes.” In order to change with presidents and progress, core themes and mission statements will always need to be adapted. However, if they fundamentally define the institution, they will be, to some degree, also stable over time.

President Williams, a strategic planning consultant, a newly established strategic planning committee, and several town hall meetings of stakeholders resulted in revised values statements, a vision statement, minor changes to the core themes, and a proposed mission statement revision for Dixie State University in 2015-16. ISAAC will be working on revising the core theme indicators and measures accordingly. These changes are to be approved by the University Council and the DSU Board of Trustees. The new mission statement will be sent to the Board of Regents for approval in early Fall 2015.

**Proposed 2015 Mission Statement and Core Theme Revisions**

Dixie State University is a public comprehensive university, dedicated to rigorous learning and the enrichment of the professional and personal lives of its students and community by providing opportunities that engage the unique Southern Utah environment and resources.

The mission of Dixie State University is captured in three overarching themes that guide its long term direction and day-to-day activities and decisions:

**Core Themes (L.E.O.):**

**Learning:** DSU promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve and exceed their educational goals.

**Engagement:** DSU maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff, and the community to foster citizenship, a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment, and economic and civic growth.
**Opportunity:** DSU values the professional and personal development of individuals and facilitates a culture of collaboration, creativity, inclusion, ethics, and service.

Expanded strategic planning workgroups have been identified and begun developing plans for implementing the six strategic goals identified by the institution and its stakeholders Spring 2015. To see DSU Strategic Planning documents go to [http://dixie.edu/strategicplanning/](http://dixie.edu/strategicplanning/). A task for ISAAC in 2015-16 will be to revisit the core themes assessment plan and revise the objectives, outcomes, indicators, measures and benchmarks and tie the strategic plan as closely to the core themes as possible. President Williams is reestablishing the practice of a campus-wide annual report. DSU has not completed a campus-wide annual report since 2012, when one was created for the NWCCU Comprehensive Self-study. The DSU assessment website with assessment processes defined, templates, timelines and training is found at: [http://www.dixie.edu/assessments/](http://www.dixie.edu/assessments/)

Results and lessons learned from institutional assessment practices are used to improve the institution as a whole. Data and reports help Dixie State University reflect on mission fulfillment, core themes, and overall institutional effectiveness. This process of self-evaluation catalyzes self-initiated changes and helps members of the system recognize strengths and weaknesses, helping everyone at DSU better achieve goals and efficiency.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of DSU’s Assessment Processes**

In the past six years Dixie State University has made a concerted effort to develop and strengthen its assessment processes. With the hiring of a Director of Academic Assessment, a new Institutional Research Director with expanded office personnel and a new Accreditation Liaison Officer, the triangulation has made significant improvements in institutional assessment. Some notable accomplishments are:

- All academic and support departments have been trained in best assessment practices and the use of Taskstream for archiving data and report generation.
- Academic assessment conducted by programs with specialized accreditation has always been strong. These programs have been used as examples for other programs with weaker assessment practices, bringing all to a higher level of assessment.
- As of August 2015, 83% of the academic programs had an assessment plan with findings and action plans that were reported and reviewed in Taskstream. The remaining 9 programs should complete their assessment uploads into Taskstream before the Mid-cycle Evaluation site visit.
- General Education assessment, identified in the 2012 NWCCU Comprehensive Evaluation Report as needing improvement in assessment, has made great strides in developing and implementing a fairly progressive, across program, assessment plan.
- Practicing data gathering, analysis and use for continuous improvement is becoming an accepted way of being for DSU.

A major challenge of systemic assessment is achieving engagement of all stakeholders. Taskstream has become an important tool in monitoring assessment activity and results. But
good communication is a key to engagement. With time and experience, appreciation of the value of assessment will increase across campus. Some areas of needed improvement include:

- Better campus communication. It was a notable finding from the Great Colleges to Work For Survey conducted Spring 2014.
- Consistent accountability processes and responses across campus, including distribution of workload for assessment assignments.
- Stronger appreciation of assessment by some academic and support programs.
- More direct use of meaningful data in decision-making and budgeting.
- Moving forward from assessment and analysis to better strategic planning using data.
- Better coordination of campus strategic planning with core theme assessment.
- Fuller use of Taskstream by all departments and administration for data archiving, strategic program planning and report generation.
- Establishment of common reporting templates to meet accreditation, Regent and institutional reporting needs.

Figure 4 is a planned timeline for institutional assessment processes to determine mission fulfillment. It has yet to be fully implemented; full implementation is planned for 2015-16.

Figure 4
PART II: Two Representative Examples of Operationalized Mission and Core Themes to Show Mission Fulfillment.

Appendices A through G show the processes used at Dixie State University to operationalize its mission and core themes through setting objectives and outcomes, identifying indicators and conducting measurements and data analysis in order to determine mission fulfillment and ways to improve.

Two representative examples have been chosen to exemplify these processes in action from beginning to closing-the-loop, the assessment of the Dental Hygiene Bachelor’s Degree program and the English Bachelor’s Degree program. These two exemplary programs were chosen in part because Dental Hygiene is a highly successful, specialized accreditation program and English, without specialized accreditation, has emerged as an unexpected leader in assessment at DSU. The English department is also a department involved in the challenge of General Education assessment.

DSU Dental Hygiene Program Assessment

Dental Hygiene Department Support of the DSU Mission and Core Values
The Dental Hygiene Program enriches the lives of individual students and the community by providing AAS and BS degrees in dental hygiene. This is accomplished by delivering excellent teaching in a learning environment which includes inter-professional collaboration with other health science departments, and service to the community which fosters values, diversity and open access by creating strategic partnerships for learning opportunities. Additionally, the Dental Hygiene Department sponsors events and community outreach programs to meet the needs of constituents such as health fairs, public elementary and preschool oral health education, Head Start family clinic days, mobile clinic care taken to limited access community partners, and participation in oral health screenings at senior games.

DSU Core Theme 1: A Culture of Learning. Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledge and competent students who achieve their educational goals.
- Dental hygiene students become knowledgeable and competent in critical thinking skills, with demonstrable skills needed to be successful in their chosen careers, resilient in dynamic situations and prepared for life-long learning.

DSU Core Theme 2: A Culture of Values. Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.
- The dental hygiene program fosters a culture of respect, integrity, honesty, service, engagement, and diversity that strengthens students’ abilities to contribute to society.

DSU Core Theme 3: A Culture of Community. Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.
The dental hygiene program creates an atmosphere where strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community stakeholders can be built and maintained, facilitating economic growth, workforce development, continuing education, and cultural enrichment.

**AAS Dental Hygiene Program Learning Outcomes**

DSU Dental Hygiene graduates will be able to:

**PLO 1: Patient Care**: Execute all steps in the dental hygiene process of care.

**PLO 2: Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct**: Apply a professional code of ethics which complies with Federal and State laws.

**PLO 3: Community Service**: Provide health promotion and education services in public health and alternative settings.

**PLO 4: Graduation and Promoting the Dental Hygiene Profession**: Successfully graduate and affiliate with professional organizations.

**PLO 5: Life-long Learning and Education**: Perform self-assessment for professional growth and lifelong learning.

**BS Dental Hygiene Program Learning Outcomes**

DSU Dental Hygiene graduates will be able to:

**PLO 1**: Exhibit critical thinking to promote the profession of dental hygiene.

**PLO 2**: Design, implement or evaluate educational programs to address oral health issues.

**PLO 3**: Apply leadership and theory principles in collaborative inter-professional activities that promote oral health.

**PLO 4**: Critically examine research while applying evidence based decision making skills.

**PLO 5**: Demonstrate culturally competent interactions for diverse populations in a global community.

**Assessment Process in the DSU Dental Hygiene Department**

The Dental Hygiene Department has had a continuous process of assessment since achieving accreditation from the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) in 2000. This professional accreditation is on a renewal cycle of every seven years, with the most recent self-study and site visit by CODA representatives in November 2014. Successful accreditation by CODA was achieved with only one reporting condition of adding a prerequisite course, introductory psychology, before admittance into the program.

Assessment of the Dental Hygiene Department and program learning outcomes is a priority. Each academic year, the department holds three full day meetings to work on assessment. Program review meetings (including assessment review) are conducted at the end of Fall and Spring semesters with all full time faculty and staff participate. Institutional department assessment meetings are held at the beginning of Fall semester as well. A faculty calibration meeting is held each Fall with all full and part-time faculty. In addition, weekly faculty meetings are held that often include assessment planning, calibration, data analysis, and reporting.

The program has two full-time faculty members who work on the assessment process throughout the academic year. Each step of the assessment cycle is communicated at faculty meetings to invite recommendations. Curriculum mapping is reviewed yearly at the Fall calibration meeting.
to coordinate curriculum and calibrate faculty for the academic year. After student learning outcomes are collected and organized, outcomes are then distributed for further analysis and creating action plans as a department. The outcome analysis and action plans are accomplished at the end of both Fall and Spring semesters.

Learning and Improvement of Assessment
Each of the program learning outcomes are measured, analyzed, and action plans determined according to an established timeline. They are also mapped to Dixie State University’s Core Themes to prepare students for success in education, career, service, and life-long learning. For assessment during the academic year 2013-2014, all program learning outcomes were assessed to establish thresholds/baselines and targets for each outcome. The program learning outcomes were then classified as either met, partially met, or not met. (See Taskstream or 2013-14 data.) From this data, it was determined that a restructuring of the BS program was necessary to reduce excessive credits and redundancy in course content. This restructuring will also facilitate compliance with the state mandate “finish in four”, achieve a BS degree with four years of study. The PLOs needed to be rewritten for better measurement of the changing needs of the dental hygiene profession and for analysis of student needs for successful entry into the profession. It was decided that during the academic year of 2014-15 that PLO1 of the AAS program and PLO2 of the BS would be measured (see Appendix H) while new department vision, mission, goals and PLOs were developed for the academic year of 2015-16. These program learning outcomes were not likely to change drastically with the rewrite of PLOs and would allow the department some continuous data for analysis. The new PLOs will be implemented during the academic year of 2015-2016 and utilized for both the BS and AAS degrees. (See Appendix I)

Dissemination of Information
Each faculty member reports on individual course assessment at Program Review meetings, as well as participates in the overall program results and creation of action plan. Clinical adjunct instructors are informed of any changes/improvements at the annual calibration meeting. Input by all instructors is considered for additional improvement. Any policy or curriculum changes are shared with students through the current addition of the Policy and Procedures Manual. Students are required to attend two orientation meetings during the year. At these meetings, students are instructed regarding the Policy and Procedure Manual, Competency Education, OSHA safety protocols, and curriculum updates. Also, students and the community can access the program website for current information on learning outcomes. An overall annual program report is submitted to the American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation giving an accounting of program status.

Summary
All specified benchmarks for measurement of PLOs were successfully met academic years 2013-14 and 2014-15; however, the process indicated areas for potential improvement that are being implemented. The University has recently undergone a strategic planning process resulting in new vision, mission, goals and core themes to be published Fall 2015. The Dental Hygiene program intends to map the newly created PLOs to the latest institutional core themes and establish measurement instruments for student mastery at the annual Fall department assessment meeting. (See Appendix I for the revision of the Dental Hygiene program’s vision, mission, goals and core themes relationships).
DSU English Program Assessment

English Program Description

The English Department at Dixie State University strives to instill in students an appreciation for the centrality of language and literature in human culture, particularly their function in social, historical, and political contexts. Students who major in English master skills in analyzing and evaluating texts and other media, as well as learning how to produce focused critical essays.

The English Department offers a bachelor’s degree in English with four emphases. The Creative Writing emphasis will enable students to develop and hone skills in three primary areas of creative literary production—poetry, fiction and nonfiction. The Literary Studies emphasis seeks to broaden and deepen students’ understanding of the unique value of literary expression as an aesthetic form that challenges the senses, the intellect, and the imagination. Students also learn to appreciate the complex relationship between the aesthetic and intellectual aspects of literature and the culture and time in which it was produced. The Professional and Technical Writing program prepares students for careers in technical, scientific, medical, legal, and business writing environments. Courses introduce students to the procedures and practices that professional writers and editors use regularly, including grant writing, freelance writing, interactive media development, magazine production, technical editing, and document design. To further enhance their understanding of language and verbal communication, students in our program investigate areas such as composition theory, visual rhetoric, and the history of rhetoric, as well. The English Education emphasis area with developed in accordance with NCTE/NCATE program standards for initial preparation of teachers of secondary language arts, our English education courses help students adopt and strengthen professional dispositions and skills needed by English language arts teachers. Students integrate knowledge of English, students, and teaching.

Institutional Mission and Core Themes

Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.

Core Theme 1: A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

Core Theme 2: A Culture of Values
Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.

Core Theme 3: A Culture of Community
Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.

English Program Alignment with Institutional Core Themes

PLO1: Critical Strategies. Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, and interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language and its literature. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes (CT) and Objectives (#) for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.2)
Students engage in active learning through reading literature and writing in a variety of genres, purposes, and audiences. The faculty in the English department employ pedagogical practices that enrich students’ comprehensive understanding of literature and writing. Many classes, especially the General Education classes, support student achievement of their educational goals.

**PLO2: Cultural and Ideological Awareness.** Students will identify and negotiate the ideologies and core cultural beliefs present in multiple rhetorical and aesthetic genres and forms. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3.)

The faculty in the English department engage students in activities that enhance their experiences at DSU. In addition, faculty promote an environment of respectful, responsible, and ethical behavior.

**PLO3: Collaborative Learning.** Students will enhance their understanding of texts, literary history, and research methods through varying collaborative activities. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3, and Community CT3.3.)

Through small class sizes, English faculty are able to foster a climate of support and collaboration. Faculty members employ pedagogical practices that use collaborative learning in a variety of ways. These smaller class sizes result in more positive student-faculty relationships, which lead to increased retention and graduation rates.

**PLO4: Research & Information Literacy.** Students will demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, learning to produce scholarly writing for potential publication and/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure and source integration. Students develop & master relevant knowledge & skills. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.2.)

The English department teaches classes that develop students’ research skills and informational literacy, particularly focusing on MLA documentation and citation. Students use relevant scholarly databases as well as library collections to create original scholarly work. These skills enable students to succeed in a changing and competitive world.

**PLO5: Professional Development.** Students will cultivate an understanding of language usage that prepares them for employment in fields that attach importance to sophisticated writing and critical thinking skills. (Corresponds to DSU’s Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3, and Community CT3.1, CT3.2, CT3.3.)

Students engage in successful educational exchanges with the community and local businesses. This institutional core theme is met in a variety of English classes. Students within the Professional and Technical Writing emphasis area focus on grant writing for local non-profit organizations; also, these students design and develop websites for local business. Students within the English Education emphasis area participate in local schools, observing and teaching students within the Washington County School District. Students within the Creative Writing
emphasis area host writing workshops and read original works at local and regional events. Students within the Literary Studies emphasis area present their research at local and national conferences.

Program Assessment Method/Plan

The English Department’s 5-Year plan for assessment includes the following elements:

**Year 1 (2013-2014):** the English department worked with the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) to assess the Freshman Composition program: English 1010 and English 2010. The GEAC’s findings in the areas of critical thinking and written communication have been noted as part of the English department’s ongoing assessment process.

**Year 2 (2014-2015):** Assessment of PLO 1-Critical Strategies - Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, and interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language and its literature. Assessment of PLO 4 Research & Information Literacy - Students will demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, learning to produce scholarly writing for potential publication and/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure and source integration.

**Year 3 (2015-2016):** Assessment of PLO 2 Cultural and Ideological Awareness - Students will identify and negotiate the ideologies and core cultural beliefs present in multiple rhetorical and aesthetic genres and forms; and assessment of PLO 5 Professional Development - Students will cultivate an understanding of language usage that prepares them for employment in fields that attach importance to sophisticated writing and critical thinking skills.

**Year 4 (2016-2017):** Assessment of PLO 3 Collaborative Learning - Students will enhance their understanding of texts, literary history, and research methods through varying collaborative activities.

**Year 5 (2017-2018):** Assessment of the PLOs that required the most revision will take place.

Program Status and Improvement Plans

The English department’s mission statement (including those statements associated with the individual emphasis areas) serves as a guideline to help demonstrate how well the department stays in line with Dixie State University’s core themes. While the department clearly and significantly contributes to the culture of learning and the culture of values emphasized by the institution, assessment findings, as well as anecdotal evidence indicates that more must be done for the department to contribute to the culture of community. Within the department, revisions and improvements are underway to increase the number of English majors participating in internships with local businesses and to create and promote service learning opportunities for many English students. Amongst individual full-time faculty members, encouragement is being given to seek out and participate in programs that allow English professors to have a direct impact on the community (volunteering and assisting with language and literacy programs e.g.).

The English department’s assessment process is still young, and some wrinkles are still being ironed out. The newness of the process means that nothing is set in stone, and thus far positive revisions have been fairly easy to implement. The consensus seems to be that the department may have too many indicators at this time and that there may be too little variety in the types of
indicators used. Both of these concerns have been addressed with the action plan for the 2015-16 academic year.

In the upcoming year, fewer signature assignments will be collected; in the emphasis area of English Education, standardized praxis scores and job placement data will be the focus of the emphasis assessment group. Not surprisingly, the most difficult areas in which to implement changes are in the instruction given by professors within the classes assessed. The use of emphasis area groups has been the most effective way to communicate results and suggest revisions, and these groups have improved the comradery which is necessary when curricular changes and improvements are called for. Within each of these groups, peers are comparing ideas and sharing best practices. The assessment coordinator and the department chair are overseeing much of the organization and collection of the data, but the emphasis area reading groups have been the points of focus in which most of the work is being done and the result are being shared. Refinement and revision of both PLOs and CLOs must be done in order to better focus findings.

Appendix J presents the English Department assessment plan and the results and action recommendations for 2014-2015.
PART III: Preparation for Seven Year Comprehensive Evaluation in 2020

The foundation of Dixie State University’s assessment processes has become quite stable and strong. Plans on the path of best practices in assessment continue to develop, assessment expertise is available, and many areas of the campus are already fully engaged. President Williams adds his considerable support to conduct effective institutional strategic planning, using meaningful data and assessment in order to appraise and ensure mission fulfillment.

Because this formal assessment process is new for many areas, many programs are still building their assessment practices. Institutional closing-the-loop using core theme related data and analysis, resulting in well-founded recommendations and actions have taken place for many areas for the first time in 2014-15. The administration is confident that if practice doesn’t make perfect, it at least makes assessment much better.

The act of attempting to close-the-loop for practical application and use of data teaches the participants about the worth of their indicators, measures, and benchmarks to shed light on objective fulfillment and thereby, on core themes and mission fulfillment. During the assessment analysis process in 2013-14, it was found that some measures were not useful or practical and so were discarded. In other cases, benchmarks were adjusted. Again in 2014-15 adjustments were made to indicators, measures and benchmarks for which there was new data.

The biggest challenges to face are: full valuing of assessment; engagement by all members of campus; communication of results to stakeholders; and use of assessment for determining mission fulfillment, strategic planning and action toward institutional improvement.

There are still pockets of resistance, though by now most realize that “resistance is futile.” In the next four years it is planned that all programs will have fully functioning, healthy assessment practices in place, with a trend of three or four years of good data and analysis on which they have made significant moves forward on the continuous improvement track.

Addenda to Accompany the DSU Mid-cycle Evaluation Report (following appendices)

There was some confusion over the addenda required of Dixie State University to accompany its Mid-cycle Evaluation. After investigation, it was determined that the only addendum required was an update on the implementation of the bachelor’s degree program in Criminal Justice and its related certificate program for Computer Forensics. An email from NWCCU Executive Vice-President, Les Steele, verifying this is found as Appendix A of the Criminal Justice Report.

A response to the Year One Evaluation’s recommendations is normally required, but was not requested by the Commission in its response to the Year One Evaluation. This was confirmed by Dr. Steele. The Year One Evaluation recommendation was to “further clarify and articulate what constitutes mission fulfillment” including improving benchmarks. Though not required for this report, the importance of this recommendation was appreciated by Dixie State University administration. Therefore, the recommendation was seriously addressed by ISAAC in its 2013-14 and 2014-2015 assessment improvement processes, with an overhaul of benchmarks and clarification of mission fulfillment, as articulated in this report.
Appendix A: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Rubric
(Evaluation conducted by the Academic Assessment Coordinator)

Rubric for Evaluating Academic Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes (PLCs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Alignment with PLOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Assessment Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Assessment Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A rubric was designed to evaluate the assessment of student learning for your academic program. The rubric has nine major dimensions, and each dimension was evaluated using a scoring scale ranging from “developing” to “exemplary”. A summary of the evaluation is outlined below, and the details of the ratings, along with comments and feedback, are provided in the following pages.

Overall Evaluation:

Comments & Feedback:
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and values students gain or improve upon through engagement in the academic program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses action verbs.</td>
<td>The list of outcomes is a well-organized set of observable and measurable outcomes that focus on the most important knowledge, skills, and values of the academic program. Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes have not been developed or have been developed, but list is problematic. Describes a process, rather than an outcome (i.e., language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes encompass a discipline-specific knowledge, skills and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes accurately describe how students can demonstrate learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes articulate the level of mastery appropriate to the degree type (CER, AS/AA, B/BS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observable and measurable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable number of outcomes identified making assessment manageable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations to industry standards are identified, where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation:

Comments & Feedback:

PLO Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes

A matrix that illustrates the degree of congruence between the institutional goals and the PLOs. The greater the alignment, the more successfully the desired outcomes can be achieved (Maki, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PLOs are explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to develop each of the outcomes related to the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
<td>The PLOs are explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to develop each of the outcomes related to the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
<td>There is little relationship between the institution’s goals and the PLOs. Students appear to have some reasonable opportunities to develop each of the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths and gaps in the alignment are identified and used to inform the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
direction of the academic program.

Evaluation:
Comments & Feedback:

Curriculum Alignment with PLOs
A matrix that illustrates the degree of congruence between the PLOs and the curricular content. The greater the alignment, the more successfully the desired outcomes can be achieved (Maki, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to learn and develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome (i.e., the program curriculum is coherent and structured in a logical, sequential, and consistent manner).</td>
<td>The curriculum is explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to learn and develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome.</td>
<td>There is little relationship between the PLOs and the curriculum. Students appear to have some reasonable opportunities to develop each of the PLOs. Sequencing and frequency of opportunities may be problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths and gaps in the curriculum are identified and used to “close the loop”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation:
Comments & Feedback:

Assessment Planning
Explicit sustainable plan is presented for assessing each program learning outcome over a reasonable period of time, such as the period for program review cycles (5 years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program has a fully articulated sustainable, multi-year assessment plan.</td>
<td>The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies</td>
<td>There is no formal plan for assessing each PLO or assessment relies on short-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Assessment Services, Duke State University
Adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Texas A&M University, & others. Last updated 04/09/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected.</td>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected.</td>
<td>It is not clear that potentially valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments reflect good research methodology.</td>
<td>Instruments reflect good research methodology.</td>
<td>evidence for each PLO is collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures for one or all outcomes.</td>
<td>At least one measure is identified for each</td>
<td>(Methodology is questionable.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and indirect measures are used;</td>
<td>outcome.</td>
<td>Not all outcomes have associated measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis is on direct measures.</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures are used.</td>
<td>Few or no direct measures used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible – existing practices are used when</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruments may not be developed yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible; at least some measures apply to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course grades are used as an assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The measure(s) used do not seem to capture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the &quot;end of experience&quot; effect of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valid Assessment Measures**

The systematic collection of valid evidence from a variety of methods used to evaluate each PLO.
### Reliable Assessment Measures
The systematic collection of reliable judgments about evidence of student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, to assess student attainment of each PLO.</td>
<td>Faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, to assess student attainment of each PLO. Reviewers of student artifacts are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Individual reviewers use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work, or faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each PLO, but reviewers are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way (low inter-rater reliability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria (e.g., rubrics) have been pilot-tested and refined over time. Reviewers of student artifacts are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation:
**Comments & Feedback:**

### Achievement Targets
The values set that will represent success for achieving a given outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is identified for each measure. Targets are aligned with measures and PLOs. Targets represent a reasonable level of success. Meaningful – based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards.</td>
<td>Target is identified for each measure. Targets are aligned with measures and PLOs. Some targets may seem arbitrary.</td>
<td>Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure. Target is too high or too low. Language is too vague (e.g., &quot;improve&quot;, &quot;satisfactory&quot;) making it difficult to determine if target is met. Value(s) is aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g., survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation:

Comments & Feedback:

Findings
A concise summary of the results gathered from the applied measurement approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete and organized. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected. Relevant faculty members routinely analyze and discuss results. Solid evidence is provided that targets are met, partially met, or not met. Faculty take comparative data into account when interpreting results and deciding on changes to improve learning.</td>
<td>Complete and organized. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected. Relevant faculty members analyze and discuss the results. Results may align with achievement targets, but report does not address whether targets are met, partially met, or not met.</td>
<td>Incomplete or too much information. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected, but relevant faculty do not or inappropriate analyze results. Results are not clearly aligned with achievement targets. Relevant faculty members do not discuss the results. Questionable conclusion about whether targets are met, partially met, or not met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation:

Comments & Feedback:

Use of Results
A documentation of the process by which faculty members use assessment results to improve student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action plan exhibits an understanding of the implications of assessment findings. Relevant faculty members routinely develop plans for improvement.</td>
<td>Action plan reflects with sufficient depth what was learned during the assessment cycle. Findings are used regularly to improve</td>
<td>Action plan not clearly related to assessment results. There is little collective use of findings or findings have been used occasionally to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Academic Services, Texas A&M University
Adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Texas A&M University, & others. Last updated 04/29/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action plan identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical next steps.</th>
<th>the academic program. At least one action plan is in place.</th>
<th>improve the academic program. Too many action plans to manage. Action plan too general, lacking details (e.g., time frame, responsible party).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement. Number of action plans is manageable. Relevant faculty members secure necessary resources, identify responsible person or group, and implement changes. Action plan contains completion dates. Relevant faculty members collaborate with others, such as librarians, student advisors, and students to improve the program. Relevant faculty members conduct follow-up studies to confirm that changes have improved learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**
# Appendix B: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form A - PLOs, Core Theme alignment and 5-Year Plan

## Degree Program Name

### Academic Year

### Department Name - School Name

**Dixie State University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>When PLOs Assessed during a 5-Year Cycle</th>
<th>Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence of Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List all the learning outcomes for the degree program below. What students know, do &amp; value. Also, for each PLO, identify with which DSU core theme(s) it aligns with [i.e., Learning (CT1), Values (CT2), and Community (CT3)].</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Data collected in Spring to be used to assess the PLOs for the following AY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 5 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 6 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 7 Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 8 Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form B - Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program(s) Name(s)</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Outline the program courses in the second column of the grid and the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) in the second row of the grid. Conceptualize the extent to which each course addresses each PLO.

