

## Memorandum

To: Board of Trustees  
 From: Academic Council  
 Date: April 2005

---

Consistent with Board of Regent Policy R411, concerning the Review of Existing Programs, the College has asked its departments to prepare program review reports. The Regents' have requested the Academic Council to prepare a recommended Institutional Response and forward these program reports and the recommended Institutional Response to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees will then review the proposed Institutional Response and either approve or alter it. Each program will be rated according to one of the following standards: Outstanding, Commendable, Acceptable, Marginal, Probationary (see policy 3.43, Program Review). Following is Dixie State College's response of the Academic Council:

### ALS Evaluation of 2004/2005 Program Reviews

Program	Prior Eval	2005 Dean
<b>Literature</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>

Strengths:

- Major improvement in this year's program review
- Strong departmental leadership
- Program more closely linked to state literature offerings.
- Evidence suggests the department is increasing rigor and fighting grade inflation.
- Seventy percent of faculty hold doctorates in their field.

Weaknesses:

- 2002 review evaluation noted that they had not been able to demonstrate that students in fact achieve department objectives. This has not changed.
- 2000 review urged literature faculty to promote consensus and implement more effective appraisals to demonstrate student achievement. This has also not been done.
- Not all literature courses participate in assessment.
- Needs more consistent assessment of the program year by year.
- All literature faculty need to buy into and participate in the review process.
- Department needs to develop a system for measuring consistency and conformity in course curriculum and content.

Plans for Improvement

Action	Person Responsible	Time to Completion
Yearly assessment of courses.	Literature faculty	1 year

Action	Person Responsible	Time to Completion
Mandatory pre/post assessment for all literature courses	Literature Faculty	1 year

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Revise pre/post assessment tool	Literature Faculty	Fall 2005

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Develop a system for measuring consistency and conformity in course curriculum and content.	Literature Program Head	3 years

<b>Program</b>	<b>Prior Eval</b>	<b>2005 Dean</b>
<b>Art</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>

Commendations:

- New Art Gallery and Permanent Collections storage and care
- Student Art displays
- Strong 2 year Art program

Concerns:

- Need for yearly evaluation of class assessment and program objective attainment
- Need for more specific learning objectives for each class
- Need for careful correlation between Program Review identified needs and yearly budget requests.

Plans for Improvement

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Art program objectives reviewed and objectives refined	Art Faculty	1 year

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Yearly evaluation of class assessment compared to program objective attainment.	Art Faculty	1 year

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Budget requests justified by program review