Use the following scoring scheme to indicate whether each PLO is introduced, developed, and/or mastered in the information/material presented to the students for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I = Introduce</th>
<th>Learning outcomes are introduced at the basic level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D = Develop</td>
<td>Students are given opportunities to practice, learn more about and receive feedback to develop more sophistication in the outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = Mastery</td>
<td>Students demonstrate mastery at a level appropriate for graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A course may only introduce an outcome during the course or it may both introduce and develop an outcome. On the other hand, it is possible that a course may not introduce, but rather develop students’ knowledge/ability in a given outcome. It is also possible that a course would introduce, develop, and demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate the extent to which the program curriculum is coherent and structured in a logical, sequential, and consistent manner, and indicate any possible recommendations here:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
## Appendix D: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form C - Activities, Results and Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLO**
Identify the PLO(s) assessed in the current AY (1-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Baseline / Threshold / Benchmark / Target</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action Taken (closing the loop)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct or indirect</td>
<td>1. Course(s) number</td>
<td>For each PLO, consider all the data and summarize the three important findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of measure (upload instrument &amp; sample artifacts)</td>
<td>2. Semester collected</td>
<td>Highlight whether the targets were met, partially met, or not met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scoring strategy (upload rubric)</td>
<td>3. Sample size</td>
<td>Include summary reliability indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Score scale (e.g., 4=exemplary, 1=unsatisfactory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Measure(s):</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measure(s):</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Measure(s):</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Baseline / Threshold / Benchmark / Target</td>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Direct or indirect</td>
<td>1. Course(s) number</td>
<td>For each PLO, consider all the data and summarize the three important findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Description of measure (upload instrument &amp; sample artifacts)</td>
<td>2. Semester collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Scoring strategy (upload rubric)</td>
<td>3. Sample size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Score scale (e.g., 4=exemplary, ... 1=unacceptable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Measure(s):
Appendix E: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form D - Chair’s/Program Director’s Annual Assessment Results and Recommendation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results</th>
<th>Implications for resources needed/budget allocation priorities</th>
<th>Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes, Objectives, and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| If a program’s plan to ‘close the loop’ includes making a budget request for additional resources, substantiate the request using assessment data, in addition to your most recent program review action plan. | Explain how the proposed plan to ‘close the loop’ builds upon past decisions using a SWOT analysis (i.e., explain the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the program in its current state). Consider assessment and Banner data (enrollments, number of majors, number of graduates, SCH, Student FTE, Faculty FTE, Student FTE to Faculty FTE) in your explanation, and discuss how the proposed plan will improve the quality, viability, and sustainability of the program. | }
Appendix F: Institutional Assessment, Annual Report Template for Deans

Appendix F1
School Report
School of {Type School Name Here} 
{Description of the school.}
{Summary of how the school fulfills DSU’s mission and core themes using available data (as per Core Themes Worksheet). Highlight accomplishments and action plans for improvements.}
   Core Theme 1…
   Core Theme 2…
   Core Theme 3…
{Concluding paragraph introducing programs offered at the school.}
{Sign}, {Dean Name}
Dean of {Type School Name Here}

Appendix F2
Department Report: {Department Name} 
IR Data: 
   Enrollment {#}
   Majors {#}
   Minors {#}
   Retention {#}
   Capstone and Undergraduate Research {#}
   Graduation {#}
   Employment {#}

A. Program Description/Mission Statement of Department
   {Write a short description of what this program offers and state the mission.}

B. Student Learning Assessment
   {Obtain information for this section from Form D, first column and from the Action Plan Report available via Taskstream.}
   1. Student Learning Outcomes Graduates in this Program will…
   2. Assessment of Student Learning for {current year}:
      a. Outcome Assessment
      b. Findings
      c. Action Plan for Improvement

C. Program Assessment
   {Obtain information for this section from Form D, second column.}
   1. {SWOT Analysis}
   2. {Recommendations}

D. Department Mission Fulfillment and Alignment to Core Themes
   {Obtain information for this section from Form D, third column.}
Appendix G: Institutional Core Themes, Objectives and Measures

DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY CORE THEMES, OBJECTIVES AND MEASURES (2014-15)

MISSION: Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.

Core Theme One: A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Foster a campus-wide culture of learning</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Provide a wide variety of learning resources &amp; support to advance the knowledge of students, faculty, &amp; staff</td>
<td>1) Student satisfaction of resources &amp; support services</td>
<td>a) NSSE Grouping - First Year &amp; Senior Interaction Results (Q13) b) NSSE Grouping - Campus Environment c) Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>NSSE provides comparative data with peer institutions. A student survey will give their perspective on resources &amp; support services &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>a) ≥5 on a 7 point quality scale b) When mean comparisons are statistically &amp; practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY &amp; SR). c) 80% of respondents agree they are satisfied with their DSU experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Faculty/staff satisfaction of resources &amp; support services</td>
<td>a) Great Colleges Survey: Job satisfaction/support; Facilities b) Faculty Teaching Practices &amp; Resources Survey (Q 1, 2, 8)</td>
<td>A faculty/staff survey will identify areas of strengths &amp; of needed improvements in support services.</td>
<td>a) DSU will be higher than Public Carnegie comparison. Good - Excellent range ≥ 65% b) Mean will be ≥ 3.0 on 4 point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Offer quality educational programs in response to need &amp; demand</td>
<td>1) Number &amp; variety of degree programs offered by school</td>
<td>a) Comparison of DSU program offerings to peer institution offerings b) Market &amp; student demand</td>
<td>Justification for new &amp; existing degree programs, plus identification of degrees in high demand.</td>
<td>Programs meet the following requirements: 1) programs offered by ≥60% of peer institutions; 2) high student demand; 3) high market demand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Program goals align with academic &amp; professional standards</td>
<td>a) Regent approval of new degrees b) External evaluator report rating for 5 year program reviews c) Regent review &amp; approval process of 5 year program reviews d) NSSE groupings – Academic Challenge; Learning with Peers; High Impact Practices</td>
<td>Justification of new degree programs &amp; validation of existing programs. NSSE provides comparative data with peer institutions.</td>
<td>a) 90% proposed degrees are approved. b) Program reviews will receive no less than “met academic &amp; professional standards” by external reviewers. c) 100% programs will be approved. d) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY &amp; SR).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 2: Deliver excellent teaching in a student centered environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Faculty are qualified & strive to teach effectively | 1) Faculty Credentials | a) Percent with terminal degrees in each school  
b) Credit hours taught by part-time faculty  
c) Qualification of faculty teaching upper division courses | Faculty having terminal degrees & professional qualifications indicates superior educational experience for students (Regent policy 312-7.2.3). | a) Regents require 60% of our faculty (FTE, Full-time & adjunct) have terminal degrees.  
b) Less than 40% of Student Credit Hours Generated by Part-time Instructions (Faculty Work Load).  
c) Regents policy requires all upper division courses are taught by terminal degree (or working toward). |
| 2) Faculty strive to teach effectively | a) Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey – items related to active learning pedagogical practices including trends on use of technology  
b) Number of Faculty serviced by Center for Teaching & Learning | The more faculty use different strategies to improve student learning demonstrates the importance of continual improvement. | a) Increase in use of technology & pedagogical techniques by 5% in 3 years.  
b) Faculty use of the Center for Teaching & Learning will increase by 5% in 3 years. |
| B) Students engage in active learning in the classroom | 1) Faculty report on active learning practices used, & the frequency of usage | Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey – items related to active learning pedagogical practices | Best pedagogical practices support student engagement & active learning. Reflective teaching & learning practices also promote learning. | 75% of faculty report 3 or more active learning techniques are used some of the time (or more). |
| 2) Students report on the variety of active learning practices they experience, the frequency of usage | a) Student Teaching Practices Survey – items related to active learning practices  
b) NSSE Grouping – High Impact Practices | Students & faculty reporting on pedagogical practices is informative, personally & institutionally & identifies areas of needed improvement. | a) 75% of students indicated faculty use 3 or more active learning techniques  
b) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR). |
| C) The institution maintains an atmosphere characterized by strong relationships & positive interpersonal interactions between faculty & students | 1) Small class sizes | a) Student to faculty ratio (IPEDS)  
b) Percentage of courses by student class size (Common Data Set) | Smaller class sizes result in more positive student-faculty relationships. | Student to faculty ratio is 25:1 or lower. More than 65% of class sections have less than 30 students. |
| 2) Positive feedback from students | a) NSSE grouping – Experience with Faculty  
b) Student Satisfaction Survey (Faculty Section – Interpersonal) | Provides comparative data with peer institutions  
Student survey will identify areas of needed improvement | a) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR).  
b) 60% will agree/strongly agree on a 5 point satisfaction scale. |
| 3) Positive feedback from faculty | a) Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey | Faculty survey will identify areas of needed improvement. | a) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale. |
### Objective 3: Develop students’ knowledge and skills, enabling them to succeed in a changing and competitive world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Students develop &amp; master relevant knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>1) Student success in meeting General Education Requirements</td>
<td>GE learning outcome attainment, based on AAC&amp;U’s VALUE rubrics (4 point scale)</td>
<td>GE committee already collecting this data which demonstrates students’ attainment of GE learning outcomes.</td>
<td>70% of students will perform at a 2-3 (milestones), some competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Student success in mastering the foundational knowledge &amp; skills of their major</td>
<td>Percent of programs meeting their PLO benchmarks based on rubric ratings (3-point scale: 1) not met, 2) met, 3) exceeded )</td>
<td>Program assessments informs mission fulfillment. Acquisition of foundational knowledge &amp; skills in a field is essential for mastery of that field &amp; one assumed purpose of education.</td>
<td>Threshold: 75% of programs will submit completed Assessment Forms. Target: of those responding 70% of programs/outcomes will have at least met their PLO benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Support student achievement of their educational goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Support students in the transition to, progress in &amp; attainment of their chosen major</td>
<td>1) Students progress towards their major &amp; meeting their educational goals</td>
<td>a) Retention rate b) Student satisfaction survey (questions 94-99, General comments) c) NSSE Grouping – Quality of Interactions d) Graduating student survey (questions 83-88 educational goals, Overall) e) Non-returning student survey</td>
<td>Impacting factors for DSU low retention need to be identified. NSSE data will provide perceptions re. the quality of interactions. Non-returning student data will provide comparison to returning students. Graduating student survey question will query student perceptions of DSU educational experience. Measures identify areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>a) Meet national average retention rates. b) 80% of students will agree or strongly agree with the statement. c) When mean comparisons are statistically &amp; practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY &amp; SR). d) 80% of students will agree or strongly agree with the statements. e) Will be used for needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Students graduate</td>
<td>a) Degrees awarded b) Graduation rate c) Time to degree from Complete College America</td>
<td>Nationally reviewed graduation statistics give realistic measures ACT provides national persistence to degree rates (graduation rate) information based on degree offerings &amp; admissions selectivity. NCES provides data on time to bachelor’s degree.</td>
<td>a) Degrees awarded trend upward by degree type. b) Meet national average graduation rates. c) Meet national median time to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Core Theme Two: A Culture of Values

Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.

### Objective 1: Engage students and employees in service and citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie State University experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Students are engaged in service & citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie experiences | 1) Students participate in experiences that contribute to growth in service & citizenship | a) NSSE Questions: Q12, Q15e (service learning, community service or volunteer work)  
b) NSSE Question: Q17j (Being an informed & active citizen) | Service is an integral part of the Dixie experience. Participation in service activities enriches academic learning, engages students & develops citizenship. NSSE allows comparisons of First Year Students to Seniors & to peer institutions. | a) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR).  
b) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher that Rocky Mtn. mean ($FY & SR). |
| B) Faculty & Staff engage in volunteer service & citizenship activities that benefit the campus & community | 1) Faculty & staff participate in professional service (survey)  
b) Faculty & staff participation in citizenship activities | DSU is an integral part of surrounding community. The activities & involvement of faculty & staff in service is part of DSU’s fabric & provide an example for students. | DSU is an integral part of surrounding community. The activities & involvement of faculty & staff in service is part of DSU’s fabric & provide an example for students. | a) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale for faculty & staff participation in professionally related service.  
b) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale for faculty & staff participation in citizenship activities. |

### Objective 2: Promote an environment of respectful, responsible, and ethical behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Campus culture creates an expectation of responsible, respectful, & ethical behavior | 1) Behavioral conduct statement included in syllabi | a) Sampling of syllabi for inclusion of statement  
b) Student policies include statement (student handbook on website) | Setting standards of appropriate responsible behavior, communicating expectations & providing consequences for offending behavior is foundational in educating an individual. | a) 100% syllabi compliance, as reported by school deans to PAIR  
b) Student policies, comparable to peer institutions & reflecting DSU values. |
| 2) Students have opportunities to foster respectful & ethical behavior | a) Student Satisfaction Survey: Climate Section  
b) NSEE Q8,Q14d,Q14i,Q17g,Q17h | Students should be provided opportunities to be in a climate that demonstrate behavior appropriate for the workplace. | Students should be provided opportunities to be in a climate that demonstrate behavior appropriate for the workplace. | a) The Student Satisfaction Survey Climate Section will have a mean of $3.0 on a 5 point agreement scale  
b) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR). |
3) Employee relationships reflect mutual respect & fairness.

Great Colleges to Work For Survey: Fairness; Respect & Appreciation; Supervisor/Department Chairs

Employees have the right to expect a healthy work environment & to be treated in a professional manner with respect & fairness.

a) Threshold: DSU will be higher than Public Carnegie comparison.
Target: Good to Excellent range (> 65%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: Foster a climate of support and collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Campus culture fosters a spirit of camaraderie &amp; pride in DSU mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Theme Three: A Culture of Community

*Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.*

### Core Theme Three: A Culture of Community

**Objective 1: Enrich educational exchanges between community, businesses, and the university by providing effective high quality opportunities and partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Successful educational exchanges with the community</td>
<td>1) Participation by community in educational exchanges</td>
<td>Trends in participation: a) Number of participants b) Number &amp; types of exchanges</td>
<td>Increased enrollment in educational exchanges is indicative of program effectiveness &amp; quality.</td>
<td>a) Total participation by community in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. b) Number &amp; types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Quality of educational exchanges</td>
<td>Customized participant satisfaction survey by program</td>
<td>The satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perceptions of program quality &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>75% of participants are satisfied with the programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Successful educational exchanges with businesses</td>
<td>1) Participation by businesses in educational exchanges</td>
<td>Trends in participation: a) Number of participating businesses b) Number &amp; types of exchanges</td>
<td>Increased participation in educational exchanges is indicative of program effectiveness &amp; quality.</td>
<td>a) Participation in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. b) Number &amp; types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Quality of educational exchanges</td>
<td>Participant satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>The satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perception of program quality &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>75% of participants are satisfied with the programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2: Engage the campus and community by providing a variety of quality cultural, athletic, and social programs and events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Campus &amp; community are engaged in cultural programs &amp; events</td>
<td>1) Number &amp; variety of cultural programs &amp; events offered</td>
<td>a) Number of participants b) Number &amp; types of programs &amp; events c) Community interest survey</td>
<td>Cultural events are in response to community interests &amp; needs. The more cultural events offered &amp; the greater the variety of those offerings the more engaged the campus &amp; community.</td>
<td>a) Participation by community in cultural programs/events will grow 5% in 3 years b) Number &amp; types of programs &amp; events will grow/change 5% over 3 years. c) 50% of new programs &amp; events will be in response to community interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Quality of cultural programs &amp; events</td>
<td>Participant satisfaction survey</td>
<td>Satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perception of program quality &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>75% of participants are satisfied with the programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 3: Encourage economic development by assisting and supporting individuals, businesses and community organizations to nurture the growth of the regional economy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSU is a primary partner in nurturing the growth of the regional economy</td>
<td>1) Number &amp; types of programs &amp; engagements that support economic development needs</td>
<td>a) Business Resource Center (BRC) reports: numbers of engagements &amp; services to companies (BRC) provided annually.</td>
<td>Efforts to encourage economic development are reflected in the programs &amp; engagements that are supported in response to needs assessment.</td>
<td>a) Increase BRC’s number of services &amp; engagements provided by 10% annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Participation in economic development programs</td>
<td>Small Business Development Center (SBDC) tracks number of long-term clients, business starts &amp; capital infusion</td>
<td>Grants have set required participation rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase St. George SBDC numbers annually &amp; meet targets set by state SBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Success of &amp; satisfaction with the economic development programs</td>
<td>a) Small Business Development Center (SBDC) customer satisfaction ratings, including GOED Chrisman statewide survey (BRC)</td>
<td>Program grants are approved &amp; continued based on meeting grant specifications &amp; goals. Program results reveal impact. The satisfaction surveys reveal participant’s’ perception of program quality &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) 80% of SBDC participants are satisfied with service (Mean of at least 4 on 5 point satisfaction/quality scale). b) SBDC scorecard meets or exceeds all goals &amp; actual numbers compared to other SBDC’s in Utah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Dental Hygiene Assessment Plans, Findings and Results 2014-15 for the AAS (PLO 1) and BS Degrees (PLO 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAS Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1 AAS Program</td>
<td>Direct Measure(s): Clinic V – Dental Hygiene Process of Care Evaluation. Each student is evaluated on each area of the process of care for competency. 1. Assessment 2. DH Diagnosis, Care Plan, and Evaluation 3. Implementation</td>
<td>Baseline: 74%</td>
<td>DHYG 3515 Spring Semester Sample: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Measure(s): Regional Board Exam Scores</td>
<td>Baseline: 100% passing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAS Program Assessment Findings and Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAS Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Measure:** This PLO is comprised of five total elements and was evaluated per student/patient experience and as a total cohort. Each element measured is summarized below with average scores reported.

- Assessment: 94.87%
- Radiographs: 84.83%
- Care Plan: 99.64%
- Implementation: 90.70%
- **Total Patient: 95.16%**

**Indirect Measure:** 100% of the student cohort achieved passing scores for the Regional Board Exams.

**Direct Measure:** Radiographs: Although students met the target, scores were lower than expected on the radiograph portion of the evaluation. It was determined that this may have occurred because of certain record keeping requirements. In addition, the course that supports this criteria has been improved for student application of concepts and scores are expected to improve.

**Care Plan:** Scores for this criterion were actually higher than expected. Clinic coordinators plan to create a rubric and calibrate faculty for better inter-rater reliability.

**Indirect Measure:** No action needed

**Further Actions:**

The Department plans to fully implement digital patient charts Fall 2015 per government mandated initiative for Electronic Health Records.

University IT personnel indicate that the clinic computers do not have the capacity to manage all the software that must be integrated. New computers are indicated. (current computers are 10-12 years old)
### BS Dental Hygiene Assessment Plan 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PLO 2 Design, implement and evaluate educational programs to address oral health issues. | Direct Measure(s):  
Capstone Project:  
1. Utilizes logic model  
2. Action plan, budget, and evaluation measures  
3. Impact of project personalized to problem or issue | Baseline: 90% of students score above 74% in this category.  
Target: 90% will score above 85%. | DHYG 4570 Summer Semester Sample: 16  
Capstone Final Report |
| Indirect Measure(s):  
Graduation Rates  
Attrition Rates | Baseline:  
Graduation 90%  
Attrition: 10%  
Target:  
Graduation: 100%  
Attrition: 0 | DHYG 4570 Summer Semester Sample: 16 |

### BS Program Assessment Findings and Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PLO 2 Design, implement and evaluate educational programs to address oral health issues. | **Met** Direct Measure: 15 graduating students demonstrated mastery. One student did not fully evaluate her results.  
**Partially Met** | More specific instruction on how to conduct and document self-evaluation will be given next year. |
| **Not Met** Indirect Measure:  
15 Students graduated, 1 student dropped out for personal reasons. | **Early intervention when student appears to get behind in course work. A remediation plan will be implemented by the instructor and the student will be referred to StarFish. (An institutional remediation system for advisors.)** |
Appendix I: DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY REVISED DENTAL HYGIENE PROGRAM & ASSESSMENT (To be implemented 2015-2016 Academic Year)

Vision Statement
The vision of the DSU AAS and BSDH program is to provide a progressive education which prepares the graduate to promote the art and science of the advancing dental hygiene profession.

Value Statement
The Dixie State University Dental Hygiene Program values competence, integrity, responsibility, mutual respect and promotion of lifelong learning opportunities for our students, patients, faculty, and community dental health professionals.

Mission Statement, Strategic Goals
The mission of the Dixie State University Dental Hygiene Program is to produce dental hygienists of the highest ethical and professional standards by providing an exceptional academic and experiential curriculum, serving the needs of students, the University and the community at large.

In support of our vision and mission, the strategic goals of the DSUDH Program are:
- prepare dental hygiene students in the provision of comprehensive dental hygiene care, while emphasizing ethics and social responsibility.
- advance health through current evidence, innovative education, and the highest-quality care.
- attract, educate and graduate students who are prepared intellectually, technically and ethically to meet the oral health challenges of diverse communities.
- create an educational environment that fosters the development of inter-professional practice, lifelong learning, outstanding citizens and leaders, and oral health care professionals.

Competencies for Entry into the Profession of Dental Hygiene

PLO #1: Customized Patient-Centered Care
DSUDH graduates will be able to execute all steps in the dental hygiene process of care.
1.1 Perform a comprehensive patient assessment utilizing critical decision making skills to construct and document a dental hygiene care plan for all types of patients based on data collected.
1.2 Perform and document comprehensive patient care to promote patient health and wellness for all patient types and classifications.
1.3 Provide appropriate life support measures for medical emergencies that may be encountered in practice of dental hygiene.

PLO #2: Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct
DSUDH graduates will be able to apply a professional code of ethics as stated in the ADHA Code of Ethics.
2.1 Apply a professional code of ethics and conduct to all aspects of dental hygiene.
2.2 Comply with state laws, recommendations and regulations, governing the practice of dental hygiene.
2.3 Achieve high levels of ethical consciousness, decision making, and practice to carry into the profession.
PLO #3: Health Care Systems
DSUDH graduates will be able to promote oral health through education and service in public health and alternative settings.
3.1 Administer oral health services and education, individualized to patients’ cultures and special needs, in a variety of community settings.
3.2 Assess, plan, implement, and evaluate community based oral health programs with respect to the oral health needs of the community.
3.3 Employ inter-professional partnerships to encourage health promotion and disease prevention within the community.

PLO# 4: Critical Thinking and Research
DSUDH graduates will be able to critically examine research while applying evidence based decision making skills.
4.1 Search and critically examine medical/dental databases for current information for evidenced based decision making.
4.2 Evaluate the safety and efficacy of oral health products, interventions and treatments.
4.3 Utilize principles of research methodology to evaluate the scientific literature, synthesize the information in a critical and effective manner to apply evidence-based approaches to patient care.
4.4 Apply self-assessment skills to prepare for lifelong learning.

PLO #5: Communication and Collaboration
DSUDH graduates will be able to demonstrate effective communication and collaboration interacting with diverse population groups including patients, peers, and other healthcare professionals and health care teams to contribute to increased health and health behaviors.
5.1 Demonstrate effective communication skills when providing oral health education to patients and populations from diverse backgrounds.
5.2 Collaborate with the patient and the inter-professional healthcare team in the formulation of evidence based, comprehensive, patient centered, dental hygiene care.
5.3 Employ effective written and verbal communication skills to provide oral health education and promotion in a variety of settings.
## Appendix J: English Department Assessment Plan & Results 2014-2015 (PLOs 1 and 4 were assessed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOs for All English Majors</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 1 - Critical Strategies.</strong> Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language &amp; its literature.</td>
<td>ENGL 2600-Comparison of Pre &amp; Post Test results were compared. Scoring Scale: 3-Significant Improvement is Evident, 2-Moderate Improvement is Evident, 1-No Improvement is Evident</td>
<td>Target: Over 65% of students show &quot;Significant Improvement&quot; on each question.</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; because the target was only <strong>partially met</strong>, the questions for the pre and post-test have been discussed and revised by all class instructors. The test will be administered again in the fall 2015 &amp; spring 2016 semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 1 - Critical Strategies.</strong> Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, &amp; interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language &amp; its literature.</td>
<td>ENGL 2140, ENGL 3600 &amp; ENGL 4700 - Signature assignments in each class were collected &amp; read. Scoring Scale: 5 (excellent)/ 4 (above average)/ 3 (average)/ 2 (below average)/ 1 (unacceptable)</td>
<td>Target: 65% of students will score 3 or above</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; the reading group for each artifact generated a summary of results. The reading groups met &amp; suggested greater continuity be established amongst instructors teaching the same courses. Revisions to the standardized section of the signature assignment rubric have been made for academic year 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 4 - Research &amp; Information Literacy.</strong> Students demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, produce scholarly writing for publication &amp;/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure &amp; source integration.</td>
<td>ENGL 4500- Signature assignments were collected for this class &amp; read. Scoring Scale: Capstone-4/ Milestones-3 &amp; 2/Benchmark-1</td>
<td>Target: 65% of students will score 2 or above on AAC&amp;U Written Communication Value Rubric</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; this reading group made specific recommendations for the program assessment process, the instructors of this course &amp; the assessment reading group. Each recommendation has been discussed with the appropriate group. Progress will be monitored by the assessment coordinator, the assessment reading group &amp; the department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 4 - Research &amp; Information Literacy.</strong> Students demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, produce scholarly writing for publication &amp;/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure &amp; source integration.</td>
<td>ENGL 3030, ENGL 3720 &amp; ENGL 4700 - Signature assignments in each class were collected &amp; read. Scoring Scale: 5 (excellent)/ 4 (above average)/ 3 (average)/ 2 (below average)/ 1 (unacceptable)</td>
<td>Target: 65% of students will score 3 or above</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; the reading groups met &amp; suggested: collect a larger sample of artifacts for Professional/Technical Writing courses; identify specific courses that precede ENGL 3030 &amp; ENGL 4700 &amp; increase the amount &amp; level of instruction given on research &amp; information literacy, specific to the discipline of English. Progress will be monitored by the assessment coordinator, the assessment reading groups &amp; the department chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM: Dixie State University  
Criminal Justice Associate, Baccalaureate and Digital Forensics Certificate Programs  
(Third Year Report - Regent Approval May, 2015)

Program Description

The Criminal Justice program was designed to address varying needs of the criminal justice system and the diverse interests of students. Whether a student desires to enter law enforcement or to pursue a graduate degree in the behavioral sciences, this program offers the appropriate education. The Criminal Justice Program requires common core courses that address the main facets of the modern criminal justice system and the study of it. The program offers two emphases: Criminology and Digital Forensics. This unique facet of the proposed program allows students to pursue an education in traditional Criminal Justice or to be educated in one of the cutting-edge fields of Criminology or Digital Forensics. The program prepares graduates with the necessary knowledge and skills to enter any of the numerous traditional or emerging professions within criminal justice.

Criminal Justice is a program within the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Students may pursue an Associates of Science in Criminal Justice or a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology or Digital Forensics. Students may also obtain a Criminal Justice emphasis in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program. A Certificate in Digital Forensics is available as well. Minors in Criminology and Digital Forensics were approved in September of 2014.

The Criminal Justice provides support to other programs by providing an emphasis in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program. In addition, the digital forensics courses support the Computer & Information Technology department in the following ways: all digital forensics courses above the 1000 level are approved technical electives; CIT students and CJ students pursue the digital forensics certificate; and the CJ2500 A+ Computer Hardware/Windows OS is dual listed with IT1200.

Degrees offered solely by the Criminal Justice Program
Certificate in Digital Forensics
A.S. Criminal Justice
B.A. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology
B.S. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology
B.A. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Digital Forensics
B.S. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Digital Forensics

Interdisciplinary degrees
B.A. Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
B.S. Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Minors (Approved 09/2014)
Minor in Criminology
Minor in Digital Forensics
Mission

The Criminal Justice Program at Dixie State University is committed to:

- Developing students who value the search for knowledge by means of scientific methods and research and to providing students with the knowledge and skills to do so.
- Developing students who appreciate and understand that behavior results from complex interaction between psychological, biological, and sociological factors, among other things.
- Developing students whose understanding of criminology reflects integration of a variety of theoretical perspectives.
- Developing students who appreciate the power of applied criminology to foster physical, social, and communal well-being.
- Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and as future participants in the field of criminal justice.
- Inspiring students to value to use critical thinking as students, scholars, consumers of media, and targets of influence.
- Inspiring students to commit themselves to a lifetime pursuit of knowledge and understanding.

Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes and Strategic Positions

The Criminal Justice Program’s mission is clearly aligned with DSU’s core themes and strategic priorities as set forth in Table 1.

Table 1. CJ Program Alignment with DSU Mission and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSU Mission and Goals</th>
<th>CJ Program Mission and Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals. | -Inspiring students to commit themselves to a lifetime pursuit of knowledge and understanding.  
-Developing students who value the search for knowledge by means of scientific methods and research and to providing students with the knowledge and skills to do so.  
-Developing students whose understanding of criminology reflects integration of a variety of theoretical perspectives. |
| Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration. | -Developing students who appreciate the power of applied criminology to foster physical, social, and communal well-being.  
-Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and future participants in the field of criminal justice. |
| Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment. | -Inspiring students to value to use critical thinking as students, scholars, consumers of media, and targets of influence.  
-Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and future participants in the field of criminal justice. |
History

Recommendations from Previous Review
This Criminal Justice Program proposal was reviewed February 28, 2011, by Curtis D. Fillmore, Chair of the Criminal Justice Department, Utah Valley University. The recommendations of the Reviewer were:
A. Course CJ 1340 titled Introduction to Police Investigation should be changed to Introduction to Criminal Investigation. This title makes it compatible with the other institutions under the articulation agreement.
B. Increase the number of required core criminology and criminal justice courses and decrease the number of elective courses as deemed appropriate to align the credit hours with the other institutions.
Both of these recommendations have been addressed and have led to positive changes in the program.

Accomplishments and/or Changes
- Faculty
At the inception of the Criminal Justice Program, there were two full-time tenure-track faculty. One additional full-time faculty member was hired between 2011-2012 and 2014-2015 (see Table 3 below). Two additional part-time faculty were hired during those years.

Although few in number, the Criminal Justice faculty is accomplished in their respective areas of expertise. All full-time faculty now have Ph.Ds and are dedicated to teaching and providing opportunities for students to be actively involved in the classroom and the community. Criminal Justice faculty also conduct research for publication in scholarly journals and present scholarly work at regional and national conferences. Criminal Justice faculty are active in department and campus governance and service. Criminal Justice Program faculty also regularly serve as presenters in the Social and Behavioral Sciences monthly Brown Bag series presented to faculty, students, and staff.

- Curricula
Two minors in Criminology and Digital Forensics were created in the 2013-2014 academic year and approved in 2014-2015 academic year.

Goals and Program Learning Outcomes

Core Program Goals
Core Program Goal #1: Provide a Base Knowledge of the Criminal Justice System
Learning Outcomes:
- Define the major components of the criminal justice system and the fundamental processes that take place therein.
- Explain the vital role each branch plays in order for the criminal justice system as a whole to perform its proper function.
- Identify the responsibilities and challenges faced by professionals working in the principle branches of the criminal justice system.
- Discuss the process of the development, enforcement, reformation, and behavior of law.
Core Program Goal #2: Communicate the Scientific Pursuit of the Causes of Criminal Behavior

Learning Outcomes:
- List the major criminological theories that have been developed to describe the root causes of criminality.
- Define the causal arguments outlined by these fundamental theories.
- Compare and contrast varying theoretical frameworks.
- Understand basic methodological techniques employed in past and current research done on the causes of criminal behavior and the inter-workings of the criminal justice system.
- Identify and interpret research that illuminates the strengths and weaknesses of current criminal justice policy, as well as research that attempts to reveal the causes of criminal behavior.

Specific Goals for the Emphasis in Criminology

Criminology Emphasis Goal #1: Develop Critical Thinking Skills in Criminology and Criminal Justice

Learning Outcomes:
- Distinguish personal views from knowledge based on empirical research that addresses criminal behavior and the criminal justice system.
- Connect real, diverse facts to criminological theories.
- Collect and use empirical evidence in drawing conclusions and in practice.
- Apply problem solving strategies to create solutions to the many challenges faced by those working in and controlled by the criminal justice system.

Criminology Emphasis Goal #2: Application of Criminology and the Study of Criminal Justice

Learning Outcomes:
- Use criminological theory and crime trends to address criminal behavior within certain contexts.
- Evaluate the costs and benefits of criminal justice programs and policies.
- Identify key applied areas in the discipline and determine whether an applied specialty can provide a solution for a given problem.
- Apply criminological theory and proper research methods to varying criminal behaviors or functions within the criminal justice system.

Specific Goals for the Emphasis in Digital Forensics

Digital Forensics Emphasis Goal #1: Extend the Criminal Justice Base Knowledge Set by Exploring the Subset of Crimes Known as Cybercrimes

Learning Outcomes:
- Understand current technologies, and how these are misused to commit cybercrime.
- Differentiate cybercrime from other criminal activity by using computer base knowledge and current case studies.
- Explore the problems faced by criminal justice professionals through the examination of the yet to be solved challenges resulting from the emergence and proliferation of cybercrime.
• Apply problem solving strategies and sound research to create solutions to the many challenges faced by those dealing with cybercrimes and cybercriminals.

Digital Forensics Emphasis Goal #2: Application of Digital Forensic Tools and Methodologies for Use in Criminal Justice Proceedings
Learning Outcomes:
• Understand different digital forensic methodologies and the correlation of those methodologies for the various environments and situations that can be encountered.
• Evaluate the costs and benefits of the application of digital forensic to court proceedings.
• Know the place digital forensics holds in present criminal justice activity and identify trends that can predict new aspects that will become important in the future.
• Identify each phase of the digital forensic process and apply each phase to current technologies in such a manner that will result in admissible evidence.

Curriculum

Distinguishing Features
The Criminal Justice Program offers two unique bachelor’s degrees; students can earn a degree in Criminal Justice with either an emphasis in Criminology or Digital Forensics. These Bachelor degree emphases are unique in the state, as no other Criminal Justice program in Utah offers a four year degree in this discipline with these specialized areas of training.

Course Additions and Deletions
There have been no course deletions in the past three years. The courses that have been added in the past three years are:
• CJ 3350 American Jails and Prison, CJ 3500 White Collar Crime, CJ 3710, Crimes Against Humanity, CJ 4260 The Criminology and Policy of Terrorism, and CJ 4500 Special Topics: These courses were listed in the Bachelor's Degree proposal and were to be added over the first few years of the program. By adding these courses we provided other valuable upper division courses for our students and diversified the subject matter in our program.
• CJ 4875, Criminal Justice Senior Practicum: This course was designed to address feedback we received through the Senior Survey and better prepares our seniors for success after graduation.

Learning Experiences
Students are provided a broad foundation in criminal justice starting with CJ 1010, the prerequisite for many of the other criminal justice courses. All students are required to take CJ 4780 or CJ 4790, two integrative courses in criminology or digital forensics in their senior year. The goal of these courses is for students to integrate the many subfields of their respective emphasis area through the development of an applied or research paper/project and presentation. Given DSU’s mission, size and goals, the Criminal Justice Program provides excellent breadth and depth.
The CJ Program offers internship opportunities. Students have completed internships in law, law enforcement, and the judicial system. Advanced students participating in the digital forensics program have the opportunity to assist in this training providing excellent experience. Students have assisted with this training on campus, at professional conferences, and this past year, 5 students assisted overseas in Thailand through our partnership with the Royal Thai Police.

Policies and Practices to Ensure Uniformity in Courses
The base of the Criminal Justice Program is comparable to the program at Utah Valley University, Weber State University, and Southern Utah University as well as other peer institutions. However, the two aforementioned emphasis areas make the Criminal Justice Program unique as no other Criminal Justice program in the state offers a four year degree in this discipline with these specialized areas of training. Criminal Justice faculty have participated in discussions with representatives of each USHE institution at the annual Major’s meeting. As a result of this interaction, the Criminal Justice Program is consistent with the high standards established by sister programs in the state, while offering a curriculum that capitalizes on our unique faculty expertise, and more importantly, our unique Dixie State University Mission.

Students
Student enrollment and graduation data are set forth in Table 2. The data reveal a rapid increase in enrollment in the Criminal Justice Program over the past three years with increases from 270 the first year to 612 the third year. The number of majors in the baccalaureate programs grew to 180 in the first three years of the program’s existence. Data reveal that the majority of students in the Criminal Justice majors are male and approximately 29% of students are minorities.

Table 2. Student Credit Hours, FTE and Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Majors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yr. Majors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Majors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment
Enrollment grew since the inception of the Criminal Justice Program. The program proposal anticipated that we would there would be 130 FTE in the fourth year of the program and the FTE for Fall 2014 was 132.5, with enrollment of 689 students. As of fall, 2014, there were 85 associate majors and 262 declared Criminal Justice baccalaureate majors.

Time to Degree
According to the Senior Survey, most students graduated in 4-5 academic years.

Graduation
The number of graduates has increased each year. The number of students declaring Criminal Justice as their baccalaureate major (262 as of the Fall 2014) has nearly tripled the number of students declaring Criminal Justice as the focus of their AS degree.

Employment Status
Many of the programs’ graduates have found employment in criminal justice related fields. Some have entered the field of law enforcement/corrections, the world of corporate security, and the area of human services.

Graduate School
Students graduating from the Criminal Justice Program have entered graduate programs both in state (i.e. SUU, WSU, UofU) and nationally (i.e. Arizona State University, Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology, Pepperdine University, University of Oklahoma).

Future Enrollment
Continued growth in enrollment in the Criminal Justice Program over the next few years is anticipated. With the current total of 347 majors, the program is one of the largest DSU majors.

Assessment of Student Learning

Measures of Student Learning
Faculty employ various methods of assessing student achievement in the courses they teach. In general, faculty use graded quizzes, exams, assignments, papers, and projects to assess student achievement.

Additionally, the Criminal Justice Program has distributed the Senior Survey to all Criminal Justice baccalaureate graduates since the inception of the program. In part, results suggest that criminal justice graduates are satisfied with the DSU Criminal Justice Program and feel that it met their expectations. For example, on student remarked, “My plans were to start in police work then go into adult probation and parole. I feel academically I was ready to accomplish these tasks…” Another student, who continued their education in a graduate program stated, “Graduate school requires an excessive amount of writing and reading. Both were heavily covered in a majority of my classes. In addition, I believe the course work in this program provided a great foundation for future criminal justice work.”

In order to assess the program’s success in achieving its program learning goals and outcome, the Criminal Justice Program has developed and is in the process of implementing a 5-year
Evidence of Student Learning

As per the program’s assessment plan, faculty are currently gathering and assessing artifacts to bolster the direct measures of the program’s learning outcomes. The continued growth of graduates from the program will allow future assessment efforts to quicken. Nonetheless, assessment from indirect measures has provided invaluable feedback about the Criminal Justice Program at DSU. Through the senior survey, it was learned that students need more career advising. Moreover, one student suggested the program, “stress internships and certain programs that will help prepare students for the real world.”

In response to this, the Criminal Justice Program is developing a study abroad program for students and is strongly encouraging students to participate in the internship program. Additionally, CJ 4875 Criminal Justice Senior Practicum was developed to aid students in their transition from school to the workforce.

Lastly, to ensure students are prepared to continue their education or enter the workforce as future leaders in their field the Criminal Justice Program offers a strong foundation in theory, statistics, and research methods. Additionally, Criminal Justice faculty works closely with students on faculty-led and student-led projects. Faculty have even mentored students and accompanied them to professional conferences. Despite the sparse number of faculty in the Criminal Justice Program, online classes have been developed in the Digital Forensics emphasis to assist students who may not be able to attend courses in person.

Staffing-Related Information

Faculty

Current, full-time tenure-track faculty and their credentials are set forth in Table 3. Full and part-time faculty numbers by degree and year are shown in Table 4. Non-tenure track faculty and their credentials are set forth in Table 5 and Part-time/Adjunct Faculty are in Table 6.

Table 3. Full-time Tenure-track Faculty (2014-15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree &amp; Date</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Hired at DSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell, Gary</td>
<td>Ph.D., 2012</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Digital Forensics Coordinator</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Lish</td>
<td>Ph.D., 2011</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Program Head, Criminology Coordinator</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, R.C.</td>
<td>Ph.D. 2014</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Internship Coordinator</td>
<td>July 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Headcount of Faculty and FTE Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured (Tenure Track)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Master’s Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Non-Tenure-Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, Bill</td>
<td>M.A., 1996</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Lewis University</td>
<td>DSUCCI Director/ Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runs Through, Joan</td>
<td>M.Ed., 2013</td>
<td>Education in Learning and Technology</td>
<td>Western Governors University</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatum, Michael</td>
<td>Ed.D., 1983</td>
<td>CJ Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>.74 Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Part-time/Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConkie, Marshall</td>
<td>J.D., 2006</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Valparaiso University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, M. Rick</td>
<td>J.D., 2003</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter, Craig</td>
<td>J.D., 1993</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashir, Shadman</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>California Western School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Don</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschler, Matt</td>
<td>M.F.T., 1997 Ph.D., 2011</td>
<td>Marriage and Family Therapy</td>
<td>Phillips Graduate Institute CSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff/Advising

The Criminal Justice program does not have any staff working in the program full-time. There is a full-time secretary for the department of Social and Behavioral Sciences and her time is split between the many programs in the department. Staff are listed in Table 7. One staff member provides the primary secretarial support for the Criminal Justice Program (Katrina Haney). One part-time staff provides all of the Criminal Justice Program’s advising (Lindsay Huber).

Table 7. Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haney, Katrina</td>
<td>FT Secretary</td>
<td>August, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, Lindsay</td>
<td>.74 Advisor</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research

Full-time faculty members in the department are very active in ongoing research for presentation at conferences, for publication in professional or scholarly journals, and for student training. Faculty have presented at preeminent conferences in their respective field, including the Annual Conference of the American Society of Criminology and the Violent Crimes Task Force Convention. In the last three years faculty has also published in books, professional publications such as *American Jails*, and academic journals including the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* and the *Journal of Digital Forensics Security and Law*.

Service

The digital forensics program has researched and developed new cell phone data extraction techniques/hardware that provide a cost effective option for law enforcement who perform digital forensics on cell phones through direct NAND memory access.
This option was previously not affordable by most law enforcement agencies. In addition to their regular class load, the digital forensics program is providing professional training using this hardware/technique to law enforcement agencies. The monies received from this training support scholarships and internship opportunities for students within the digital forensics program.

The digital forensics lab on campus continues to flourish with an average of 400 cell phone exams a year performed by faculty. Thus, the faculty is able to discuss real world experiences and present current problems in the field in the classroom environment. In turn our students have formed a volunteer organization and are taking some of their classroom training into the real world by giving internet safety and professionalism training to local high schools and other organizations.

Ongoing service has also been provided to the assessment committee at the federal courthouse in Salt Lake City.

Development and Recruitment

The greatest impediment to faculty productivity in the Criminal Justice program is lack of additional faculty. For the first three years, only two full-time faculty labored in the program; one in each respective emphasis area. The 2014-2015 academic year brought a new hire to the program, but multiple additions to the faculty in varying areas of expertise are in order for the program and its faculty to be as productive and efficient as possible.

Funding-Related Information

Technology

Technological resources in the program are aging, but are currently sufficient. The Digital Forensics emphasis is implementing a lab fee to help keep the equipment and programming updated.

Distance Learning

The Digital Forensics emphasis offers CJ 1900 and CJ 2700 as online courses. As faculty numbers grow, the program hopes to expand the number of online and distance learning courses.

Library

The DSU library has been very responsive to the needs of the Criminal Justice Program. Many lower-division courses utilize library resources, and all upper-division courses utilize library resources. The library subscribes to EbscoHost which provides access to key academic research articles. Articles that are not available on campus can be ordered through interlibrary loan in a relatively short amount of time. The library holdings and resources are current and relevant for the Criminal Justice Program.
Facilities

The Criminal Justice Program faculty, staff and students reside in the University Plaza, Building D. Humanities courses are also frequently taught in the University Plaza, Building D.

The University Plaza is an off-campus facility rented by DSU that also houses the Humanities Department. The offices are spacious and comfortable, although the peripheral location of the University Plaza provides some difficulty for our students. Students struggle to arrive to class on time because ten minutes isn’t enough time to race from a class on main campus to the University Plaza or because they are circling our sparse parking lot searching for spots that aren’t available. As DSU continues to expand, both of these problems will grow exponentially.

The majority of the classrooms have tables that seat three or four students creating multiple rows of seating. While all classrooms have computers with internet access, projectors, document cameras, DVD players and video recorders, the computers are well used. All classrooms have whiteboards.

Faculty and staff offices are furnished adequately and contain filing cabinets and book shelves. All full-time and part-time faculty have telephones, computers and printers.

Conclusions

Program Strengths

Results from the Senior Survey suggest that the Criminal Justice faculty is one of the strengths of the program. As one student noted, “I believe all of the teacher’s knowledge and experience of how the criminal justice system works and being able to apply real life scenarios was by far the biggest strength.” Student comments about faculty were overwhelmingly positive and focused on how individual faculty helped prepare students for graduate school, encouraged students to succeed, and were very knowledgeable in their area of expertise.

Individualized instruction is another strength of the Criminal Justice Program. Despite the rapid growth of the Criminal Justice Program over the past three years, there is a strong focus on student development. Classes in Criminal Justice are relatively small to ensure a personalized education for Criminal Justice majors with a limit of approximately 40 students for lower-division courses and 25 for upper-division courses.

Program Weaknesses

The biggest weakness of the Criminal Justice Program is the dearth of full-time faculty. According to the approved degree proposal, the program should have at least one more full-time faculty member by now. The steady increase in majors has made this need more acute. Without
the hiring of new full-time faculty in the very near future, we will be unable to provide the number of courses demanded and needed by our students.

**Comprehensive Plan for the Future**

Because the Criminal Justice Program is a relatively young program that has grown rapidly, there are many opportunities for improvement to address challenges and foster a culture of excellence within the Program. The Criminal Justice Program endeavors to foster excellence in teaching and research experiences through faculty development, instructional resources, collaboration, and technology.

The Criminal Justice Program developed CJ 3100 as a cross-listed course with the Psychology Program and CJ 2700 as a cross-listed course with Information Technology. The Criminal Justice Program will continue to look for opportunities to collaborate with other programs on campus to best meet the needs of students on campus and foster faculty collaboration to provide excellent academic preparation for our students.

The faculty is eager to assess program learning outcomes to address challenges identified through program evaluation. Results from the Senior Survey have been instructive and are being used to address challenges within the program. Feedback from students suggests that the Program needs to continue to add more faculty to diversify course offerings and provide more learning opportunities to students. This is a priority for the Program.

As mentioned previously, the Criminal Justice Program is currently developing a study abroad program for our students and is strongly encouraging students to participate in our internship program. Faculty will continue to develop programs that increase our students’ opportunity for experiential learning.

Lastly, in order for criminal justice students to succeed in the workplace or graduate school, they need practical research experience. Criminal Justice Program faculty are committed to meeting these needs and will continue to work with and encourage students to participate in various research opportunities.
Dixie State University Computer Crime Institute
Academic Program Progress Report

Background

Recent studies show 90% of all criminal activity will in some way involve the use of a mobile device. Mobile phones are utilized by criminals to not only facilitate traditional, non-digital crimes such as kidnapping, but are also used to commit digitally driven crimes like cyber stalking and distracted driving. Law enforcement in the State of Utah is continually challenged with the issue of how to collect and analyze evidence stored on a mobile device. This challenge is compounded by the fact that the Federal Regional Computer Forensics Lab in Salt Lake City and other law enforcement labs currently provide little if any support for small device forensics. The availability of mobile phone forensic expertise is hindered by the initial cost to establish a lab, the yearly expense of maintaining a lab, and the availability of local expertise.

The DSU CCI Academic programs began in the Spring of 2010. The original design was two programs; the BS Degree in Criminal Justice with Digital Forensics Emphasis and the Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics. Since inception the program has expanded to include two other programs for a total of four academic offerings.

Current Programs

- BS Degree in Criminal Justice with a Digital Forensics Emphasis
- Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics
- Minor in Digital Forensics
- Digital Forensics Basics Certificate Program

The BS degree was intended for a student seeking a BS degree in criminal justice, who wished to explore a digital forensics route instead of the traditional. This program has been successful and has seen continued growth since inception. There are recruitment programs at various levels in an effort to continue that growth. Current enrollment in this program is at 43. (See Table 1 for student completion counts by year)

The Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics was targeted toward working law enforcement who already have a degree or current students in technical fields like DSU’s Information Technology and Computer Science programs. In 2012 an agreement was made with the CIT department to include all digital forensics class 2000 and above as technical electives in their programs. Since then, there has been a growth of these non-CJ students in the certificate program. The Digital Forensics Minor was added in 2014 to better accommodate these non-CJ students.

The addition of the minor has caused a decrease in participation in the certificate of completion program, but inquiries about the certificate program from individuals who are currently working in digital forensics and related fields have increased. In response, the division is exploring re-tooling this program to decrease GE requirements and increase online course opportunities. Re-tooling the certificate completion program as a remote or partly
remote “professional” program should increase participation.

In 2013, the Digital Forensics Basics Certificate was created through a Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training Program grant from the Department of Labor. This is a separate fewer credit certificate program as compared to the certificate of completion. For those already employed in the fields of law enforcement or IT security, this certificate is evidences of a developing career pathway. The certificate is comprised of three stackable courses, CJ 1900, CJ 2700, and CJ 4750. Students completing these courses in conjunction with studies in IT security and/or criminal justice are qualified for entry level computer forensic positions. This certificate also provides students with entry into other programs, including DSU’s Certificate of Completion in Computer Forensics. The three Digital Forensics Basics courses have been adapted to an online format utilizing state-of-art platforms, methods, and technologies to bring these courses to the greatest number of students possible, including those in geographic locations distant from DSU.

Table 1: Students Completing Programs by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baccalaureate Program</th>
<th>Certificate of Completion</th>
<th>Basic Certificate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Initiated - 0</td>
<td>Initiated - 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initiated - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Initiated - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Digital Forensics Lab

Dixie State University’s Computer Crime Institute (DSU-CCI) established its digital forensics lab in 2011 with the needs of Utah’s law enforcement agencies in mind. Since its creation, the DSU-CCI has provided a unique service to law enforcement while pioneering the development of advanced cell phone forensics processes. As a result, the DSU-CCI has one of the most advanced cell phone forensics labs in the USA.

The professionalism and expertise of the DSU-CCI can be illustrated by the following quote from a Salt Lake City Police Department homicide detective. The statement was made in relation to the forensic examination of a phone submitted to the lab in connection with a homicide investigation. “We have had the FBI screw up phones with zero results for years. It’s great to know we have a local resource that can get things done right….and quickly. Thanks again!” The technique used to exam this particular phone was a “chip off” process that allows password protected phones to be examined. The DSU-CCI is one of only a few labs in the
nation that can conduct “chip off” exams and the only lab that can boast a better than 95% success rate utilizing said process.

In addition to the hundreds of digital exams the DSU-CCI has performed, the lab has also taught week-long law enforcement training on various advanced cell phone forensic techniques, provided workshops for groups as diverse as the Department of Wildlife Resources Western States Conference, the ESMART camps for girls entering the 8th grade and has assisted other states law enforcement agencies with difficult exams. The DSU-CCI has also presented cell phone forensics training at international conferences such as the Paraben Forensic Innovations Conference and has taught cell phone forensic classes to officers involved with the Boston marathon bombing investigation, and investigators of the Royal Thai Police from Bangkok, Thailand.
Criminal Justice Report Appendix A:

NWCCU Confirmation of Required DSU Mid-Cycle Report Addendums

Mon 6/8/2015 12:00 PM
Les Steele <LSteele@nwccu.org>

RE: Confirmation of Required Addendums for Dixie State University Mid-cycle Report

To: Bryant, Debbie; Ela Buckley

You replied to this message on 6/8/2015 12:32 PM.


Greetings Debra,

I do hope you will soon be able to enjoy the summer!

I have gone back through the file reviewing letters and you are correct – your Mid Cycle Report only needs to include an addendum regarding the Criminal Justice program.

I hope this helps!!

Take care,
Les

Les Steele, PhD
Executive Vice President
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
lsteele@nwccu.org
425 566-4224
**DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY CORE THEMES RESULTS (2014-2015)**

**MISSION:** Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community & the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, & community.

**Core Theme One: A Culture of Learning**

*Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; & prepares knowledgeable & competent students who achieve their educational goals.*

**Objective 1: Foster a campus-wide culture of learning**

Outcome A: *Provide a wide variety of learning resources & support to advance the knowledge of students, faculty, & staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measure: NSSE Grouping - First Year & Senior Interaction Results (Q13) Target: ≥ 5/7 pt quality scale | Quality of Interactions:  
13b - Advisor Interaction: FY 5.0 / SR 5.4 (Met)  
13c - Faculty Interaction: FY 5.3 / SR 6.0 (Met)  
13d - Student Services: FY 4.9 / SR 4.9 (No Significant Difference)  
13e - Other Admin: FY 5.1 / SR 5.5 (Met) | Met |
| Measure: NSSE Grouping - Campus Environment Target: When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR). | Significantly Higher Results (Met):  
Quality of Interactions (SR)  
Supportive Environment (FY, SR)  
No Significant Difference (Unmet):  
Quality of Interactions (FY) | Met |
| Measure: Student Satisfaction Survey for Fall 2014 End-of-Term Survey Target: 80% of respondents agree or are satisfied with their DSU experience | Would choose to attend DSU again? (89% - Met)  
Overall satisfaction with DSU (92% - Met)  
Newly developed Student Satisfaction Survey to be conducted in 2015/16 | Met |
| Measure: Great Colleges Survey: Job satisfaction/ support; Facilities Target: DSU will be higher than Public Carnegie. Target: Good to Excellent range (≥ 65%). | Job Satisfaction/ Support - DSU 76; 2014 Carnegie Public Baccalaureate 71 (Met)  
Facilities - DSU 76; 2014 Carnegie Public Baccalaureate 70 (Met) | Met |
| Measure: Faculty Teaching Practices | Question 1: How satisfied are you with the following resources on campus? Mean of Means 3.50 (Met) | Met |
Office Space 3.46
Lab Space 3.88
Classroom Space 3.16
Library resources 3.68
Computer & Technical Resources 3.23
Clerical Support 3.62
Administrative support 3.31
Technical support 3.40
Teaching resources & support 3.36
Research support 3.54
Support for securing grants 3.83
Human resources support 3.17
Business services support 3.74
Custodial support 3.69
Facilities support 3.51
Food services 3.44
Bookstore 3.52
Health & wellness services 3.88
Campus police 3.59
New & continuing faculty orientation & training 3.08

Question 2: The institution provides adequate support & opportunity for me to advance my learning & development.
Mean of 3.32 (Met)

Question 8: The institution's technology meets my needs as a faculty member.
Mean of 3.63 (Met)

Recommendations:
1) Student Services will further investigate meaning of lower quality interaction scores for freshmen & seniors (13d) in the NSSE survey via focus groups.
2) The data used is from Fall 2014 End-of-Term Survey from student services. The survey should be replaced by Student Satisfaction Survey (Institutional survey).
3) The Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey scale used a 4-point scale with NA as a fifth response option. It is recommended that a 5 point scale be used: Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neutral, satisfied, very satisfied, NA.
4) The Teaching & Learning Center should be involved in the administration & analysis of the Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey.

Objective Fulfillment:
Based on the data provided for 1.1.A, the objective of providing a wide variety of learning resources & support to advance the knowledge of students, faculty, & staff, was met.

Outcome B: Offer quality educational programs in response to need & demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Comparison of DSU program offerings to peer institution offerings</td>
<td>1) Missing degrees in the following CIP Code Categories (Unmet): Social Sciences Physical Sciences (USHE approval 2015) Philosophy &amp; Religious Studies Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences General Studies &amp; Humanities Public Administration &amp; Social Service Professions Parks Recreation Leisure &amp; Fitness Studies (USHE approval 2015) 2) Insufficient data from student surveys. (Unknown)</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs offered by ≥60% of peer institutions, 2) high student demand, &amp; 3) high market demand.</td>
<td>3) Work groups researching the relationship between career demand &amp; specific degree proposals. (Unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Measure:** Regent review & approval process of new degrees  
**Target:** Target: 90% of new degrees proposed are approved. | 7 new degree proposals – 5 approved (71%), 2 pending approval  
5 minors proposed – 5 approved (100%), 0 pending approval  
9 new emphases proposed, 8 approved (89%), 1 pending approval  
1 program endorsement proposed & approved (100%)  
**Met** |
| **Measure:** External evaluator report rating for 5 year program reviews  
**Target:** All program reviews will receive no less than “met academic & professional standards” (on a 3 point scale) by external reviewers. | For the 2014-15 AY, there were 5 academic programs under review. At this point in time, of the 5 programs, 3 have had an external evaluator, & all have met academic & professional standards based on their report.  
**Met** |
| **Measure:** Regent review & approval process of 5 year program reviews  
**Target:** 100% programs will be approved. | The 5 programs are still being processed, & have not been sent for approval by the Regents yet. The expected internal & external approval process should begin in September 2015.  
**Unknown** |
| **Measure:** NSSE groupings – Academic Challenge; Learning with Peers; High Impact Practices  
**Target:** When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR). | **Partially Met**  
Academic Challenge & Learning with Peers  
Significantly Higher Results (Met):  
Higher-Order Learning (SR)  
Reflective & Integrative Learning (SR)  
Learning Strategies (SR)  
No Significant Difference (UnMet):  
Quantitative Reasoning (FY, SR)  
Collaborative Learning (SR)  
Discussions with Diverse Others (FY, SR)  
Higher-Order Learning (FY)  
Learning Strategies (FY)  
Significantly Lower Results (Unmet):  
Reflective & Integrative Learning (FY)  
Collaborative Learning (FY) |

**Recommendations:**
1) Conduct feasibility study for missing CIP Code degrees.
2) May consider improving the new degree proposal process to be more efficient so that all programs proposed in one academic year get all the required approvals in that same year. The other option would be that 90% of new degrees proposed within an academic year are approved that same year. Also, may consider changing the outcome to be “Regent & NWCCU review & approval”.
3) Create a template & rubric for the program review external evaluators to use.
4) Move programs through the 5 year program review process more in line with the suggested timeline. Lag data for a year.
5) Include 3 year follow up reports for new degrees as part of the assessment process to evaluate academic & professional standards.
6) Programs should review their NSSE results, research the concepts, & provide faculty training.
7) Teaching & Learning Center will provide seminars & online resources on best practices related to NSSE engagement indicators.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
Based on the data provided for 1.1.B., the objective of offering quality educational programs in response to need & demand, was partially met. But, according to the number of recommendations is definitely an area that needs attention.

**Objective 2: Deliver excellent teaching in a student centered environment**

A) *Faculty are qualified & strive to teach effectively*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Percent of faculty with terminal degrees in each school</td>
<td>Faculty with Terminal Degrees</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: Regents requires 60% of DSU faculty (FTE, Full-time &amp; adjunct) have terminal degrees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Terminal Degrees for DSU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis Title</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Fac w/ Terminal Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Fac w/ Terminal Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fac w/ Terminal Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**By Academic School**

2014-2015

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure: Credit hours taught by part-time faculty
Target: Less than 40% of Student Credit Hours Generated by Part-time Faculty (Faculty Workload).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Institutional Student Credit Hours Generated by Part Time Instructors</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Faculty Overload</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Adjunct and Wage Rated Instructors</td>
<td>38.68%</td>
<td>34.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent of Institutional Student Credit Hours Generated by Part Time Instructors</td>
<td>42.88%</td>
<td>40.58%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure: Qualification of faculty teaching upper division courses.
Target: 100% of upper division courses are taught by faculty with a terminal degree (or working toward) as required by regent policy.
No current data available.

Measure: Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey – items related to active learning pedagogical practices including trends on use of technology
Target: Increase in use of technology & pedagogical techniques by 5% in 3 years.

Active learning pedagogical practices Baseline (Q3, Q4 & Q6):
Unknown (Baseline data)
Q4 Rank order the five teaching practices from the dropdown list that you use most frequently (1 being most frequent)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practices</th>
<th>Number of Respondents that selected this teaching practice as one of their top five</th>
<th>% of respondents selecting this teaching practice</th>
<th>Average % of teaching practice usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76.27%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussions</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74.76%</td>
<td>15.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In class group work</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46.33%</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40.11%</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.51%</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.88%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-studies / Real world situations</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.73%</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student presentations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.16%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual representations (models, maps, diagrams, graphs)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.77%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning / Field studies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research papers and/or projects</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision with feedback opportunities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussions, activities, or labs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.69%</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-spot comprehension checks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective writing / Journaling / Blogs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of class team work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student peer evaluations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial engagement question or problem</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-selected content topics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental instruction outside of class and office hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic games</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live performances</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required community service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Deliberate inclusion of diverse students               | 4                                                                                 | 2.26%                                           |                                      |
| Debates                                                | 3                                                                                 | 1.69%                                           |                                      |

**Total Respondents**: 177
Measure: Number of Faculty serviced by Center for Teaching and Learning
Target: Faculty use of the Center for Teaching and Learning will increase by 5% in 3 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Annual Teaching and Learning Conference – 150 Lunch &amp; Learn Sessions – 241 CTL Workshops – 106 Conducted Individual and Departmental Consultations – 103</td>
<td>Total Faculty and Staff participation at sponsored events: 600</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations:**
1) While maintain the number of part-time faculty with terminal degrees, focus on percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees.
2) Special attention should be paid by Health Sciences and Education to monitor need and requirements for terminal degrees.
3) Continue to monitor percentage of credit hours generated by part-time instructors.
4) Change active learning indicator benchmarks to align with the Teaching Practices & Resources Survey questions. For example, survey question 7 asks how frequently do you incorporate the following forms of technology, and the response options range from Never to Very Often. Based on the latter, cannot determine the increase in usage of 5% in 3 years.
5) Baseline was set at 600 participants at CTL events. Recommend revising the measure to: Number of participants to events organized by the Center for Teaching and Learning.
6) If faculty are not to teach overload, then more full-time faculty must be hired in order to not exceed optimal adjunct teaching percentage.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
Based on the data provided above for 1.2.A, the objective of meeting faculty qualifications was partially met. The limit for the portion of instruction by part-time faculty was met. Data for faculty striving to teach effectively is baseline and will be monitored by the Center for Teaching and Learning.

### B) Students engage in active learning in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student Pedagogy Survey – items related to active learning practices Target: 75% of students indicated faculty use 3 or more active learning techniques some of the time (or more).</td>
<td>Survey to be conducted in 2015/16.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: NSSE Grouping – High Impact Practices Target: When mean comparisons are statistically &amp; practically significant, DSU mean will be higher</td>
<td>High Impact Practices Significantly Higher Results (Met); Service Learning (FY, SR) Research with Faculty (FY, SR) Learning Community (SR) Culminating Senior Experience (SR) No Significant Difference (Unmet); Internship or Field Exp. (SR)Student Significantly Lower Results (Unmet);</td>
<td>First Year Partially Met Seniors Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations:
1) Increase emphasis on junior & senior students participating in internships & practical field experience. Deans identify areas in their divisions where they should be utilized to the students’ career advantage.
2) Have the Center for Teaching & Learning research learning communities & study abroad best practices & make recommend to Academic VP & Deans regarding their application at DSU.
3) The Center for Teaching & Learning should continue to present seminars on a variety of high impact learning practices.

Objective Fulfillment:
Based on the NSSE data for 1.2.B. Students engage in active learning in the classroom, shoe need for an increase in number of students participating in High Impact Learning Practices, especially at the freshman level.

C) The institution maintains an atmosphere characterized by strong relationships & positive interpersonal interactions between faculty & students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measure: Student to faculty ratio (IPEDS)  
Target: Student to faculty ratio is 25:1 or lower. | Data from the common data set.  
| | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| **Student to Faculty Ratio** | 24 | 20 | 25 | 23 | 20 |
| **Students** | 6631 | 6663 | 6539 | 6227 | 6404 |
| **Faculty** | 267 | 333 | 263 | 271 | 315 |
| * Calculations of students and faculty are all full-time plus 1/3 of part-time. | | | | | |
| Measure: Percentage of courses by student class size range (Common Data Set)  
Target: More than 65% of class sections have less than 30 students. | [Common Data Set - Class Section Counts]  
% Class Size < 30 | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| | 72% | 73% | 74% | 74% | 74% |
| **Sum** | 982 | 1036 | 1046 | 1029 | 1127 |
| Measure: NSSE grouping – Experience with Faculty  
Target: DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR). | Significantly Higher Results (Met):  
Student-Faculty Interactions (SR)  
Effective Teaching Practices (FY & SR)  
No Significant Difference (Unmet):  
Student-Faculty Interactions (FY) | Met

Measure: Student Satisfaction Survey (Faculty Section – Interpersonal questions)  
Target: 60% will agree/strongly agree on a 5 point satisfaction scale. | Survey to be conducted in 2015/16 | Unknown

Recommendations:
1) It is time to reconsider faculty to student ratio and class size targets.
2) Increase emphasis on faculty interactions with freshman. At most vulnerable stage of higher education, faculty should more fully engage freshman.
3) Divisions should review NSSE results, research the indicators, and respond accordingly.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
Based on the data for 1.2.C regarding the target percentage of employees indicating that the institution maintains an atmosphere characterized by strong relationships & positive interpersonal interactions between faculty & students, is met. With change to university status and growth, the institution needs to reconsider targets and respond to growth and develop challenges.

**Objective 3: Develop students’ knowledge & skills, enabling them to succeed in a changing & competitive world**

**A) Students develop & master relevant knowledge & skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: GE learning outcome attainment, based on AAC&amp;U’s VALUE rubrics (4 point scale) Target: 70% of students will perform at a 2-3 (milestones), some competency.</td>
<td>The General Education Assessment Committee is responsible for assessing student competency of the General Education Outcomes. During the 2013-14 academic years, two skills were assessed: (a) written communication &amp; (b) critical thinking. <strong>Written Communication:</strong> For written communication, a random selection of student work from the ENGL 2010 course was assessed using the AAC&amp;U VALUE rubric for Written Communication. The ENGL 2010 course was chosen because it is a course all DSU students are required to take.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>context and purpose of writing</th>
<th>content development</th>
<th>genre disciplinary conventions</th>
<th>sources and evidence</th>
<th>control in syntax and mechanics</th>
<th>total score (total score possible 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R5-R6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4-R5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5-R6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6-R7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that target was achieved from the written communication assessment. Overall, students scored between 2.6 & 2.93 on the five criteria of the rubric, with the lowest average score when providing sources & evidence (2.6 on a 4-point scale).

**Critical Thinking:** For critical thinking, a total of 95 student artifacts were randomly selected from all sections of the following courses: (a) English 1010, (b) Mathematics 1210, (c) Art 1010, (d) Humanities 1010, (e) Chemistry 1210/1215, & (f) Physics 1010. The intent was to sample artifacts from a selection of GE courses that represented the student enrollment patterns. A form of the AAC&U VALUE rubric for Critical Thinking was used to assess the students’ work.
Since each content area had raters that specialized in their specific discipline, it was not possible to analyze the data simultaneously. Therefore, the results are presented on different linear scales, & summarized separately. The results indicate that target was partially met in all discipline areas for most of the five criteria on the rubric. Students scored lowest when: (a) explaining the issue in ART 1010, (b) providing evidence in ENGL 1010, CHEM 1215, & PHYS 1010, (c) analyzing assumptions in ENGL 1010, (d) defending their position in MATH 1210 & HUM 1010, & (e) drawing conclusions in HUM 1010. The fact that the data could not be aggregated poses some difficulty for the GE committee when evaluating Critical Thinking for the GE program as a whole, & setting benchmarks for future assessment cycles. These findings were presented to stakeholders such as the General Education committee, the Deans, the Vice President of Academics, & the English faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>explanation of issue</th>
<th>evidence</th>
<th>influence of content</th>
<th>student's position</th>
<th>conclusion</th>
<th>total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 1210</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1010</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 1010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 1215</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 1010</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 1010</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure: Percent of programs meeting their PLO benchmarks based on rubric ratings (3-point scale: 1) not met, 2) met, 3) exceeded)
Threshold: 75% of programs will submit completed Assessment Forms.
Target: Of those responding 70% of programs/outcomes will have at least met their PLO benchmarks.

Over 83% of the programs, according to assigned workspace, had an assessment plan with findings & action plan that was shared or reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not started</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred twenty three measures were identified for this academic year. Of those reviewed, 92 measures reported findings. Of the 92, results show 20% (18) did not meet their target, 38% (35) met their target & 20% (18) exceeded their target.

Threshold: Met
Target: UnMet
Recommendations:

1) General Education - Written Communication: According to AAC&U, a score of 2 or 3 represent intermediate milestones that indicate that students are moving toward more complex & sophisticated demonstrations of learning. Therefore, an average score between 2 & 3 would be an acceptable level of achievement for students in their general education program. A limitation to the findings is that the sample size was halved due to the fact that half of the scores were not as reliable even though the raters were calibrated. More attention will be placed on obtaining reliable scores in the next assessment cycle.

2) General Education – Critical Thinking: The main recommendations for this assessment are (a) increase the sampling across more GE courses for each outcome assessed, & (b) to try to standardize the use of the rubric so that data can be aggregated.

3) For academic program assessment, adjust threshold & target to match Taskstream reports.

4) For academic program assessment, change threshold language to “75% of the programs, according to assigned workspace, will have an assessment plan with findings & action plan shared or reviewed”.

5) For academic program assessment, change language to “70% of measures identified with findings will have at least met their target”.

6) Reduce the number of unspecified measures.

7) Total budget request amount affiliated with action plans aligned to findings is $200,000. The resources requested should be reviewed by the respective Deans to evaluate how providing the resources can help academic programs better meet their targets.

Outcome Fulfillment:

Based on the data provided for 1.3.A, the objective that students develop & master relevant knowledge & skills was partially met. The critical issues are process improvement, increasing the number programs reporting findings, & dean involvement.

The target for programs meeting their learning outcome benchmarks was unmet. It is critical that faculty use this data to improve their programs and, thereby, the success of students in accomplishing their learning outcomes.
Objective 4: Support student achievement of their educational goals

A) Support students in the transition to, progress in & attainment of their chosen major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Retention rate (2012: 58.3% for 4 year public institutions with open selectivity reported by ACT) Target: Meet national average retention rates.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Retention Rate Graph" /></td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student satisfaction survey (questions 94-99, General comments) Target: 80% of students will agree or strongly agree with the statement.</td>
<td>Survey to be conducted in 2015/16</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Measure: NSSE Grouping – Quality of Interactions Target: When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR). | Q3: Student-Faculty Interactions (SR) (Met)  
Student-Faculty Interactions (FY) (No significant Difference - Unmet)  
Quality Interactions (FY)  
13a – Students: FY 5.5 / SR 6.0 (Met)  
13b - Advisor Interaction: FY 5.0 / SR 5.4 (Met)  
13c - Faculty Interaction: FY 5.3 / SR 6.0 (Met)  
13d - Student Services: FY 4.9 / SR 4.9 (No significant Difference - Unmet)  
13e - Other Admin: FY 5.1 / SR 5.5 (Met) | Met, except for First Year Student-Faculty Interactions & Student Services Interactions |
| Measure: Graduating student survey (questions 83-88 educational goals, Overall) Target: 80% of students will agree | Survey piloted Spring 2015. Will be revised & conducted Fall 2015. | Unknown |
or strongly agree
with the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Non-returning student survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: Will be used as a needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results conducted in Spring 2014 of Fall 2012 Cohorts students who did not return in the Fall 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 Non-Returners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reasons: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Difficulties: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping Administratively: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission: 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Responsibilities: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Obligations: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change In Work: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Do Online: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Degrees awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target: Degrees awarded trend upward by degree type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Graduation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2012 is 27.2% for 4 year public institutions with open selectivity reported by ACT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: Meet national average graduation rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure: Time to degree from Complete College America (2008: 55 months, reported by 2012-2013 Full-time, Bachelor-Degree seeking from CCA is 5.84 years = 70.08 months. |
| Unmet |
the National Center for Education Stats)  
Target: Meet national median time to degree.

**Recommendations:**
1) Investigate why retention rate fell in 2013. Utilize best practices to improve retention.  
2) Concerted effort is needed to engage freshman, in particular, in positive and meaningful interactions with faculty, student services and each other inside and outside the classroom.  
3) Faculty need to engage freshman in activities and discussions other than classwork.  
4) Divisions should review NSSE results, research the indicators, and respond accordingly.  
5) Concerted effort is needed to look at graduation rate and time to completion data to implement changes and create positive results.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
1.4.A is an area of strategic importance to the institution and the majority of the indicator targets are unmet or unknown. Concerted efforts need to be made to improve quality of interactions, and to increase number of degrees awarded, retention, graduation and time to degree rates.

---

**Core Theme Two: A Culture of Values**

* Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, & collaboration.

**Objective 1: Engage students & employees in service & citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie State University experience**

A) **Students are engaged in service & citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Measure: NSSE Q12 (service learning)** Q15e (community service or volunteer work) Target: When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR). | Q 12 - # of courses that include a community-based project (FY/SR): DSU: FY 1.6 (Insignificant Difference - Unmet) / SR 1.9 (Met)  
Rocky Mountain: 1.6 / 1.7  
Q15e - # of hours doing community service or volunteer work (FY/SR):  
DSU: FY 3.2 (Met) / SR 3.9 (Met)  
Rocky Mountain: 2.4 / 3.3 | Met |
| **Measure: NSSE Question: Q17j (Being an informed active citizen)** Target: When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher | Q17j: Being an informed active citizen (FY & SR)  
DSU: FY 2.4 (Unmet) / SR 2.6 (Met)  
Rocky Mountain: 2.6 / 2.5 | Partially Met |
that Rocky Mtn mean (FY & SR).

**Recommendations:**
1) Divisions should review NSSE results, research the concepts, and provide faculty training.
2) The Teaching & Learning Center should provide seminars & online resources regarding community-based learning projects.
3) Increase student government outreach to freshmen students on voting and informed citizenship.

**Outcome Fulfillment:**
The target for 2.1.A. Students are engaged in service & citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie experiences, was ‘met’, except for First Year students’ level of involvement in community-based projects & community service & volunteer work. Engaging students early in their high education experience in developing community mindedness is important, therefore, DSU needs to provide opportunities for these activities in the first semesters at college.

---

**B) Faculty & Staff engage in volunteer service & citizenship activities that benefit the campus & community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Employee participation in professional service (survey) Target: 70% of faculty, 50% of staff and 70% of Administration participate in professionally related service.</td>
<td>In a 2015 survey, 86.5% of Faculty, 63.9% of Staff and 93.1% of Admin participated in at least 1 professionally related service.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Employee participation in citizenship activities Target: 75% of faculty, staff and Administration participate in citizenship activity.</td>
<td>In a 2015 survey, 93.6% of Faculty, 86.5% of Staff and 100% of Admin participated in at least 1 citizenship activity.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations:**
1) Create a measure of intuitional encouragement of employee participation in service, add survey question.

**Outcome Fulfillment:**
The status for 2.1.B is Unknown.

---

**Objective 2: Promote an environment of respectful, responsible, & ethical behavior**

**A) Campus culture creates an expectation of responsible, respectful, & ethical behavior.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Sampling of syllabi for inclusion of statement Target: 100% syllabi compliance, as reported by</td>
<td>No data yet available.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student policies include a code of conduct (student website handbook)</td>
<td>The DSU Student Website includes student rights and their code of conduct, Student Rights and Responsibilities code, Policy 5:33: [<a href="http://dixie.edu/humanres/policy/sec5/533.html">http://dixie.edu/humanres/policy/sec5/533.html</a>]</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: student policies, comparable to peer institutions &amp; reflecting DSU values.</td>
<td>New Survey to be conducted in 2015/16</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student Satisfaction Survey: Climate Section</td>
<td>Discussions with people from following groups (FY/SR):</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: The Student Satisfaction Survey Climate Section will have a mean of &gt;3.0 on a 5 point agreement scale.</td>
<td>8a. Different race or ethnicity DSU: FY 2.9 (Unmet) / SR 2.8 (Unmet) Rocky Mountain: 2.9 / 2.9 8b. Different economic background DSU: FY 2.8 (Unmet) / SR 3.0 (Unmet) Rocky Mountain: 3.0 / 3.0 8c. Different religious beliefs DSU: FY 2.9 (Unmet) / SR 3.1 (Met) Rocky Mountain: 3.0 / 3.0 8d. Different political views DSU: FY 2.9 (Unmet) / SR 3.1 (Met) Rocky Mountain: 3.0 / 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 (Discussions with people of different backgrounds)</td>
<td>Q14d DSU emphasizes contact with students of different backgrounds DSU: FY 2.6 (Met) / SR 2.6 (Met) Rocky Mountain: 2.5 / 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14i, Q17g (Personal Code of Values), Q17h (Understand People) Target: DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn mean (FY &amp; SR).</td>
<td>Q14i DSU emphasizes attending events that address important social, economic &amp; political issues DSU: FY 2.5 (No Sig, Diff) / SR 2.2 (Unmet) Rocky Mountain: 2.5 / 2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17g - DSU experience helped develop or clarify a personal code of values and ethics: FY/SR DSU: FY 2.5 (Unmet) / SR 2.7 (Met) Rocky Mountain: 2.5 / 2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17h - DSU experience helped understanding people of other backgrounds, FY/SR DSU: FY 2.5 (Unmet) / SR 2.7 (Met) Rocky Mountain: 2.5 / 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSU emphasizes contact with students of different backgrounds, but provides limited opportunity because of homogenous on &amp; off-campus community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure: Great Colleges to Work For Survey: Fairness; Respect & Appreciation; Supervisor/Department Chairs Threshold: DSU will be higher than Public Carnegie comparison. Target: Good to Excellent range (≥ 65%).

|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Recommendations:
1) Provide greater opportunity for students to interact with students & others of different backgrounds. Recruit diverse students, faculty & staff. This is particularly important for first year students.
2) Provide greater opportunity for students in all courses, but especially First Year students, to develop & clarify their personal code of values & ethics. The Center for Teaching & Learning should provide seminars on this topic, particularly in GE courses commonly taken in first year.

Objective Fulfillment:
That objective 2.2.A is only partially met is of concern. Efforts to fully promote an environment of respectful, responsible and ethical behavior are of critical importance.

Objective 3: Foster a climate of support & collaboration

A) Campus culture fosters a spirit of camaraderie & pride in DSU mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Colleges to Work For Survey: Job satisfaction &amp; Support; Communication</td>
<td>Job satisfaction &amp; Support – DSU 76; 2014 Carnegie Public Baccalaureate 71 (Met) Communication – DSU 52; 2014 Carnegie Public Baccalaureate 54 (Unmet)</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Carnegie comparison. Target: Good to Excellent range (≥ 65%).

Recommendations:
1) Conduct focus groups and based on results and initiate programs to improve Collaboration; Senior Leadership; Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations; and Communication across campus.

Objective Fulfillment:
That objective 2.3.A is only partially met is of concern. Efforts to fully foster a climate of support and collaboration are of critical importance.

Core Theme Three: A Culture of Community
Dixie State University builds & maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff & community to foster economic growth & a continuum of educational, cultural & recreational enrichment.

Objective 1: Enrich educational exchanges between community, businesses, & the university by providing effective high quality opportunities & partnerships

A) Successful educational exchanges with the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Trends in participation; Number of participants Target: Total participation by community in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
<td>Of the 36 Educational Programs and Exchanges with the community, 10 programs provided counts totaling 8,441 participants.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Number &amp; types of exchanges Target: Number &amp; types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
<td>36 Educational Programs and Exchanges offered with the community: Community Education – After School Programs Community Education Channel (CEC) Colorado Plateau Institution Computer Camps Concurrent Enrollment Conferences and Workshops Preschool Dental Clinic Road Scholar</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Customized participant satisfaction survey by program Target: 75% of participants are</td>
<td>Of the 36 Educational Programs and Exchanges with the community, only 1 program (Youth Conferences and the ACT conference - 261) completed surveys.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfied with the programs.

**Recommendations:**
1) A philosophy and definition of educational exchange valued by the institution need to be determined.
2) There is a need to collect more than participation rates; where appropriate, quality of service also needs to be assessed.
3) Reviews of need, interest, and quality of educational exchanges are important to make strategic determination of offerings.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
The status for 3.1.A is unknown. Assessment of not only participation, but quality, want and need are critical aspects of strategically assessing programs.

---

**B) Successful educational exchanges with businesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Trends in participation; Number of participants. <strong>Target:</strong> Participation by businesses in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
<td>Of the 30 Educational Programs and Exchanges with business, 14 programs provided counts totaling 1,526 participants.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Number &amp; types of exchanges. <strong>Target:</strong> Number &amp; types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years.</td>
<td>30 Educational Programs and Exchanges offered with business: Career Center, CIT Job Board, Clinical Rotations, Cooperative Education, Internships, Practicums, Preceptorships, Student Teaching, Volunteer Tax Program (VITA), Castle Rock Music Camp, Ragin Red Outreach Workshop</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Customized participant satisfaction survey by program. <strong>Target:</strong> 75% of participants are satisfied with the programs.</td>
<td>Of the 30 Educational Programs and Exchanges with business, 9 programs (368, mostly graduation surveys) completed surveys. There is not a standardized participant satisfaction survey or set of survey questions that must be included.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations:**
1) Define educational exchanges with businesses, determine who is participating, and how to gather data on quantity and quality of exchanges.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
The status for 3.1.B is unknown. Assessment of not only participation, but quality, want and need are critical aspects of strategically assessing programs.
Objective 2: Engage the campus & community by providing a variety of quality cultural, athletic, & social programs & events.

A) Campus & community are engaged in cultural programs & events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Number of participants</td>
<td>2012-2013 Of the 24 cultural events, 22 events provided counts totaling 37,157 participants.</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure: Number & types of programs & events | In 2012-2013: 24 cultural events offered: Dance concert DOCUTAH Art Shows Celebrity Concert Series Open Mic Nights Native American Youth Conference Tonaquint Intermediate Multicultural Students Tour | Unknown (Baseline data) |

| Measure: Community interest survey | New survey to be piloted in 2016/2017. | Unknown (Baseline data) |

| Measure: Participant satisfaction survey | No survey data. | |

**Recommendations:**
1) There is a need to collect more than participation rates; where appropriate, quality of service also needs to be assessed.
2) Reviews of need, interest, and quality of educational exchanges are important.

**Objective Fulfillment:**
The status for 3.2.A is unknown. Assessment of not only participation, but quality, want and need are critical aspects of strategically assessing programs.

B) Campus & community are engaged in athletic & social events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Number of participants</td>
<td>2012-2013 Of the 117 social and 203 athletic events, 302 events (107 social and 295 athletic events) provided counts totaling 143,401 (54,773 in social and 88,628 in athletic events).</td>
<td>Unknown (Baseline data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 3: Encourage economic development by assisting & supporting individuals, businesses & community organizations to nurture the growth of the regional economy**

*DSU is a primary partner in nurturing the growth of the regional economy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Targets</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Target Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Business Resource Center (BRC) reports: numbers of engagements &amp; services to companies (BRC) provided annually.</td>
<td>Findings: For the second half of 2014 and the first half of 2015, the Business Resource Center BRC has had a new director &amp; service numbers were not maintained. A new director has committed to maintaining service files. Following is an example of BRC programs offered &amp; their service numbers:</td>
<td>Unknown for 2014-15 Met for 2013-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target: Increase BRC’s number of services & engagements provided by 10% annually.

The Business Resource Center (BRC) is a consortium of business support programs. The programs offered by the St. George BRC are:

- **SBDC** - Small Business Development Center: a Utah Office of Government of Economic Development (GOED) contract with the national Small Business Administration (SBA).
- **USTAR** – Utah Science & Technology Initiative (Utah government grant)
- **PTAC** - Procurement Technical Assistance Center (GOED funded). USTAR is being restructured in 2015, uncertain of impact.
- **SCORE** – Volunteer business people helping small business people succeed
- **Site Select Plus** – Washington County Economic Development private & public partnership

### Dixie Business Resource Center 1st Qtr CY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>SBDC</th>
<th>USTAR/Seed</th>
<th>PTAC</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Site Select Plus</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Contacts/Referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Resource Center</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up Visits</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Up Visits</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubator Clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Lab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Tech total participants during the Quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Steps Workshop -SCORE/SBDC -for the 1st Quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media 3 Part workshop</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 1200 Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BizSmart Online Class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN Networking Group (Monthly)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Startup (4 sessions)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure: Small Business Development Center (SBDC) number of long-term clients, business starts & capital infusion

Target: Increase St. George SBDC numbers annually & meet targets set by state SBDC

Findings: Long-term clients: 133 (105% Target) (Met) Business starts: 38 (181% Target) (Met) Capital infusion: $9,990,700 (151% Target) (Met)

Measure: Small Business Development Center (SBDC) customer satisfaction ratings, including GOED Chrisman statewide survey (BRC)

SBDC participants are satisfied with service

Findings: Satisfaction data for 2014 was 100% (Met), for 2013 satisfaction ratings were 95% (Met), for 2012 were 83% (Met). Ratings exceeded target. & show improvement over time.

Met
Target: 80% of SBDC participants are satisfied with service (Mean of at least 4 on 5 point satisfaction scale).

Measure: St. George SBDC fulfills its mission & performance measures
Target: SBDC scorecard meets or exceeds all goals & actual numbers compared to other SBDC’s in Utah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBDC scorecard meets or exceeds all goals and actual numbers compared to other SBDC’s in Utah.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings: St. George’s SBDC exceeded all its goals &amp; the actual numbers of other Utah SBDC’s except for capital infusion of Logan. (Met)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations:
1) Maintain Business Resource Center Service numbers & records & trend over time.
2) All BRC programs maintain customer satisfaction information and respond to data with strategic planning.

Objective Fulfillment:
Objective 3.3.A, DSU is a primary partner, through the BRC programs, in nurturing the growth of the regional economy, has been substantially met. The BRC is known throughout Utah as providing superior business support services. It is, however, important that the BRC maintain and assess customer need & satisfaction, as well as numbers of services & participants.
Academic Program Research
Baccalaureate Majors by Year through 2015

[Bar chart showing trends in baccalaureate majors over the years from 1999 to 2015.]
Academic Program Research

**Purpose:** Provide data, insights, and recommendations for potential future academic programs

**Committee:**
- Andrea Brown, Director of Institutional Research
- Clint Buhler, Faculty Senate appointed
- Jared Dupree, Faculty
- Summer Fackler, Academic Advisement
- Samantha Tommer, DSUSA VP Academics
- Brett Schwartz, Ambassadors
- David Wade, Director of Academic Programs & Curriculum
Academic Program Research

Stakeholders:

- DSU Academic Advisement Center
- DSU Administration
- DSU Alumni Association
- DSU Career Center
- DSU Faculty
- DSU Financial
- DSU Institutional Research
- DSU Student Body
- DSU Student Services/ Ambassadors
- DSU Trustees

- DXATC
- Sister USHE institutions
- STG Chamber of Commerce
- STG & Las Vegas large employers
- STG community leaders
- Washington County
- Washington County School District
- Washington County Dept. of Workforce Services
- US Bureau of Labor Statistics
Academic Program Research

Research:
- Strategic alignment
- External demand
- Internal demand
- Revenues
- Costs
- Miscellaneous

Next Steps/Milestones:
- Identify programs
- Create timeline
- Perform round I research
- Create white papers
- Present recommendations
- Round II, Graduate benchmarks
# Academic Program Research
## First Round Findings

### Baccalaureate Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent (42 pts. Possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioinformatics</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth, Energy, &amp; Environment</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Info. Systems</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Film</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Management</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Masters Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent (42 pts. Possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Scores by Category

#### Baccalaureate Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Anthropology</th>
<th>Bioinformatics</th>
<th>Digital Film</th>
<th>Earth, E, &amp; Enviro</th>
<th>Health Promo</th>
<th>Hosp Mgmt</th>
<th>Mgmt Info Sys</th>
<th>Sociology</th>
<th>Sport &amp; Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Demand</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Demand</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>16.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Masters Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Account (MAcc)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Psych (MFT)</th>
<th>Tech &amp; Entre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Demand</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Demand</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>27.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic Program Research
### First Round Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioinformatics</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Masters</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Entrepreneurship Masters</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth, Energy, &amp; Environment</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Information Systems</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Film</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology or Accounting Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (in 000s)</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$1,515</td>
<td>$2,135</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Five-year Total (in 000s)**: $7,990
Academic Program Research
Baccalaureate Majors & Masters Degrees by Year
# DONATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Cash Donations</th>
<th>Gifts-In-Kind</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$189,538.83</td>
<td>$5,177.37</td>
<td>$193,716.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$46,303.18</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$46,503.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$52,031.33</td>
<td>$10,345.00</td>
<td>$62,376.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$64,010.53</td>
<td>$11,250.00</td>
<td>$75,260.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$1,021,946.33</td>
<td>$9,078.00</td>
<td>$1,031,024.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$593,318.06</td>
<td>$12,810.00</td>
<td>$606,128.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$75,671.11</td>
<td>$4,843.00</td>
<td>$80,514.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$27,338.33</td>
<td>$27,650.00</td>
<td>$54,988.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$560,012.42</td>
<td>$3,616.00</td>
<td>$563,628.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$79,751.53</td>
<td>$5,740.00</td>
<td>$85,491.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$110,929.86</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$110,929.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$70,975.86</td>
<td>$39,563.00</td>
<td>$110,538.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,890,827.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,272.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,021,099.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Donors:** 1,025  
**Total Gifts:** 1,533

 August 31, 2015
## DONATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Cash Donations</th>
<th>Gifts-In-Kind</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$49,968.83</td>
<td>$848.00</td>
<td>$50,816.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$181,316.73</td>
<td>$3,700.40</td>
<td>$185,017.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to Date Totals: $231,285.56 + $4,548.40 = $235,833.96

## DONATION SUMMARY

- **Alumni**: $11,518.00
- **Athletics**: $25,383.56
- **Buildings & Projects**: $25,081.00
- **Gifts-in-Kind (value determined by donor)**: $4,548.40
- **Other**: $775.00
- **Scholarships**: $168,528.00

**TOTAL**: $235,833.96
MINUTES OF THE DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
Zion Room, Jeffrey R. Holland Centennial Commons
Friday, May 1, 2015
8:00 a.m. – Closed Executive Session
9:00 a.m. – Open General Session

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
Christina Durham (Chair)
David Clark (Vice Chair)
Larry Bergeson
Elisabeth Bingham
Matthew Devore (DSUSA President-elect)
Hal Hiatt (Alumni Association President)
Gregory Layton (DSUSA President)
Jon Pike
Gail Smith
Thomas Wright – Participated by phone

TRUSTEE EXCUSED: Julie Beck

ALSO PRESENT:
President Richard B. Williams
Del Beatty – Dean of Students
Lori Blackner – Director of Donor Relations
Jason Boothe – Athletic Director
Andrea Brown – Exempt Staff Association President-elect
Debra Bryant – Accreditation Liaison Officer
Bill Christensen – Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer
Will Craver – Interim Director of Human Resources
Cynthia Kimball Davis – Title IX Clery Act Compliance Director
Addison Everett – Interim Dean of the School of Humanities
Bryant Flake – Institutional Budget Director
Jack Freeman – President of the Classified Staff Association
Nancy Hauck – Faculty Senate President-elect
Jeannine Holt – Former Member of the Board of Trustees
Jeff Jarvis – Dean of the School of Visual and Performing Arts
Kevin Jenkins – Reporter from The Spectrum
Scott Jensen – Associate Director of Business Services
Steve Johnson – Director of Public Relations and Publications
Gary Koeven – Chief Information Officer
Marilyn Lamoreaux – Assistant to the President
Kalynn Larson – Alumni Director
Brad Last – Vice President of University Advancement
Debbie Millet – Classified Staff Association President-elect
Paul Morris – Vice President of Administrative Services
Erin O’Brien – Faculty Senate President
Rick Palmer – Senior Development Officer
Rich Paustenbaugh – Dean/Director of the DSU Library
David Roos – Executive Director of Enrollment Services
Brenda Sabey – Dean of the School of Education
Becky Smith – Dean of Academic and Community Outreach
Nate Staheli – Faculty Senate Past President
Kelle Stephens – President of the DXATC
Scott Talbot – Assistant Vice President of Business Services
David Wade – Academic Program and Curriculum Director
Kyle Wells – Dean of the School of Business and Communication
Karman Wilson – Community Relations and Special Events Coordinator
I. WELCOME

At 8:04 a.m., Dr. Christina J. Durham, Chair of the Dixie State University (DSU) Board of Trustees, welcomed everyone to the meeting today. She called for a motion to move into Executive Session.

**MOTION BY GAIL SMITH, DULY SECONDED BY GREG LAYTON, TO MOVE INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING PERSONNEL AND/OR REAL ESTATE ISSUES. Action: Approved unanimously, by a show of hands.**

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 9:01 a.m., Chair Durham called for a motion to adjourn the Executive Session.

**MOTION BY HAL HIATT, DULY SECONDED BY ELISABETH BINGHAM, TO ADJOURN THE EXECUTIVE SESSION AND RETURN TO THE GENERAL SESSION. Action: Approved unanimously, by a show of hands.**

III. GENERAL SESSION – WELCOME/THANK YOUS/INTRODUCTIONS

At 9:14 a.m., Chair Durham again welcomed everyone. She excused Trustee Julie Beck, who was unable to attend today’s meeting, and she welcomed Trustee Thomas Wright, who was participating by phone. Chair Durham facilitated the following introductions and expressions of thanks:

- **Thank you to Gregory Layton, Outgoing Trustee and DSUSA President.** Chair Durham told Greg that the Trustees have thoroughly enjoyed having him on the Board, and they are excited for what comes next for him. Greg is going to Hawaii for part of the summer. Chair Durham presented a thank you plaque to Greg. Greg received a standing ovation.

- **Introduction of Matt Devore, Incoming Trustee and DSUSA President.** Chair Durham introduced Matt. He will be sworn in as a member of the Board of Trustees in the September Board meeting. Matt said he would be a senior integrated studies major. He has been in student government for two years. He is happy to be the president and excited to get things done.

- **Introduction of New DSUSA Executive Council.** Trustee Matt Devore introduced his new Executive Council members.

- **Introduction of Tamara Lemmon, Student Speaker at Commencement.**

- **Thank you to the following, who have each done an outstanding job this year:**
  - Dr. Nate Staheli, Outgoing Faculty Senate President.
  - Jack Freeman, Outgoing Classified Staff Association President.
  - Mace Jacobson, Outgoing Exempt Staff Association President.

- **Welcome to the following:**
  - Dr. Erin O’Brien, Incoming Faculty Senate President.
  - Dr. Nancy Hauck, Incoming Faculty Senate President-elect.
  - Debbie Millet, Incoming Classified Staff Association President.
  - Andrea Brown, Incoming Exempt Staff Association President.

- **Welcome President Kelle Stephens from the DXATC.**

- **Welcome Representatives of the Press – Kevin Jenkins from The Spectrum, and Steve Johnson.**

- **Welcome Jeannine Holt, former member of the Board of Trustees.**

IV. PRESENTATIONS

**Report on Preparing for the Accreditation Mid-Cycle Review**

Dr. Debra Bryant, Accreditation Liaison Officer, said DSU’s Mid-Cycle Accreditation Review by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) will take place on October 19th and 20th. She doesn’t think they will call the Trustees to meet as a group, but some may be called individually. The comprehensive evaluation was originally scheduled for 2019, but is now scheduled for 2020. For this 2020 evaluation, we will report on our entire process, and then feature two stellar programs – Dental Hygiene and the English Department. NWCCU wants us to show that we use data for planning, budget, and action. We tend to use data anecdotally, but they want to see that we have made decisions based on data. We have to make all the connections (measuring core themes, etc.). In our last evaluation, communication and sharing results were weaknesses, but we are correcting those. Our accreditors want us to be honest and forthright
about our weaknesses so we can address them. This summer, the ISAAC Committee will gather data and do an initial analysis of assessment and core themes. At some point, the administration (including the Board of Trustees) is to look at the data and accept or reject it. She will show this process in the report. With our strategic planning process, many things are already in the works. Chair Durham thanked Deb for her work.

**DOCUTAH Film Festival Update**

Recent alum Karman Wilson, Community Relations and Special Events Coordinator in the University Advancement Office, oversees DOCUTAH. They have had 347 films submitted so far. The extraordinary volunteers evaluate every submission and narrow them down to 50 films to be included in the September festival. She said they have 38 states and 31 countries represented. Vice Chair David Clark expressed concern about the DOCUTAH audit, which was based on previous years’ data. He stressed to the current DOCUTAH staff to make the necessary corrections. Dean Jeffery Jarvis said they are aware of the audit report and are in the process of changing the methodologies and status. They will report more complex numbers and are working on a method to officially count all attendees. Vice Chair Clark said he appreciates that. Trustee Hal Hiatt asked about the future of DOCUTAH. Dean Jarvis said he, Karman, and Phil Tucket are working with Bill Christensen and President Williams to revise DOCUTAH. One of the big goals going into this year is to increase student involvement in the festival and the festival’s visibility on campus. There is a great opportunity for outreach in the state and region, and he believes there is the opportunity for a national presence. Trustee Pike said he hopes one of the viewing sites might be the new Electric Theatre.

V. **PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

**General Update**

President Williams said this is a great time of year for DSU – honoring students, staff and faculty. He thanked Deb Bryant for all her work with Accreditation, and Karman Wilson for helping to make DOCUTAH such a special part of DSU. President Williams’ presentation included the following:

- **D-Week.** Such a fun time, with great participation in all events, including the community breakfast and world record event. Whitewashing the D was his favorite. A 93-year old woman climbed up to the D. It was her birthday and everyone sang to her. President said he was wrongfully accused of splashing students. He showed a slide of the devious look on Mayor/Trustee Pike’s face. There was a lot of Dixie Spirit at the D, and he hopes we can do that every year.

- **Burns Office Addition.** Construction has begun. Paul Morris, Vice President of Administrative Services, said when the bids came back for this addition the pricing was such that we could complete the entire building. It will house Human Resources, Security, Advancement, Athletics, and will have 15-16 faculty offices. We are very excited about this.

- **Hansen Stadium Remodel.** President showed photos of how we might reinvent the stadium, including a red track! It will be a place where other groups can hold events. DSU is the community’s university!

- **Student Housing.** We are moving forward with student housing. The programmers have been on campus twice now, and they have captured what is important to us; we’ve had great student input, too.

- **Strategic Plan.** The Strategic Plan is moving forward into the implementation phase. The Strategic Planning Committee has worked very hard on an 80-page document. Check the website.

- **Thank you to Greg Layton.** President said he has been in Higher Education for 17 years, and the student body presidents have all been great – but they are not Greg Layton. President said he appreciates Greg’s advocacy for students, the community, and the state. President presented a stone DSU arch to Greg. President said we are excited about Matt Devore, new student body president, and his upcoming leadership. President also recognized the staff – Jordon Sharp, Brett Schwartz, Del Beatty, etc. – who work with the student government kids and show great leadership to organize the students.

- **Thank you to Will Craver.** Will is retiring and this is his last Board meeting. We had a fun farewell party for him yesterday. President thanked Will for all he has done in Human Resources and for DSU. Chair Durham told Will she has appreciated him, and he will be missed.

**Proposed Board of Trustees Meetings Dates for 2015-2016**

President Williams brought the following proposed meeting dates to the attention of the Trustees:

- Friday, September 11, 2015
- Friday, November 6, 2015
- Friday, January 29, 2016
VI. ACTION ITEMS

Approval of Minutes
Chair Durham called for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 20, 2015 Board of Trustees meeting.

MOTION BY DAVID CLARK, DULY SECONDED BY JON PIKE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 2015, AS PRESENTED. Action: Approved unanimously.

Administrative Services

Investment Report
Scott Talbot, Assistant Vice President of Business Services, said Cheri Capps is ill today. Scott brought forward two months of investment reports – July 1, 2014 to January 31, 2015, and July 1, 2014 to February 28, 2015. In the future, the investment reports will also include information regarding short-term investments. These reports show a general increase and a more positive return on investments.

MOTION BY LARRY BERGESON, DULY SECONDED BY GAIL SMITH, TO APPROVE THE DSU INVESTMENT REPORTS, AS PRESENTED. Action: Approved unanimously.

2015-2016 Budget Process Outcomes
Vice President Paul Morris, and DSU Budget Director Bryant Flake came to the table. Paul said they are pleased to report that we are adding $4 million to the budget this year. The money came from various sources. Bryant said our budget will be just short of $60 million. Paul said with the money, we paid a 2% COLA increase; will give each employee an average of 3% salary increase; funded our rank and tenure advancements, and we are in year two of a four-year plan to increase adjunct pay. We will also add another 4.9% into our insurance. We also received a little adjustment from the state. A lot of great work is being done on the strategic plan, and we have $700,000 to help with implementation of that plan. We have created a new area in scheduling. We want to eliminate inner department charges and we are now going to fund those areas properly. Also, each division received some block funding. Finally, we are committed to an operating reserve (about $2 million) for unexpected contingencies. We will still maintain our low cost position on tuition. What has made all of this possible has been the state funding support we have received for the past few years. We owe a huge debt of gratitude for the legislative support we have received. Vice Chair Clark said the gap has closed significantly and he applauds the effort and fiscal responsibility shown.

MOTION BY GREG LAYTON, DULY SECONDED BY JON PIKE, TO APPROVE THE 2015-2016 BUDGET REPORT/OUTCOMES, AS PRESENTED. Action: Approved unanimously.

Academic Services

Request for Approval of 2015 Dixie State University Graduates
Dr. Bill Christensen, Executive Vice President and CAO, said we have 1870 graduates eligible to walk for commencement: 621 baccalaureate graduates, 1039 associate graduates, and 167 certificate recipients. This is wonderful! Vice Chair Clark moved to approve 1870 times.

MOTION BY LARRY BERGESON, DULY SECONDED BY GAIL SMITH, TO APPROVE THE 2015 DSU GRADUATES, AS PRESENTED. Action: Approved unanimously.

Request for Approval of 2015 Student Speaker for Commencement
Bill explained that we went through a different selection process this year. Historically we pick the top GPA student, but programs are different and some students are tied on GPA. So this year we still wanted to have a top student, but invited all students with a 3.9 GPA and higher to submit a speech. In the past we have had a valedictorian and a student speaker, but this year we chose to go with a single speaker – Tamara Lemmon.

MOTION BY GREG LAYTON, DULY SECONDED BY HAL HIATT, TO APPROVE THE 2015 STUDENT SPEAKER, AS PRESENTED. Action: Approved unanimously.
Request for Approval of Professor Emeritus Status Award
Bill said this award is for Dr. Donald R. Hinton. Typically, professor emeritus candidates are recommended/nominated by their Dean. Addison Everett, Interim Dean of the School of Humanities, wrote a letter recommending this status be given to Dr. Hinton. This was voted on by all tenured faculty within the school. The vote was unanimous. Bill then wrote a recommendation to the President. Dr. Hinton will be presented this award at the commencement ceremony. MOTION BY JON PIKE, DULY SECONDED BY GAIL SMITH, TO APPROVE THAT PROFESSOR EMERITUS STATUS BE AWARDED TO DR. DONALD R. HINTON, AS REQUESTED. Action: Approved unanimously.

Application for Award of Tenure and Rank Advancement
Dr. Dannelle Larsen-Rife, Assistant Professor of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Department Chair in that area of the School of Humanities, applied for tenure and rank advancement to Associate Professor. Dr. Christensen, Interim Dean of Humanities Addison Everett, and both the School of Humanities’ and DSU’s Retention, Tenure and Promotion committees evaluated the materials submitted and verified that Dr. Larsen-Rife is eligible for rank promotion and tenure. They have unanimously approved these awards. Dr. Christensen forwarded this information to the Board of Trustees for their approval.
MOTION BY HAL HIATT, DULY SECONDED BY DAVID CLARK, TO APPROVE THE AWARD OF TENURE AND RANK ADVANCEMENT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR FOR DR. DANNELLE LARSEN-RIFE, AS DISCUSSED. Action: Five in favor; three opposed. Motion carried.

Academic Program Proposal: DSU STEM Center for K12 Education
Bill Christensen and Dr. Brenda Sabey, Dean of the School of Education, said we have had an Office of STEM Education. We received a three-year grant for $500,000, and we are asking to change the Office of STEM Education to a Center for K12 STEM Education. Regents’ policies require Board of Trustees’ approval for the creation of centers. Vice Chair Clark asked if, when the $500,000 expires, we would transition into an endowment. Brenda said that would be ideal. She thinks the designation of center will help us acquire funding. The director will receive released time to preside over the center.
MOTION BY DAVID CLARK, DULY SECONDED BY LARRY BERGESON, TO APPROVE CHANGING THE OFFICE OF STEM EDUCATION TO THE STEM CENTER FOR K12 EDUCATION. Action: Approved unanimously.

Three-year Program Reviews
Dr. Christensen and Dr. David Wade presented the following program reviews:

- Criminal Justice Three-year Program Review. David said this is for students who want to go into graduate programs in Behavioral Sciences. We have received some scholarship and internship funding, and our Digital Forensics lab is very exciting and has seen good growth. Vice Chair Clark said he loves to see employment opportunities for students as they transition into regular life. Bill said this is part of a continuum of education we have available locally, starting with certificate programs at DXATC, as well as POST Training, Criminal Justice, Digital Forensics, etc. We are developing a whole series of opportunities for job placement. Chair Durham called for a motion.
  MOTION BY HAL HIATT, DULY SECONDED BY ELISABETH BINGHAM, TO APPROVE THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE THREE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW. Action: Approved unanimously.

- Mathematics and Mathematics Secondary Education Three-year Program Review. David said we have 800 full-time equivalent students in math annually. We also have 50 declared majors. We provide math camps, etc. Vice Chair Clark asked if it is difficult to find good math teachers. He assumes there are great opportunities for these math teachers. Trustee Larry Bergeson agrees with that. Representative Brad Last is involved in that. Trustee Bergeson said local grants and programs (like David Roos has worked on – placing tutors in schools) have certainly helped. A lot of people find math difficult, so the extra help is greatly appreciated. Chair Durham called for a motion.
  MOTION BY GREG LAYTON, DULY SECONDED BY GAIL SMITH, TO APPROVE THE THREE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW IN MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICS SECONDARY EDUCATION. Action: Approved unanimously.
POLICY OFFICE

Policy 2-NEW: Interim & Acting Appointments
Will Craver, Interim Director of Human Resources, presented this policy, which provides structure and transparency for all appointments. President Williams made sure it was in the policy that after a person has served in an interim position, he or she has the opportunity to get their job back.

MOTION BY LARRY BERGESON, DULY SECONDED BY HAL HIATT, TO APPROVE POLICY 2-NEW: INTERIM & ACTING APPOINTMENTS. Action: Approved unanimously.

Policy 5-3: Registration
Dr. David Roos said he oversees Enrollment Services, including the registration function, and his department is asking for a couple of changes. First, our registration is happening right now, and we have always purged students in the third week. We need space for high demand courses, so this policy proposes that we purge a week before school starts instead of three weeks later. We will publicize this widely. Secondly, we have prior to this given a 100% refund, but this policy changes that to 50% in the second and third week. Bill Christensen mentioned that this change has been wanted/needed for a long time. The impetus was the delay in paying adjuncts (they received their first check two months after they started teaching because we couldn’t get accurate numbers).

MOTION BY LARRY BERGESON, DULY SECONDED BY JON PIKE, TO APPROVE PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY 5-3: REGISTRATION. Action: Approved unanimously.

Policy 5-23: Student Accommodations
Bill said this is a consolidation of policies. Part of the drive for this is how we were addressing the issue of what to do when a student says that for religious or value reasons they feel they should be held exempt from doing something required. We have been careful to condone this. The decision came through the faculty. We require and request faculty to administer some kindness in dealing with these issues. We stand behind our faculty. Chair Durham suggested this item be tabled. She is uncomfortable putting it to vote at this time.

MOTION BY ELISABETH BINGHAM, DULY SECONDED BY HAL HIATT, TO TABLE POLICY 5-23: STUDENT ACCOMMODATION. Action: Approved unanimously. Motion tabled.

FACULTY SENATE POLICIES

Policy 3-NEW: Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of Dixie State University
Dr. Nate Staeheli, Dr. Erin O’Brien, and Dr. Nancy Hauck came to the table. Nate said this highlights the structure of the senate. Right now they have 15-20 senators, but will form a faculty senate of senators elected by their areas. The Senate Executive Committee will be a reviewing and steering committee for the senate. They have tried to codify their committee involvement to give faculty more of an involvement in academic affairs. Faculty will populate the committees but won’t direct the committees. Erin said the changes feel significant, but are mainly codifying things that have already been happening. President said it has been a collaborative process. It is definitely a step in the right direction to help us achieve university stature. The Honors Program is codified with the approval of the deans. Nate said the representation will be reviewed every year – that is written into the policy. Vice Chair Clark said there are a number of chairmen that are tenured, and many that are not. Why are they not all tenured? Erin said they generally have tenured faculty make decisions about others seeking tenure. Everyone has input in this decision. Tenured faculty within a school will decide just for that school.

MOTION TO JON PIKE, DULY SECONDED BY LARRY BERGESON, TO APPROVE POLICY 3-NEW: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY. Action: Approved unanimously.

VII. BOARD OF TRUSTEES COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair Durham requested reports from the following Board of Trustees Committees:
Audit Committee. Committee Chair David Clark, with Committee Member Hal Hiatt. Vice Chair Clark said there are two types of audits: 1) a review audit, and 2) a follow-up audit to see if the recommendations of the auditors have been implemented. President’s Travel and Business of Art were both audited, with no findings. Student Activities were audited, and all three recommendations have been fully implemented. The
biggest audit came from the State of Utah; auditors were on campus in February. Everything is right; there were no significant disagreements with the audit, and the auditors said we had presented the financial information fairly. Scott Talbot and his group should be commended.

**Finance/Investment Committee.** Chair Larry Bergeson, with Committee Members David Clark and Thomas Wright. Trustee Bergeson commended Paul for finishing the Burns Addition rather than completing it in phases. He said product completion will save 25-30%.

**Government Affairs Committee.** Chair Thomas Wright, and Committee Members Hal Hiatt and Jon Pike. Trustee Wright said they are still celebrating the legislative victories. They are talking individually to legislators and formulating some priorities for the next session. In the next few months he will share some priorities with everyone so all can assist.

**Academic Programs Committee.** Chair Elisabeth Bingham, and Committee Members Julie Beck, Larry Bergeson, Greg Layton and Gail Smith. Trustee Bingham said other than the three year reviews, there is nothing to report. Chair Durham said the Strategic Plan will provide direction.

**Policy Committee.** Chair Christina Durham, and Committee Members Julie Beck and Gail Smith. Chair Durham said that the policy committee has worked well. It is a priority to update policies, fill in gaps, etc. and there are processes in place that will help do that.

**DXATC Board Liaison.** Trustee Jon Pike asked Kelle Stephens, President of the DXATC, for an update. President Stephens said what seemed simple has become complicated, and $13 million is a lot of money to raise. She has been working closely with mayors and county commissioners to get this done. The DXATC is hoping to bond, but it is difficult. By the next Board meeting, she plans to announce the groundbreaking. She is going to talk to Building Board Chair Ned Carnahan to see if he/they will let her get started. The DXATC just received their third quarter results and they are up 19% FTE; 25% in head count – higher than any other ATC. They are up 186% in certificates awarded. Trustee Pike said that President Stephens has an incredible board and they will get this done. He said they are also the only ATC in the Utah System that doesn’t own their own facilities. DXATC leases 100% of their facilities. It is time for this to happen – with support from the city, the county, WCSD, and support from all of the major businesses. It is a huge economic development issue and could be a countywide strategic plan to keep things growing in Dixie.

**NAC Representative.** Chair Gail Smith, with Committee Members Elisabeth Bingham and Christina Durham. Trustee Smith had nothing to report.

Chair Durham thanked the Trustees. She said they have accomplished a lot and have made some changes. They are looking to put processes online for award nominations. She said the Board does not have bylaws to deal with procedural items, so the Executive Committee of the Board are looking at those and will be passing them down to the whole board. ???

**VIII. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS**

**DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT ASSOCIATION**

**Outgoing Student Government Report**

Trustee Greg Layton, outgoing student body president, said this is a sad day for him, but also a happy day as he transitions to the next phase of his life. He showed a PowerPoint recap of what they accomplished this year. Actions speak louder than words. “We DO” was their theme.

- The senate was his baby last year, so he wanted to continue the momentum of what they were able to accomplish. They passed 30 academic bills, but he still sees room for improvement. Some students were able to go to Japan, and student fees paid for all students who participated in UCUR.
- Service was one of their top priorities. During the Campus to Community project they packaged more than 60,000 meals for the community. They had more than 50 on- and off-campus service projects, which added up to more than 100,000 hours of service. Some new service traditions were created!
- Clubs are the heart and soul of how many students get involved in campus life, especially during D-week – Rock the Mall, the Great Race (41 teams/400 people participated). They started 20 new clubs, for a total of 81 clubs. There was more student involvement in everything.
- They had a drastic increase in clubs and social events. There were more than 45 events, with 24,000 people in attendance. The Night at Tuacahn and Food Fest were new and successful events. One of his goals this year was to be more connected with the community.
- Matt Devore was mastermind behind the decorations for D-Week and Homecoming. Great job, Matt.
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- Use of social media increased dramatically; 1000 new Instagram followers alone. The number one means of communication on campus is the Red Storm Roll (toilet paper in the restrooms). They had the most committee members ever on PR, and they had a team that designed a logo or description. Posters, storm roll, newspapers, handouts, etc., for each event.
- Greg told President Williams that this was an amazing year that he will remember forever – from his position in student government to sports and athletics. Some highlights for Greg: to be a member of the hiring committee for the new president, to be involved in the Human Performance Center process, community engagement, identity, intramurals/athletics, the Japan Ambassador Trip, the strategic planning process, and more!
- Greg thanked everyone for giving the students the opportunity to have a say, have power, and have the ability to lead. In Japan he told them he was a member of DSU’s Board of Trustees, and they were shocked. He is excited to turn his time over to Matt. Greg received a standing ovation.

Incoming Student Government Report
Matt Devore, incoming student body president, thanked everyone for this opportunity. Greg is an amazing leader and has set the bar high with his leadership ability. We had the highest turnout in history for elections. Matt said his election platform involved four things: 1) to work towards relocating the DCSV??, 2) to do more surveys, 3) to advocate more bachelor’s degrees, and 4) to work on the identity of DSU. Matt said he is from Mesquite, Nevada. He lived off campus as a freshman and wasn’t engaged at DSU at all. In his second year he was extended an invitation to join DSUSA and he got very involved. He knew a year ago that he was going to run for student body president. He is passionate about the possibility of changing students’ lives. He wants every student to have the opportunities that he has had.

ACADEMIC SERVICES

Recommendation for Continuing Status/Post-Tenure Review
Bill Christensen referred to the letter with a list of post-tenure review candidates. A few years ago we added a provision that requires tenured faculty to go through this process. They receive a 2% increase in salary. This is an industry best practices item. How could an associate professor be up for a post-tenure review? We basically hire people with terminal degrees, but these faculty are grandfathered in. Otherwise, they would be up for promotion to full professor, but that is not applicable here. The policy does not require Board of Trustees’ approval on this, but Bill said they wanted the Board to be aware of it. Bill said this is the largest group so far; he thinks we will see a consistent increase through the years. Bryant Flake has budgeted for this. This is a small amount compared to the cost of rank and tenure promotions.

Commencement Update
Bill said we are back to the future. We are going back to the historical process of having a single ceremony in a two-hour block instead of individual convocations. Distinguished Citizens and retirees are being recognized at the Dixie Awards the evening before commencement. We have rearranged things and have tried to keep the best traditions. There will be names being read, handshakes, pictures at the D. All Trustees planning to attend will be playing a role in the ceremony. Historically, the President has emceed, but Bill will be the MC, President will talk, and the Deans will oversee the presentation of diplomas for their schools. There is a breakfast that morning for the platform guests, etc.

Strategic Planning Update
Bill said this is proceeding on schedule. Dr. John Welty, our consultant, is wonderful to work with, and we are moving forward through the planning steps to the implementation. Some very innovative ideas have been brought forward. Bill said some of his favorite parts of the process are the ideas for student retention and success. The program development plans are also great. Go to the dixie.edu/strategicplanning website to view the entire plan.

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT

Development Office Report
Brad Last, Vice President of University Advancement, said the donation report is in the packet. It has been a good couple of months for us, and when we get more people in the pipeline it will get even better.
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- Rick Palmer, Senior Development Officer, is leaving to be the principal at Enterprise High School. This is his last board meeting, and we will miss him here. He is a great friend and he has been very helpful.
- We had a fantastic reception at Glenn and Elisabeth Bingham’s home. Thank you to the Binghams. They invited friends from their neighborhood; they have amazing neighbors. The next reception is on May 20th, sponsored by Chair Durham. Lori Blackner is working on the invitations.
- Congratulations to Alumni – they are adding a marketing and PR person to their staff.
- Regarding PR and Publications – Steve Johnson is currently the President of NCMPR, a national marketing association. We tried to recognize him on campus but he is reluctant.
- We are redoing a DSU picture book we produced a few years ago, and it should be ready by the end of the summer to give to prospective donors, etc.
- Please stop in at the Cox Performing Arts Center and see the new Hall of Fame displays. The finished display will show proper respect for all the inductees. There will be a DSC wall and a DSU wall.
- Some of the major fundraising efforts we are working on are the human performance building, an athletic complex, and the Craig and Maureen Booth Honors College, etc. We appreciate Dr. Booth in his attempt to keep the great students here instead of going off to other universities.
- Brad expressed appreciation to the deans and others for their efforts in raising funds for various projects.

TITLE IX CLERY ACT COMPLIANCE REPORT

Dr. Cynthia Kimball Davis, Title IX Clery Act Compliance Director, presented the following items:
- Campus Sexual Violence Prevention Training. Cynthia said their website is now finished and makes DSU compliant with the mandates that come from civil rights through Clery. She said they have information on the Clery Act, a CARE Team, and a Dixie State SAFE Committee.
- KCSG News Coverage of DSU’s April 9, 2015 Sexual Assault Awareness Month Panel Discussion. Cynthia said 35 people were present at this discussion. The Clery Act wants us to educate every student and employee, so the training is mandatory. The website contains policies, Title IX information, contact information, requests for information, complaint forms, speaking requests, etc. It is all very helpful to let people know where to go regarding issues relating to sex and gender, blatant noncompliance, etc.
- Training coming up on healthy relationships, etc. Paul Morris is working with security to get updated statistics on the website. Cynthia said it would be good for the Board to have face-to-face or online training. President said Dr. Davis has only been here since January – she has done an amazing job.

Trustee Pike said there are so many things on today’s agenda that are taking DSU to the next level. This is definitely one of them. Thank you so much, Cynthia.

GENERAL UPDATES

Alumni Association
Trustee Hal Hiatt, Alumni President, and Kalynn Larson, Alumni Director, presented their update:
- They showed a video of D-Week events – whitewashing the D, the fireworks, etc. They said Trustee Bergeson took second place in the Great Race. Kalynn thanked Steve Johnson and Kevin Jenkins for their coverage of the D-Day events. There are great things going on here at DSU.
- They had great community and DSU participation in the World Record event.
- President said Kalynn and Hal were just amazing – they work so hard.

Student Services
Del Beatty, Dean of Students, gave a Student Services Update:
- Del said they teach a four-semester leadership course to try to help students develop a notion of what true leadership is. Successful leaders have to be able to make tough decisions. Greg Layton has been a phenomenal leader. Del’s definition of leadership is the ability to transform vision into reality. Matt will be great, too. Del said they get a new staff every year, and it is wonderful that the students elect great new leaders each year.
- D-Week was very successful this year; the staff did a great job. They were really excited that 17 former D-Queens came. Janice Nisson, who is 93 years old, was there.
- Del invited everyone to the Dixie Awards in the Eccles Mainstage Theatre on the evening before Commencement. There is a reception at 6:00 p.m. and the ceremony begins at 7:00 p.m. It is an entertaining show.
On May 14, Del will meet with Matt and his new leaders. Del said he and Trustee Hiatt started a spring leadership event when they were in student government. It is now the Utah Leadership Academy, and all Utah public and private institutions of higher education participate; typically about 500 people attend. He is leaving to go to USU Eastern (in Price) for three days for the conference. It will be a great time.

Vice Chair Clark complimented Del on Krissia’s performance last night at the Trustees dinner. She is a very talented and wonderful girl. Del said she has found a new niche for herself. She used to be a swimmer, but now she has taken a different path.

### Athletic Services

Jason Boothe, Athletic Director, mentioned the following in his update:

- We had 400 people at our All Sports Banquet to honor our student athletes. Twenty-two percent of our student athletes had a 3.8 or higher GPA.
- The men’s golf team won a conference championship at Sunbrook. They did a remarkable job. The women’s golf team placed second. Mo Eckroth, Assistant AD, was over the tournament.
- Baseball has a chance to win a conference starting today at 4:00 p.m.
- Volleyball placed 21 in the American Volleyball Coaches Association Division II Coaches Top 25 poll.
- Softball has a very good chance. They are 4th in the nation and 1st in the west. They play a doubleheader tomorrow starting at 12 noon.
- Jason said he was appointed as the Division II men’s basketball committee chair. He is humbled by it. It is a four-year commitment, and it will be good for our conference to have that recognition. Chair Durham congratulated Jason. She attended the All Sports Banquet, and she was amazed at the athletes honored for having 3.8, 3.9, and 4.0 GPAs. With the amount of time they miss in class, etc., for them to have that dedication in the classroom is phenomenal. Jason said every department has amazing support.

### Staff Associations

Jack Freeman, President of the CSA, Andrea Brown, President elect of the ESA, and Deb Millet, CSA President-elect, all came forward. They are doing staff elections right now.

- **Classified Staff Association.** Jack said Deb Millet will be a great leader. She works with Dean Beatty. Deb said she is a Dixie alum from hundreds of years ago. We have over 300 staff members, and Deb looks forward to working with them. Jack thanked everyone for this opportunity he has had. He learned a lot in a short amount of time, and it was very rewarding. He is in Facilities Management, which always presents challenges, but he looks forward to that. He thanked the Trustees for all they do for the staff. There is a renewed enthusiasm this year; the future is unlimited.
- **Exempt Staff Association.** Andrea said we have had a very successful year and they appreciate what the President has done for ESA and CSA. As Jack said, there is renewed enthusiasm. Jack said they met with Mace Jacobson (ESA President) a lot behind the scenes. Her heart was really with us – she loves this campus and she appreciates the opportunity she had to serve. Chair Durham said it is good to know we have such diligent people working so hard. We couldn’t function without your support.

### Faculty Senate

Nate Staheli, Faculty Senate President, and Nancy Hauck, Faculty Senate President-elect, came forward. Nate said every couple of years the Faculty Senate senators rotate, so this coming week they will meet. They are going to start quickly working on the Academic Freedom policy. They will help craft that policy with help from the administration and legal counsel. They are staffing their committee. They are also working on the Faculty Advisement Responsibilities policy. Erin and Nancy will oversee all this.

Nate said it has been a tremendous opportunity to work with Erin. She is very caring about the faculty and DSU. The faculty is in good hands with Erin and Nancy.

Nate personally said thank you – he has had the opportunity to experience a lot of growth, and he is a better “spoke in the wheel of the university.” He told the Trustees thanks for their trust and support, and he hopes all faculty will understand his respect for their faculty rights, and helping them learn what their responsibilities are. He is sad to leave; it has been great.

Nancy said she will continue the shared government focus that Nate and Erin have initiated. She wants to highlight the excellence in our faculty. She would like to increase the collegiality of faculty members and highlight the excellence here already. She is happy to see the increase in adjunct pay. She is happy that the students are represented so well. Chair Durham said thank you so much. The Board has a great relationship with the faculty. It is good to have lively discussions and consider all perspectives.
• Nate wanted to make public his strong support for President Williams. He will help us make informed, accurate decisions. His leadership is amazing and heartfelt. Nancy agreed.

**Human Resources**
Will Craver gave an update on the status of the search for the Human Resources Director. Will said some candidates were going to have Skype interviews today. The Assistant Director position will be filled after the new HR Director is selected.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Chair Durham thanked everyone for their attendance and participation and invited everyone to stay for the luncheon. President Williams said it has been a great year. We started with the mantra, “We are Dixie!” and this mantra will continue for the 25 years until his retirement. He is happy that people take pride in our institution. He said Dr. John Welty, our Strategic Planning Consultant, said people are scared that we are getting our act together. Chair Durham called for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION BY DAVID CLARK, DULY SECONDED BY LARRY BERGESON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING OF THE DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES.** Action: Approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

**IX. CALENDAR OF UPCOMING MEETINGS AND EVENTS**

- **Final Exams** – Monday through Friday, May 1 through Thursday, May 7, 2015
- **President Speaks to the DSU Colleagues** – Monday, May 4 @ 12PM, Taylor 156
- **National Day of Prayer Breakfast (President is Keynote Speaker)** – Thursday, May 7 @ 7:30AM, Gardner Center Ballroom
- **President Speaks to the Washington County Republican Women** – Thursday, May 7 @ 12PM, Abbey Inn
- **Dixie Awards Ceremony** – Thursday, May 7 in the Eccles Mainstage Theatre: Reception/Light Refreshments @ 6PM; Awards Ceremony @ 7PM
- **104th Annual Commencement Exercises** – Friday, May 8 @ 11AM, Burns Arena
- **Summer Semester 2015:**
  - 14-Week Block – Monday, May 11 through Friday, August 14
  - 1st 5-Week Block – Monday, May 18 through Friday, June 19
  - 8-Week Block – Tuesday, May 31 through Friday, July 22
  - 2nd 5-Week Block – Monday, June 20 through Friday, July 22
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Friday, May 15 @ SLCC
- **Northern Utah Alumni Chapter Event** – Saturday, May 16 @ 6PM, Falcon Park in Sandy, Utah
- **DFCM Meet & Greet for Project Managers, and State Agency and Higher Education Decision Makers** – Tuesday, May 19 @ 1-4PM, Zion Room
- **Governor Herbert's Energy Roundtable Breakfast** – Friday, May 22 @ 8:30-10AM, SLC
- **Memorial Day Holiday** – Monday, May 25, 2015
- **PacWest Conference** – Wednesday through Friday, May 27-29, 2015 @ San Francisco
- **Independence Day Holiday** – Saturday, July 4, 2015
- **AASCU Summer Council of Presidents Meeting** – July 11-14, 2015 @ Denver, CO
- **Council of Presidents Meeting** – Tuesday, July 14 @ 12-3PM, The Gateway/SLC
- **Pioneer Day Holiday** – Friday, July 24, 2015
- **New Presidents Academy** – July 27-31, 2015 @ La Jolla, CA
- **Regents and Trustees Joint Workshops** – Thursday, July 30 @ 12-4PM, SUU
- **Board of Regents Meeting** – Friday, July 31, 2015 @ SUU
- **Pre-Fall Workshops for Faculty and Staff** – Monday through Friday, August 17-21
Fall Semester Begins – Monday, August 24, 2015
Council of Presidents Meeting – Tuesday, September 1 @ 12-3PM, The Gateway/SLC
Labor Day Holiday – Monday, September 7, 2015
Board of Trustees Meeting – Friday, September 11, 2015 @ the Zion Room
Board of Regents Meeting – Friday, September 18 @ Utah State University
Homecoming Week – Monday through Saturday, September 21-26, 2015
National Advisory Council Meeting – Thursday or Friday, September 24 or 25, 2015
Huntsman World Senior Games – October 5-17, 2015
PacWest Advisory Board Meetings – Tuesday, October 6 @8AM-5PM, Zion Room
AASCU Annual Meeting – Sunday through Tuesday, October 25-27 @ Austin, TX
Council of Presidents Meeting – Tuesday, October 27 @ 12-3PM, The Gateway/SLC
Halloween – Saturday, October 31, 2015
Board of Trustees Meeting – Friday, November 6, 2015 @ the Zion Room
Board of Regents Meeting – Friday, November 13 @ Weber State University
Thanksgiving Holiday – Thursday and Friday, November 26 and 27, 2015
Final Exams – Monday through Friday, December 14-18, 2015
Holiday Break – Monday, December 21, 2015 through Friday, January 8, 2016
Spring Semester Begins – Monday, January 11, 2016

X. LUNCHEON FOR ALL MEETING ATTENDEES – SERVED IN THE ZION ROOM

XI. NEXT BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING – FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015
INVESTMENT REPORT
July 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015

Investment Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>$31,819,903</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch</td>
<td>1,150,994</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors</td>
<td>1,569,660</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah Students</td>
<td>78,754</td>
<td>-1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>7,822,027</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Investments</td>
<td>689,218</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,930,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.97%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investment Earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Earnings</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Dividends</td>
<td>$158,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized Gains (Losses)</td>
<td>281,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized Gains (Losses)</td>
<td>(194,315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$334,938</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Fiscal Year-To-Date Quarterly Earnings
## INVESTMENT REPORT
### July 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash or Cash Equivalents</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value March</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>21,426,708</td>
<td>103,812</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,812</td>
<td>9,561,200</td>
<td>31,091,720</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIF - Endowment Pool</td>
<td>526,218</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>528,183</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management (Zions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management (Wells)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,952,926</td>
<td>105,777</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,777</td>
<td>9,561,200</td>
<td>31,619,903</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Money Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money Manager</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value March</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch</td>
<td>1,137,338</td>
<td>44,538</td>
<td>(30,847)</td>
<td>13,691</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,150,994</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors</td>
<td>1,593,364</td>
<td>60,923</td>
<td>(81,004)</td>
<td>(20,081)</td>
<td>(3,623)</td>
<td>1,569,660</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>7,632,443</td>
<td>188,288</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>189,584</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,822,027</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,363,145</td>
<td>293,810</td>
<td>(111,553)</td>
<td>182,257</td>
<td>(3,623)</td>
<td>10,621,435</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Restricted Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Investments</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value March</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley - Bonds</td>
<td>577,403</td>
<td>24,882</td>
<td>8,609</td>
<td>33,491</td>
<td>(43,770)</td>
<td>567,124</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Investments Fund</td>
<td>123,088</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>(1,372)</td>
<td>(995)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122,093</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors (Students)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(999)</td>
<td>(937)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,754</td>
<td>-1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700,491</td>
<td>25,259</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>32,497</td>
<td>(43,770)</td>
<td>689,218</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total                          | 33,016,562                      | 424,846             | (104,315)             | 320,531           | 9,513,807                           | 42,930,555                | 0.97%             |
### Cash or Cash Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value April</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>21,426,708</td>
<td>117,654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,654</td>
<td>6,468,000</td>
<td>28,012,362</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIF - Endowment Pool</td>
<td>526,218</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>528,421</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21,952,926</td>
<td>119,857</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119,857</td>
<td>6,468,000</td>
<td>28,540,783</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Money Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value April</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch</td>
<td>1,137,338</td>
<td>92,905</td>
<td>(75,403)</td>
<td>17,502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,154,804</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors</td>
<td>1,593,364</td>
<td>72,121</td>
<td>(74,906)</td>
<td>(2,785)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,590,579</td>
<td>-0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>7,632,443</td>
<td>188,288</td>
<td>77,811</td>
<td>266,099</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,898,542</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,363,145</td>
<td>353,496</td>
<td>(73,496)</td>
<td>279,999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,722,800</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Restricted Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value April</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley - Bonds</td>
<td>577,403</td>
<td>24,727</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>28,540</td>
<td>(43,770)</td>
<td>562,173</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Investments Fund</td>
<td>123,088</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>(6,392)</td>
<td>116,790</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors (Students)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>(999)</td>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,875</td>
<td>-1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>700,491</td>
<td>25,111</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>28,634</td>
<td>(50,162)</td>
<td>678,963</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value April</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33,016,562</td>
<td>498,464</td>
<td>(69,974)</td>
<td>428,490</td>
<td>6,417,838</td>
<td>39,942,545</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INVESTMENT REPORT

**July 1, 2014 to May 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash or Cash Equivalents</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value May</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>21,426,708</td>
<td>130,988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130,988</td>
<td>4,174,800</td>
<td>25,732,495</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIF - Endowment Pool</td>
<td>526,218</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>528,670</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,952,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,440</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>133,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,174,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,261,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Money Managers

| Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch | 1,137,338 | 93,440 | (74,537) | 18,903 | - | 1,156,205 | 1.66% |
| Soltis Investment Advisors    | 1,593,364 | 73,560 | (69,259) | 4,301  | - | 1,597,666 | 0.27% |
| University of Utah            | 7,632,443 | 188,288 | 77,811  | 266,099 | - | 7,898,542 | 3.49% |
| **Total**                     | **10,363,145** | **355,491** | **(65,946)** | **289,545** | - | **10,732,345** | **2.79%** |

### Restricted Investments

| Morgan Stanley - Bonds        | 577,403 | 24,722 | 1,221  | 25,943 | (43,770) | 559,576 | 4.49% |
| Restricted Investments Fund   | 123,088 | 491    | 12     | 504    | (6,392)  | 117,200 | 0.41% |
| Soltis Investment Advisors (Students) | -      | 203    | 38     | 241    | -        | 79,932 | 0.30% |
| **Total**                     | **700,491** | **25,213** | **1,233** | **26,446** | **(50,162)** | **676,775** | **3.78%** |

### Grand Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value May</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>33,016,562</strong></td>
<td><strong>514,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>(64,713)</strong></td>
<td><strong>449,431</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,124,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,670,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# INVESTMENT REPORT

*July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash or Cash Equivalents</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value June</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>21,426,708</td>
<td>142,243</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142,243</td>
<td>(5,775,800)</td>
<td>15,793,150</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIF - Endowment Pool</td>
<td>526,218</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>528,914</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management</td>
<td>- (3,395)</td>
<td>(3,788)</td>
<td>(7,182)</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,992,818</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,952,926</td>
<td>141,544</td>
<td>(3,788)</td>
<td>137,756</td>
<td>4,224,200</td>
<td>26,314,882</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Money Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value June</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch</td>
<td>1,137,338</td>
<td>104,702</td>
<td>(95,660)</td>
<td>9,042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,146,345</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors</td>
<td>1,593,364</td>
<td>74,224</td>
<td>(102,110)</td>
<td>(27,886)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,565,478</td>
<td>-1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investments - Student Managed</td>
<td>- (419)</td>
<td>(2,258)</td>
<td>(1,839)</td>
<td>77,852</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>7,632,443</td>
<td>251,011</td>
<td>(69,103)</td>
<td>181,908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,814,351</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,363,145</td>
<td>430,356</td>
<td>(269,131)</td>
<td>161,225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,604,026</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Restricted Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value June</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley - Bonds</td>
<td>577,403</td>
<td>24,717</td>
<td>(6,446)</td>
<td>18,270</td>
<td>(43,770)</td>
<td>551,903</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Investments Fund</td>
<td>123,088</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>(6,392)</td>
<td>118,293</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700,491</td>
<td>25,233</td>
<td>(5,365)</td>
<td>19,868</td>
<td>(50,162)</td>
<td>670,196</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grand Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Market Value July 1st</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value June</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33,016,562</td>
<td>597,133</td>
<td>(278,284)</td>
<td>318,849</td>
<td>4,174,038</td>
<td>37,589,104</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INVESTMENT REPORT

### July 1, 2015 to July 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash or Cash Equivalents</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Inv Pool (PTIF)</td>
<td>15,793,150</td>
<td>7,577</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,577</td>
<td>(6,133,900)</td>
<td>9,666,827</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIF - Endowment Pool</td>
<td>528,914</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>529,174</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Investment Management</td>
<td>9,992,818</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>(1,124)</td>
<td>(757)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,992,061</td>
<td>-0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,314,882</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>(1,124)</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>(6,133,900)</td>
<td>20,188,062</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Money Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money Manager</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley / Merrill Lynch</td>
<td>1,146,345</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>(6,223)</td>
<td>(868)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,145,476</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investment Advisors</td>
<td>1,565,478</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>(9,850)</td>
<td>(9,190)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,556,288</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soltis Investments - Student Managed</td>
<td>77,852</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,615</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>7,814,351</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,814,351</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,604,026</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>(15,653)</td>
<td>(9,295)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,594,731</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Restricted Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Investment</th>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley - Bonds</td>
<td>551,903</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>554,184</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Investments Fund</td>
<td>1,829,93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,379</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>670,196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>672,563</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Realized Income</th>
<th>YTD Unrealized Income</th>
<th>YTD Total Income</th>
<th>Additions / (Sales) / (Withdrawals)</th>
<th>Ending Market Value</th>
<th>YTD Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37,589,104</td>
<td>14,565</td>
<td>(14,414)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(6,133,900)</td>
<td>31,455,356</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request for Proposals

Translator Rebroadcast Lease (Relevant Content)
SECTION 1 – PURPOSE OF RFP

1.01 PURPOSE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit proposals to enter into a contract with a qualified entity to lease FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz (Facility No. 19621) from Dixie State University. This RFP will result in a contract award to a single lessee.

This RFP is designed to provide interested offerors with sufficient basic information to submit proposals meeting minimum requirements, but is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant or essential data. Offerors are strongly encouraged to carefully read the entire RFP.

1.02 ABOUT DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY
Dixie State University is a publicly supported teaching institution located in St. George, Utah. For additional information about Dixie State, please visit the University’s home page at www.dixie.edu.

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS

SECTION 3 – INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO THIS RFP

3.01 to 3.07 is boilerplate

3.08 CONTRACT PERIOD
Any contract awarded as a result of this solicitation will have a term ending September 30, 2021. The contract may be renewable for an additional 5 year term, contingent upon the University’s renewal of its FCC licensing as well as the mutual interest and ability of the parties to negotiate a new contract.

Lessee shall have the right to cancel the lease upon thirty days’ prior written notice to DSU if any of the following occur:
• DSU’s equipment at Webb Hill becomes entirely or substantially destroyed through no fault of Lessee, and DSU chooses not to replace or repair the equipment.
• The multi-user tower site becomes unsafe for maintenance of DSU’s equipment, through no fault of Lessee.
• DSU is prevented by law, regulation or ordinance from maintaining the equipment at Webb Hill.

Lessor shall have the right of termination for any reason by giving written notice to the Lessee of not less than ninety days. Lessor shall also have the right of termination for failure of performance of the terms and conditions of the contract by giving Lessee thirty days’ written notice.

SECTION 4 – STATEMENT OF NEEDS

4.01 OBJECTIVE
Dixie State University desires to lease FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, Utah (Facility No.19621) to rebroadcast the signal of another FM station. DSU’s equipment is located at Webb Hill. The minimum monthly lease amount will be $2,500. Proposals must include your monetary offer. Additional consideration will be given to proposals which include opportunities for Dixie State University student internships or employment, or other considerations.

Lessee will be responsible to reimburse DSU for the cost of maintenance and repair of the translator equipment in maintaining compliance with the FCC authorization and rules.

SECTION 5 – GENERAL RFP PROVISIONS

SECTION 6 – PROPOSAL RESPONSE OUTLINE

SECTION 7 – PROPOSAL EVALUATION

SECTION 8 – CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

These sections are boilerplate
DRAFT 9/1/2015

REBROADCAST AGREEMENT

This Rebroadcast Agreement (the “Agreement”) is made and entered into as of the _______ day of September 2015 by and between Dixie State University, a Utah Educational Institution (“DSU”) licensee of FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621) herein after (“DSU” or “Lessor”) and NEWCO, a Utah company in good standing hereafter (“NewCo” or “Lessee”) and collectively the Parties.

Recitals

WHEREAS, NEWCO licensee of KXXX(FM) ###.#MHz, Town, State (Facility No. xxxxxx) desires to lease from DSU, FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621) to rebroadcast the signal of KXXX(FM) on the translator subject to the terms and conditions as set forth herein;

WHEREAS, DSU licensee of FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621) desires to lease to NEWCO, licensee of KXXX(FM) ###.#MHz, Town, State (Facility No. xxxxxx), FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621) to rebroadcast the signal of KXXX(FM) on the translator subject to the terms and conditions as set forth herein;

Agreement

IN CONSIDERATION OF THE MUTUAL PROMISES CONTAINED HEREIN, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto, intending to be legally bound, do hereby agree as follows:

1. Lease Term. DSU agrees to lease FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621) to Lessee for a term which will expire on September 30, 2021, with the option to renew for an additional five (5) year period, contingent upon DSU’s renewal of its FCC licensing for the translator, as well as the mutual interest and ability of the parties to negotiate a new contract.

2. Lease Fee. The monthly lease fee shall be Two-Thousand Five-Hundred ($2,500.00) dollars payable on or before the first day of each month for the term of this Agreement. Lessee further agrees to reimburse DSU for the monthly utilities costs associated with the operation of the facility.

3. Facility. DSU is the Licensee of FM Translator K235CK operating in accordance with FCC broadcast authorization File No. BLFT - 20150716AAC (Exhibit “A”) for which Lessee authorizes the rebroadcast of KXXX(FM).

4. Maintenance & Repair. Lessee agrees to reimburse DSU for the cost of
maintenance and repair of the translator equipment in maintaining compliance with the FCC authorization and rules.

5. **Termination.** Lessee shall have the right to cancel this Lease upon thirty (30) days prior written notice to DSU if any of the following occur:

   a. DSU's equipment at Webb Hill becomes entirely or substantially destroyed through no fault of Lessee and DSU chooses not to replace or repair the equipment;

   b. The Multi-user tower site becomes unsafe for maintenance of DSU's equipment, through no fault of Lessee;

   c. DSU is prevented by law, regulation or ordinance from maintaining the equipment at Webb Hill;

   d. Lessor shall have the right of termination for any reason by giving written notice to DSU of not less than ninety (90) days in advance.

DSU shall have the right to terminate this Lease (and any further renewal options under paragraph 1) for failure of performance of the terms and conditions of this Agreement by giving Lessee thirty (30) days written notice.

6. **Representations, Warranties and Covenants.** DSU and Lessee represent that each has had the opportunity to have legal counsel review this Agreement and the action contemplated herein for which the cost of legal representation shall be paid by the party that incurred the expense.

7. **DSU Covenants.** DSU covenants to Lessee that: (a) DSU holds a valid FCC Broadcast authorization for FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz, St. George, UT (Facility No. 196261) and (b) DSU has a multi-user tower site agreement and the right and lawful authority to enter into this Agreement.

8. **Lessee Covenants.** Lessee covenants to DSU that it will; (a) promptly pay the monthly lease fee as due pursuant to paragraph 2 of this Agreement and abide by all of its terms and conditions herein, (b) Comply with all laws, regulations, ordinances and rules including but not limited to any and all laws, rules and regulations, applicable to rebroadcast programming rule 74.12854 and station ID 74.1283).

9. **Exclusivity and Confidentiality.** The parties agree that from the date hereof, the parties agree to keep confidential the terms of this Agreement, except with respect to any disclosure required by law.

10. **Notices.** All correspondence or notices required or desired to be given under this Agreement shall be deemed given when delivered to the US Postal Service, Certified Return Receipt, to the address listed below:
Dixie State University
Attn: Shawn Denevan
225 South 700 University Avenue
Jennings Communication Bldg. Room 103
St. George, Utah 84770

NEWCO
1234 Address
City, State, zip code
ATT:

11. **Liquidated Damages.** If any party performs any act or omission that adversely affects the terms of this Agreement resulting in a material breach of the agreement, that party shall be liable to the non-breaching party in the amount of not less Ten-Thousand Dollars ($10,000.00) plus any incurred attorney fees.

12. **Insurance.** Lessee shall procure and maintain at its sole cost and expense for the tower site at Webb Hill for bodily injury and property damage insurance with a combined single limit of at least one-million dollars ($1,000,000.00) per occurrence. Such insurance shall insure, on an occurrence basis, against all liability of Lessee, its employees and agents arising out of or in connection with Lessee’s use of the tower site pursuant to the lease in Exhibit “B”. DSU and the tower site proprietor shall be named as an additional insured on Lessee’s policy. Lessee shall provide to DSU a certificate of insurance evidencing the coverage required by this paragraph within thirty (30) days of the Commencement Date.

13. **Miscellaneous.** This Agreement represents the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein and supersedes any prior agreement whether in writing or otherwise. This Agreement may be amended only in writing by an instrument duly executed by both parties. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and shall be construed and enforced under the laws of Utah with venue for any action brought to enforce this Agreement in the State of Utah Fifth District Court at St. George, Utah.

The undersigned represent and warrant that, respectively, they have authority to sign this Agreement and to legally bind themselves and/or entity to perform all of the terms hereof.

**WHEREFORE,** the parties whose names and addresses appear below have caused this Agreement to be executed by them as of the date first above written.

**DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY – “DSU”**

By: ________________________________

Its: ________________________________

**NEW COMPANY - LESSEE**

By: ________________________________
Its: __________________
EXHIBIT “A”

Broadcast License of FM Translator K235CK 94.9MHz
St. George, UT (Facility No. 19621)
FCC File No. BLFT - 20150716AAC
EXHIBIT “B”

TSM, Inc multi-user tower site agreement
Dixie State University Policy

110 Speech Policy

I. Purpose

1.1 These regulations shall be interpreted in accordance with the free speech and assembly rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Utah Constitution, and in accordance with generally accepted concepts of academic freedom as followed nationally and at Dixie State University. It is the purpose of these regulations to protect and enhance the free exchange of ideas in the University and on the University campus. The primary function of a university is to discover and disseminate knowledge by means of research and teaching. To fulfill these functions a free interchange of ideas is necessary. It follows that this University must insure within it the fullest degree of intellectual freedom and protect the opportunity of all members of the University community and their guests to exercise their intellectual freedom and protect their right to communicate with others in the University community.

1.2 Academic freedom, the free flow of ideas, the right to speak, and the right to hear must be protected not only from censorship, but also from those committed to interference with a speaker’s presentation through acts of disruption. It is the responsibility of all members of the academic community to refrain from such conduct and the University shall apply appropriate sanctions under proper procedural safeguards to those who violate this obligation.

II. Scope

2.1 All persons on the campus, centers, and off campus sites of Dixie State University, whether administrators, faculty, students, employees, visitors, and/or guests are subject to the law and the regulations of the University.
Those who violate the law or the University's regulations while on the campus do so at the risk of prosecution in the courts by appropriate government officials or proceedings authorized by University regulations. By virtue of regulating the exercise of free speech on the campus, the University does not sponsor or sanction the messages being stated or the methods of speech being used unless expressly stated otherwise.

III. Definitions

3.1 Student Rights and Responsibilities Code – The Student Rights and Responsibilities Code is the Code governing student rights and responsibilities found in Policy 552.

3.2 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Code – The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Code governs faculty rights and responsibilities found in Policy 633.

3.3 Member of the University Community – Members of the University community shall include all students, members of the University faculty and teaching staff, all employees holding administrative or staff positions and all personnel associated with the University.

3.4 Departments and Colleges – For the purpose of these regulations, the terms "department" and "college" shall mean those academic units of Dixie State University that are from time to time authorized and established by the Board of Trustees of Dixie State University or the State Board of Regents.

3.5 Department or College Student Organizations – For the purpose of these regulations, the terms "department student organizations" or "college student organizations" mean those organizations of students authorized and established by the faculty or College Council of any department or college of the University, that are responsible to the faculty, college council or administrative head of that department or college and in which students in the department or college are eligible for membership.

3.6 Symbolic Speech – "Symbolic speech" shall include structures, actions and any other thing or activity for the purpose of expressing views or opinions that is not otherwise included in the concepts of oral or written speech, signs, handbills, posters or other methods of communication.

3.7 Commercial Speech – For the purpose of these regulations, "commercial speech" includes all spoken, written and symbolic speech intended in whole or
in part for the personal profit of the person, organization or institution engaged in the speech.

3.8 Scheduling Office – For the purpose of these regulations, the Scheduling Office shall be the person so designated by the University Administration and charged with scheduling the use of University classrooms, auditoria, and other indoor and outdoor space with the exception of such University facilities as shall be designated by written rules published by the Scheduling Office as outside the jurisdiction of the Scheduling Office or where administrative directives have vested scheduling authority for facilities in the administration of a college or other subdivision of the University.

IV. Policy

4.1 Freedom of Speech and Assembly – Members of the University community shall have the right to freedom of speech and assembly without prior restraint or censorship, subject only to clearly stated, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rules and regulations regarding time, place, and manner.

4.2 Academic Freedom – Academic freedom in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge through all media shall be maintained at Dixie State University. Academic freedom shall be recognized as a right of all members of the faculty, whether with or without tenure or continuing appointment, of all administrative officers, and of all students. Dixie State University endorses and hereby incorporates in these regulations the following statements of the American Association of University Professors related to defining academic freedom: "The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (http://www.aaup.org-AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm) and the "1970 Interpretive Comments" thereon; the "1970 Statement on Professors and Political Activity"; the "1970 Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility"; and, the "1967 Joint Statement on Rights and; Freedoms of Students (http://www.aaup.org-AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/stud-rights.htm)".

4.3 Freedom of the Press – Members of the University community in their publications or broadcasts are entitled to the full protection of the constitutional right of freedom of the press. Reasonable and nondiscriminatory rules and regulations, consistent with these regulations, may be adopted regarding the operations of student and faculty publications, posting of signs and notices, the distribution of commercial advertising materials, and the solicitation of funds.
4.4 Due Process – Due process of law is recognized as essential to the proper enforcement of University rules, and accordingly no disciplinary sanction may be imposed on a member of the University community or an organization by or in the name of the University except in accordance with the written regulations, policies or procedures of the University and the Constitution of the State of Utah and the Constitution of the United States.

4.5 Conduct of Classes – Discussion and expression of all views relevant to the subject matter of a class are recognized as necessary to the educational process, but students have no right to impinge on the freedom of instructors to teach or the right of other students to learn. If a student persists in behaving disruptively in class after the instructor has explained the unacceptability of such conduct, the instructor may dismiss the student from the class and may refer the matter to the University’s Student Behavior Committee. Upon dismissing a student from class, the instructor shall immediately notify the Dean of Students of the action so the student may be informed of the student’s right to appeal the dismissal.

4.6 Nondisclosure of Student Views – Information about individual student views, beliefs, and political associations acquired by instructors, counselors, or administrators in the course of their work is confidential and is not to be disclosed to others without the prior written consent of the student involved or under legal compulsion.

4.7 Academic Rights of Faculty Members –

4.7.1 A faculty member has the legal rights and privileges of a citizen. He or she may not be subject to punishment or reprisal for the exercise of such rights and privileges. He or she may be subject to sanctions for breach of the rules and responsibilities enumerated in the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy 633.

4.7.1.1 Every faculty member has the right to academic freedom and the right to examine and communicate ideas by any lawful means even where such activities generate hostility or pressures against the faculty member or the University.

4.7.1.2 A faculty member’s exercise of freedom of communication, association, or assembly, or his or her participation in political activities, does not constitute a violation of duty to the University, to his or her profession, or to students, except as otherwise limited by the Hatch Act.
4.7.2 Where his or her rank and status are appropriate, a faculty member has the right to vote on faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure and to vote for representatives to department, college and University legislative bodies.

4.7.3 In any disciplinary matter, a faculty member has a right to adequate notice, to be heard, and to decision and review by impartial persons or bodies. In disciplinary proceedings involving a possibility of substantial sanctions, a faculty member has a right to full due process and peer judgment.

4.7.4 Faculty members are entitled to support and assistance from the University in maintaining a climate suitable for the exercise of rights of academic freedom, scholarship, research, and effective teaching and learning. A faculty member is entitled to a classroom free from violence or systematic disruption. The University shall strive to assist the faculty member in improving his or her skills and developing his or her talents as teacher and scholar.

4.8 Right to Form Student Organizations – Student organizations may be established for any lawful purpose. Affiliation of any student organization with lawful off-campus groups shall not, in itself, disqualify that organization from enjoying the benefits and privileges which the University affords to student organizations. Organizations shall have the right to keep membership lists confidential and solely for their own use. The names and addresses of officers or representatives may be required by the University as a condition for registration or access to University funds or enjoyment of University privileges.

4.9 Registration Procedure for Student Organizations –

4.9.1 Registration – Any qualified organization may be added to the University Club Roster upon the filing of a completed University registration form, with the Dixie State University Student Association Clubs Council.

4.9.2 Registration Form – A completed registration form shall include the following:

4.9.2.1 name of organization;

4.9.2.2 address;
4.9.2.3 official representative(s);

4.9.2.4 constitution, charter, or official statement of the organization that:

4.9.2.4.1 sets forth the purposes and organization of the group;

4.9.2.4.2 defines the qualifications for membership;

4.9.2.4.3 provides for a method of choosing the representatives of the organization, all of whom shall be students, faculty, or employees of Dixie State University;

4.9.2.5 a signed statement of intent to be listed on the University Clubs Roster.

4.10 Maintenance of Registration for Student Organizations – Registered student organizations shall maintain their position on the University Clubs Roster upon filing annually with the DSUSA Clubs Council a statement of intent to maintain their listing on the Clubs Roster. This statement shall include any changes in the official statement since its latest filing and shall list the current recognized official representatives of the group.

4.11 Removal from Roster – The DSUSA Club Council may remove an organization from the University Clubs Roster for failure by the group to abide by University rules and regulations or state law.

4.12 Student Elections – Student elections for DSUSA shall be regulated pursuant to written regulations, consistent with the policies of these regulations, adopted by DSUSA and published as part of DSUSA bylaws. Elections for student organizations sponsored by colleges and/or departments shall be regulated by the college or department sponsoring the student organization that are pursuant to regulations consistent with the policies of these regulations.

4.13 Speaker Policy –

4.13.1 Members of the University community and their organizations shall have the right to invite speakers to address audiences on campus (at the expense of the organization and members), subject only to reasonable and nondiscriminatory regulations governing the use of University facilities. The rights of speakers to freedom of expression under the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Utah shall be protected.
The rights of speakers to speak and audiences to hear free from undue disruption and interference shall also be protected.

4.13.2 Members of the University community and their organizations who invite speakers to address audiences on or off the campus, except University organizations designated by the University or any college or department as an official organization of the University, may not imply official University sponsorship of the speaker in advertising or publicizing the event, except to identify the location of the event.

4.14 Free Speech Facilities –

4.14.1 The University shall provide reasonably appropriate facilities in the area of the Gardner Center and adjoining lawns on the north and east sides and adjacent patio areas to enable speakers to address those wishing to listen. These facilities shall be available to any person, but members of the University community and their organizations shall have preference in the use of the facilities. Use of the facilities may be reserved through the Scheduling Office for up to two hours for purposes of speaking. Members of the University community or their organizations reserving use of the facilities shall have preference in its use in the order of their application and over those seeking to use the facilities without reservation. Persons using the facilities may make use of tables and other temporary means for displaying or distributing information while the person or organization representing them is making use of the facilities. The tables or other temporary means for displaying or distributing information shall be removed upon the expiration of the time during which the facilities are being used by the person or organization. Arrangements for tables can be made with the Director of Guest Services.

4.14.2 Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as limiting the right of free speech elsewhere on the campus as provided by these regulations. The Scheduling Office shall provide general notice of the existence of free speech facilities provided for in this section and the procedures for reserving use of the facilities.

4.15 Sound Amplification Equipment –

4.15.1 Where sound amplification equipment is used to exercise rights defined or protected by these regulations, the persons or organizations exercising such rights must first obtain permission from the Scheduling Office. Sound
equipment shall only be used at sound levels which do not disrupt or disturb teaching, research, or other duly authorized meetings or activities. Violations of this restriction shall constitute grounds for revocation of the permission to use the sound amplification equipment.

4.15.2 Where permission is denied or revoked by the Scheduling Office, the Vice President of Student Services will review the denial or revocation. The decision and any remedies ordered by the Vice President of Student Services shall be final except as to claims of violation of the Utah or United States Constitution, which claims shall be heard by appeal to the University President.

4.16 Defamatory or Obscene Speech – Nothing in these regulations shall be construed as authorizing or condoning unlawful defamatory or obscene speech as defined by applicable law. Any person engaging in such conduct or using University facilities or grounds to do so shall be subject to the laws governing defamatory or obscene speech, including the authority of the University to remove signs, posters, handbills, structures or other defamatory or obscene speech or publications. Where speech is prohibited or signs, posters, handbills, or structures are designated for removal, the Vice President of Student Services will review the prohibition or proposed removal. The decision and any remedies ordered by the Vice President of Student Services shall be final except as to claims of violation of the Utah or United States Constitution, which claims shall be heard by appeal to the University President.

V. References
DSU Policies & Procedures 632: Faculty Responsibilities and Academic Freedom
DSU Policies & Procedures 552: Student Rights and Responsibilities Code
DSU Policies & Procedures 139: Scheduling of Campus Facilities

VI. Procedures

6.1 Regulations Governing the Use of University Facilities

6.1.1 Purpose. The regulations contained in this title establish procedures for the authorized use of University facilities for meetings, activities or other events. The purpose of the regulations contained in this title is to facilitate the effective and orderly use and enjoyment of the University's facilities without unduly interfering with University instructional, research and other functions. These regulations apply to members of the
University community and their organizations and to others from outside the University community who desire to use University facilities for meetings, activities or other events on campus. These regulations do not apply to the University Administration or duly authorized college, department or other administrators in scheduling University facilities for classes, research or other uses associated with the teaching and research functions of the University.

6.1.2 Scheduling Responsibilities –

6.1.2.1 The Scheduling Office of the University shall maintain and provide for inspection by any person:

6.1.2.1.1 A list of the facilities which may be scheduled for use by members of the University community and their organizations. The list shall indicate those facilities over which the Scheduling Office has authority and the persons responsible for scheduling facilities not within the authority of the Scheduling Office;

6.1.2.1.2 A list of facilities not available for scheduling for use by members of the University community and their organizations; and

6.1.2.1.3 A schedule of any fees for use of University facilities or equipment.

6.1.2.2 The Scheduling Office, in consultation with the University Administration, may adopt a schedule of fees for use of University facilities. The fee schedule may distinguish between the classes of users in whether to impose a fee for the uses described and in the amount of the fee imposed. However, any fee schedule shall be administered on a content- and viewpoint-neutral basis, without discrimination among the members of the same class of users, and fees shall not exceed the University's costs of allowing use of its facilities.

6.1.2.3 Scheduling Procedures and Standards –

6.1.2.3.1 Any member or organization of the University community may obtain the use of University facilities for non-
commercial and University-related use by filing a request form with the Scheduling Office. For the purpose of this regulation, a University-related use shall be interpreted liberally to include extracurricular activities normally associated with the University or activities reasonably related to membership in the University community. The request form shall include the following information:

6.1.2.3.2 The name of the requesting organization or the name and identification number of the requesting member;

6.1.2.3.3 A brief description of the intended use, including the name of any speaker or speakers and the general topic of an address, if applicable;

6.1.2.3.4 The anticipated number of persons who will attend;

6.1.2.3.5 Whether an admission fee will be charged and, if so, the amount and purpose of such fee;

6.1.2.3.6 Any special facilities or equipment required for the use of the facility; and

6.1.2.3.7 Any preference for specific facilities.

6.1.2.4 The request form may also contain a statement to be signed by the member or by a member on behalf of an organization in which the requesting party agrees to be liable for any fees, legitimate out-of-pocket expenses or damages because of the applicant’s conduct in use of the facility. Any rental fee charged for the use of the facility under this section shall only be made in accordance with a uniformly administered schedule of fees.

6.1.2.5 As soon as practicable, the Scheduling Office shall assign an appropriate room or space to the requesting member or organization meeting the requirements of this section and shall assist in arranging for any special equipment that might be required.
6.1.2.6 Commercial and Non-University Related Uses – The Scheduling Office shall publish rules and regulations governing the use of University facilities for commercial and non-University related purposes. The regulations may include a schedule of rental fees for University facilities. The regulations shall be available for inspection in the Scheduling Office and a written record of actions taken under the regulations shall be maintained and be open for public inspection.

6.1.2.7 Appeal Rights – If a member of the University community or organization objects to the denial of a scheduling request, the assignment of a particular facility or the assessment of fees or out-of-pocket expenses, the requesting member or organization shall have a right to appeal the denial, assignment or assessment to the Vice President of Student Services, which shall hear the appeal and render a decision as soon as practicable but in any event no later than five (5) calendar days after the date of the appeal. The decision of the Vice President of Student Services shall be final, except as to claims that the action of the Scheduling Office or the Vice President of Student Services violates academic freedom or rights guaranteed by the United States or Utah Constitution, which shall be heard by appeal to the President of the University.

6.1.3 Signs, Literature, and Structures –

6.1.3.1 Posting of Signs, Notices and Posters by Members of the University Community –

6.1.3.2 General Policy – The University shall provide reasonable space indoors and outdoors for the posting of signs, notices and posters by members of the University community and their organizations. Such signs, notices and posters may deal with any subject matter including, but not limited to, notices of meetings or events and expressions of positions and ideas on social or political topics.

6.1.3.3 Time, Place and Manner Restrictions – Members of the University community and their organizations may post signs, notices and posters on bulletin boards and kiosks maintained by the University and located on the campus. Signs, notices and posters
shall not be attached to trees, buildings, walls or other University structures unless otherwise expressly authorized by the Scheduling Office. Messages or slogans of any kind shall not be painted or otherwise written on trees, buildings, sidewalks, grounds fountains, walls or other University structures or surfaces, or on the personal property of others.

6.1.3.4 Members of the University community and their organizations may also post signs, notices and posters on designated bulletin boards and kiosks maintained by the academic and administrative departments of the University subject to the approval and reasonable limitations of the appropriate departments. Colleges and departments may adopt reasonable time regulations limiting the time for display of signs, notices and posters on bulletin boards maintained by colleges and departments to maximize everyone's opportunity to use designated areas for signs, notices and posters and may prohibit attaching signs, notices or posters to walls and other surfaces in order to prevent damage to walls and other surfaces.

6.1.3.5 Any sign, notice or poster posted on campus must contain a visible expiration date, a date after which the sign, notice or poster may be removed, not to exceed fifteen (15) calendar days from the date of posting. For purposes of this regulation, a visible expiration date shall be either a stamped expiration date by the Scheduling Office or official of the college or department responsible for the area where the sign, notice or poster is posted or a legible date placed in the lower right hand corner of the sign, notice or poster by the person or organization posting the sign, notice or poster. University maintenance personnel or other University officials may remove any signs, notices and posters which do not contain a visible expiration date as defined by this section.

6.1.3.6 The Scheduling Office may grant permission to post signs, notices and posters for a period longer than fifteen (15) calendar days where it is shown that there is good reason for the signs, notices or posters to remain in place for a longer period.

6.1.3.7 Commercial and Non-University Community Signs, Notices and Posters — The Scheduling Office shall publish rules and
regulations governing the posting or distribution of signs, notices, posters, and other materials for commercial purposes or by non-members of the University community. The regulations may include a schedule of fees and limitations upon the areas in which such commercial or non-member of the University community activity may take place. The regulations shall be content- and viewpoint-neutral, shall not discriminate among similarly situated entities, and shall be available for inspection in the Scheduling Office and a written record of actions taken under the regulations shall be maintained and be open for public inspection.

6.1.3.8 Responsibility for Content of Signs, Notices or Posters — Any person or organization shall be responsible for the content of any signs, notices or posters they sponsor or post on campus. By posting the sign, notice or poster on campus, the person or organization agrees to hold the University harmless for any assessed damages or liabilities incurred as a result of the sign, notice or poster.

6.1.4 Distribution of Handbills, Petitions and Other Written Material —

6.1.4.1 General Policy — Any person may hand out and distribute non-commercial handbills, petitions or other written material on campus without prior approval.

6.1.4.2 Time, Place and Manner Restrictions —

6.1.4.2.1 Distribution outside of University buildings is permissible but must not interfere with the entrances to the University buildings or the normal flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

6.1.4.2.2 Distribution inside buildings is permissible so long as those distributing handbills or other written materials do not disrupt the functioning of the University or unreasonably interfere with the rights of other members of the University community.
6.1.4.2.3 Handbills or other written material may not be attached or affixed to private property without the owner’s permission.

6.1.4.3 Distribution of Commercial Handbills – The Scheduling Office shall publish rules and regulations governing the distribution of commercial handbills. The regulations may include a schedule of fees and limitations upon the areas in which such commercial activity may take place. The regulations shall be content- and viewpoint-neutral, shall not discriminate among similarly situated entities, and shall be available for inspection in the Scheduling Office and a written record of actions taken under the regulations shall be maintained and be open for public inspection.

6.1.4.4 Responsibility for Handbills – Any person distributing handbills or other written material shall be personally responsible for the content of the material and hold the University harmless for any assessed damage or liability incurred as a result of the distribution of the material.

6.1.5 Structures Erected by Members of the University Community –

6.1.5.1 General Policy –

6.1.5.1.1 Members of the University community and their organizations may erect structures on campus to express their view or opinions. Such structures may deal with any subject matter including, but not limited to, expressions of positions and ideas on social or political topics.

6.1.5.1.2 A "structure" is any object (other than objects such as handbills, signs, notices and posters, arm bands or personal attire) used in the process of expressing views or opinions including, but not limited to, lawn signs, tables (and other structures used to display materials), booths, buildings, billboards, banners, and similar displays.

6.1.5.2 Time, Place and Manner Restrictions –
6.1.5.2.1 Members of the University community and their organizations may erect structures in areas where free speech facilities are required as defined herein. Members of the University community and their organizations may erect structures outside of the area where free speech facilities are required after providing an explanation in the permit application that the message is intended to reach an audience beyond the areas described in Section IV.14 of this Policy.

6.1.5.2.2 Prior to the erection of any structure, a person or organization must obtain a permit from the Scheduling Office for each proposed structure. The application for a permit shall include the identity of the member or members of the University community responsible for the structure, the proposed location and design of the structure, the length of time up to thirty (30) calendar days for which the permit shall be in effect, an agreement to remove the structure upon expiration of the permit and pay for any damage the structure may cause to the site upon which it is erected, and an agreement to hold the University harmless for any assessed damages or liabilities caused by the structure itself. In the case of structures defined in subsection 3 A of this section, other than structures that are lawn signs, billboards, banners and similar self-explanatory structures, the Scheduling Office shall require that the structure be regularly staffed during daytime school hours as a condition of issuing the permit and renewing the permit.

6.1.5.2.3 The Scheduling Office shall issue the permit:

6.1.5.2.3.1 if the intended structure and uses made of it will not constitute an unreasonable safety hazard and will not impede the normal functions of the University;

6.1.5.2.3.2 if the structure does not block or impede entry to any building or interfere with normal pedestrian or vehicular traffic; and, 3) the proposed location of
the structure does not inflict unreasonable damage upon landscaping like flower gardens and shrubs.

6.1.5.2.4 A permit shall be issued for up to thirty (30) calendar days. At the end of the time period for which a permit conditioned upon staffing the structure was issued and where there has been reasonable compliance with the staffing requirement, such a permit shall be renewed upon application for the same time period subject to the requirements applicable to the issuance of the original permit. A permit conditioned on staffing the structure shall be renewed as often as requested, but in no case shall a renewal period extend beyond the end of the academic semester.

6.1.5.3 Appeal Rights – Any person denied a permit to erect a structure or who objects to restrictions placed upon a permit may appeal the action of the Scheduling Office to the Vice President of Student Services. The action of the Vice President of Student Services may be appealed to the President of the University on the ground that the action constitutes a violation of academic freedom or rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution or the Utah Constitution.

6.1.5.4 Responsibility for Content and Safety of Structures – Members of the University community shall be responsible for the content and use they make of the structures they erect on campus. By erecting any structure on campus, the member or members of the University community agrees to hold the University harmless for any assessed damages or liabilities caused by the structure itself or caused by libel or slander in the message it conveys.

6.1.5.5 Structures Erected by Non-Members of the University Community or for Commercial Purposes – The Scheduling Office shall provide rules and regulations governing the creation and use of structures for commercial purposes or by non-members of the University community. The regulations may include a schedule of fees and limitations upon the areas in which such commercial or non-member of the University community activity
may take place. The regulations shall be content- and viewpoint-neutral, shall not discriminate among similarly situated entities, and shall be available for inspection in the Scheduling Office and a written record of actions taken under the regulations shall be maintained and be open for public inspection.

6.1.6 Demonstrations and Picketing –

6.1.6.1 General Policy –

6.1.6.1.1 Demonstrations and picketing on campus are legitimate means of expression. Anyone who wishes to engage in demonstrations and picketing shall be permitted to do so freely, as long as their conduct is not violent and does not unduly disrupt the functioning of the University or unreasonably interfere with the rights of other members of the University community or damage University or private property.

6.1.6.1.2 The term "demonstration" as used herein means any rally, gathering, protest, parade or procession.

6.1.6.2 Time, Place and Manner Restrictions –

6.1.6.2.1 Picketing or demonstrating must be orderly at all times and must not jeopardize public order or safety.

6.1.6.2.2 Picketing or demonstrating must not interfere with the entrances to buildings or the normal flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

6.1.6.2.3 Picketing or demonstrating must not unreasonably interfere with organized meetings or other assemblies in such a way as to invade the rights of others to assemble and the rights of speakers to free expression.

6.1.6.2.4 Picketing or demonstrating must not unreasonably interfere with classes and teaching, the use of offices, or the privacy of University housing, and other University activities related to teaching or research.
6.1.6.3 Responsibility for Demonstrations or Picketing –

6.1.6.3.1 Persons violating the time, place and manner regulations relating to demonstrations and picketing may be subject to arrest or other action authorized by law after notice is given of the regulations being violated and the persons refuse to cease and desist in their conduct violating the regulations.

6.1.6.3.2 Picketers or demonstrators shall be financially responsible for any damages caused by their picketing or demonstrating. Damages caused by third parties not part of the picketing or demonstrations shall be assessed against such third parties.

6.1.6.4 Appeal Rights – Any person assessed damages caused by picketing or demonstrating shall have a right to appeal the assessment of damages to the Vice President of Student Services. The decision of the Vice President of Student Services shall be final.
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101 Policy Process

I. Purpose

1.1 Dixie State University (DSU) creates, approves, issues, revises, and maintains all university wide policies to provide continuity, accessibility, clarity, and transparency to the university community.

1.2 DSU provides a comprehensive, timely, consistent, and relevant set of policies that cover key aspects of university life, maintain university core values, and protect as well as support students, staff, faculty, and university resources. Policies are designed to bring the university into compliance with state and federal law and best practices in higher education.

II. Scope

2.1 University policies address governance and principles. Unless explicitly stated, every policy applies to all faculty, staff, and students, as well as visitors to university facilities and users of university resources.

2.2 DSU adheres to the principle that the perspectives of faculty, staff, and students should be appropriately considered in the development of university policies. Representative bodies shall be consulted in the process of creating, revising, and retiring policies.

2.3 The Policy Office and the Policy Steering Committee (PSC) maintain university policies. University policies supersede other university, department, program, or office guidelines, practices, rules, handbooks, and procedures.

III. Definitions

3.1 Approval date: The approval date is the date a policy proposal is approved by the DSU Board of Trustees.
3.2 **Policy Steering Committee (PSC):** The PSC should be made up of broad university representation from faculty, staff, students, and specialty functions. The committee steers policy writing, development, process and revision, and assists owners in prioritization of policies.

3.3 **Policy Owner:** A Policy Owner must be one of the following: President, Vice President, or Executive Director of Human Resources. A Policy Owner oversees university policies for his or her area(s) of responsibility and appoints Policy Stewards.

3.4 **Policy Steward:** A Policy Steward is an individual who, under the direction of a Policy Owner and in conjunction with the Policy Office/PSC, facilitates the development and advancement of a policy proposal through the university policy approval processes.

3.5 **Non-substantive revisions:** Non-substantive revisions are changes to an existing policy or policy proposal that correct typographical and grammatical errors, change policy format, and/or update university or reference information.

3.6 **Substantive revision:** Substantive revisions are changes that alter the intent, scope, meaning, or application of a university policy or policy proposal.

3.7 **University policy:** University policies are maintained by the Policy Office /PSC on the university policy website. University policies often prescribe standards, requirements, restrictions, rights, or responsibilities and support the mission, values, and operation of the university. In this document, the terms policy and policies refer to university policies. Policies may not exist except at the university level. Divisions, schools, departments, programs, offices, etc. may have guidelines, practices, and standard operating procedures.

IV. **Policy**

4.1 All Policy ownership lies with the Policy Owner. The Policy Office/PSC, owners and stewards are responsible for reviewing, updating, and decommissioning policies on a regular basis.

4.2 Policy will be considered, evaluated, or revised according to the following priority and precedence:

4.2.1 Federal and State regulation, and court rulings

4.2.2 Board of Regents policies

4.2.3 University Policies
4.2.4 Division/school rules, regulations, procedures, guidelines, etc.

4.2.5 Department/program and office rules, regulations, procedures, guidelines, etc.

4.3 New or Revised Policy

4.3.1 Any University employee, stakeholder, subject expert, or student can submit a request form to the Policy Office/PSC, or gain stewardship through a Policy Owner. Requests to create a new policy or revise a current policy shall be sent to the Policy Office/PSC, including documentation of the reason the alteration is required, suggested revision, and impacted stakeholders.

4.3.2 The Policy Office/PSC will assign a Policy Owner. The Policy Office/PSC works with the Policy Owner and Policy Steward to guide policy revisions through the approval process.

4.4 Approval Process

4.4.1 A policy request and/or best practice draft should be submitted to the Policy Office/PSC for review, creation, or deletion and given due consideration. The office may work with Faculty Senate, Staff Associations and Student Associations where needed for review.

4.4.2 The Policy Owner approves the progression of the draft of the new policy. Upon approval, the policy is posted on the policy website for public review for a minimum of 14 days and up to 30 days. Any DSU employee, entity, or student may make a comment or suggestion regarding a draft policy under review.

4.4.3 After the review period, the Policy Office/PSC in conjunction with the Policy Owner and Steward reviews the comments and makes the needed changes, followed by a final legal review. The policy then transitions to appropriate voting councils (see flow chart). Final approval of policy rests with the DSU Board of Trustees.

4.5 Retirement of Policy

4.5.1 Policies that are no longer effective, required, or which have been subsumed by another policy may be recommended for retirement by any university entity or employee. The Policy Owner will direct final action.

4.5.2 If the policy suggested for retirement requires revision to another policy
in order to be retired, such revision shall go through the approval process simultaneously or prior to deletion.

4.6 Extraordinary Circumstances

4.6.1 In circumstances calling for urgent action, the President may determine that a policy shall be put into effect without prior presentation to the departments, programs, committees, councils, or governing bodies, and/or without the prior approval by or consultation with the those entities that would otherwise be required. Any policy put into effect in such a manner may subsequently be presented to the Policy Office/PSC, Policy Owner, and Policy Steward at the next available opportunity for ratification, disapproval, or recommendations.

4.6.2 If a recommendation or requirement of a regulatory agency, statutory or regulatory change, or judicial or administrative mandate creates the need for a new policy, policy revision, or policy retirement, legal counsel may advise the Policy Office/PSC to make needed policy changes and present such changes for approval to the Executive Council and Board of Trustees in the most expeditious manner possible, including foregoing other input and approval measures.

4.7 Revision of Policy

4.7.1 The Policy Office/PSC is empowered to make non-substantive revisions to existing policies.

4.7.2 Under no circumstance may the Policy Office create new policies, make substantive revision to current policies, or delete existing policies without the appropriate approvals, including University Council and the Board of Trustees.

4.7.3 An editorial revision to an existing policy does not constitute the enactment of a new or revised policy and does not change the approval or effective dates of such policies.

4.8 Policy Library and Archive

4.8.1 DSU shall maintain a searchable library of current policies accessible through the University’s website. Within the Policy Library, the university may provide an archive of revisions and access to previous versions of policies, as well as accurate recording of approval and implementation dates. To the extent possible, policies that interface or cover related content shall be linked.
4.9 Regular Review of Policy

4.9.1 The Policy Office/PSC may coordinate regular and ongoing review of University policies. Each policy should be reviewed five years after the effective date, and every five years thereafter.

4.9.2 Policy reviews should involve appropriate Policy Owners, Stewards, and stakeholders and focus on the following:

4.9.2.1 Compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and Board of Regents policies.

4.9.2.2 Consistency with other University policies covering related content.

4.9.2.3 Effectiveness of the policy to assist in accomplishing the University's mission.

4.9.2.4 Currency of information and format.

V. References

VI. Procedures


VII. Addenda


Policy Owner: President
Policy Steward: Policy Steering Committee

History:
Approved 0/0/00
Revised 0/0/00
# DSU Policy Request Form

To propose a new policy or a revision to a current policy, any member of the DSU community can submit this form to the Policy Office at policies@dixie.edu. The form can be expanded as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested by:</th>
<th>Carole Grady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email or phone contact:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grady@dixie.edu">grady@dixie.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic or title of affected policy:</td>
<td>Faculty Staffing Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If current DSU policy, Policy #:</td>
<td>Faculty 3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of proposed new policy or revision:**

I am requesting that the policy be retired/discontinued. See rationale below in “Instigation for proposed new policy or revision.”

**Elements that MUST be in the policy for it to be effective:**

None

**Instigation for proposed new policy or revision (event precipitating request, if any):**

The policy is 20 years old and is inconsistent with current practices in decision-making about faculty positions. The committee has not been staffed for several years. Other practices (e.g. ongoing budget request process) currently are in place for faculty input into new positions. Faculty Senate leadership (Erin O'Brien and Nancy Hauck) support the retirement of the policy.

**Is there an existing procedure associated with this policy?**

Yes ☐ No ☑

Will a procedure associated with this policy need to be developed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Legal or regulatory considerations (please give references or links if possible):**

N/A

**Similar policies at other USHE institutions (please give links when appropriate):**

N/A

**Similar policies at other colleges or universities (please give links when appropriate):**

N/A

**Similar policies at non-educational institutions or businesses (please give links when appropriate):**

N/A

**Additional Information (please attach other documents as needed):**

N/A
3-36 FACULTY STAFFING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

36.1 The mission of the Faculty Staffing Advisory Committee is to report to the College President in matters dealing with staffing full-time faculty positions.

36.2 The purpose of the committee is to advise the college president as to which departments and programs are understaffed or over staffed.

36.3 The Faculty Staffing Advisory Committee shall consist of one faculty, recommended by the chair, from each instructional department.

   36.3.1 Committee appointments shall be made by the college president in consultation with the faculty senate president and the vice-presidents.

   36.3.2 The academic vice-president and instructional deans will serve as ex-officio committee members.

36.4 A chair shall be selected by the committee members.

36.5 The committee is advisory in nature.

36.6 Recommendations from the committee regarding staffing will coincide with the budget building process.

36.7 Committee members shall consider, but not be limited to, the following criteria for their recommendations concerning department and program staffing:

   36.7.1 Student/faculty ratio
   36.7.2 Enrollment trends
   36.7.3 Importance to the mission of the college
   36.7.4 Adjunct/full-time faculty ratio
   36.7.5 Job placement information
   36.7.6 Availability of qualified adjunct faculty
   36.7.7 Direct cost per FTE
36.7.8 Program Advisory Committee recommendations

36.7.9 Staffing reductions will be made in compliance with the College's Termination and Reduction of Workforce Policy.
08/12/2015

Dear Board of Trustees,

It is with tender feelings that I request early retirement July 16th, 2016. DSU has been my work home for the past 32 years. I am fortunate to have worked here with so many amazing people. It has fulfilled me personally and professionally with a sense that brought value not only to me but to those I associated with.

I have been a dedicated employee serving the students and the community when I was over the recruiting efforts from 1984 to 1992. From 1992 to 2015 I have been the Director of Cooperative Education/Internships. This job brought even greater satisfaction in serving the DSU students, community, and businesses.

Warmest Regards,

[Karl Hutchings signature]

Karl Hutchings
August 18, 2015

DEl Beatty, Dean of Students
225 South University Ave.
St. George, UT 84770

Dear DEl:

As you may have heard, I would like to apply for early retirement. According to the policy I would need to be older than 57 and I am 64. Additionally, the policy states that my age and years of service must add up to 75 years; please note that I am 64 and have worked for the university for about 27 years for a total of 91 years.

I am requesting early retirement as a result of my poor health. In the past ten years I have had five by-passes, three stents, a pace maker and replaced a heart valve. Furthermore, over the past year or two I have noticed that I am starting to experience increased and chronic fatigue, which makes working quite difficult and thus my request for early retirement.

I have not yet determined a specific retirement date, as that would depend on needing to know if I will receive the early retirement plan. However, if possible, I would like to leave as early as the last day of September 2015. As you can see, this would leave a month and a half in which time I could adequately train a potential successor.

I appreciate your time and consideration in this matter. If you have any questions or concerns in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Barbara Johnson, SU DC
Health & Wellness Center Coordinator
June 30, 2015

Paul Morris  
Vice President Administrative Services  
Human Resources  
225 S University Ave.  
St. George, UT 84770

Dear Paul Morris and Board of Trustees members,

I am requesting I be considered for early retirement, retiring December 31, 2015. I have been employed full time consecutively for 15 years, August 14, 2000.

I began working at Dixie College part-time on the switchboard in 1989 when my family and I moved from Las Vegas, NV. It was encouraged at that time by the Vice President, Max Rose that all staff were recommended to complete an associate’s degree. I earned an Associate of Science degree with Business Resources as a field of study in 1994. During that time I was hired as a full-time secretary for the business department. I wanted to pursue my educational goals so I traveled in the evening to complete a Bachelor of Science degree, but needed to leave my job because it became too difficult to work full time, commute and attend school full time. I earned the degree in the summer 1997 and was hired by Dr. Don Hinton as an adjunct instructor for fall semester. I was hired full time in 2000 as an academic advisor while still being an adjunct instructor in the evening. I earned a master’s degree in 2002 when we became Dixie State College. I have been the Assistant Director in Academic Advisement since 2012, and I’m still an adjunct instructor for Dixie State University.

The reason I am requesting an early retirement is because I have not been well since May 2014 because of some health and stress issues that have happened which I believe has caused my thyroid condition to worsen. I have been able to manage in working with my physician, but I have taken more time off this past year than I would have ever thought I would need considering I hardly ever took a sick day for 13 years. I wanted to wait until I am full retirement age, but I feel I can only stay until the end of this year if you grant me early retirement.

Respectfully,

Dana Kelvington

Dana Kelvington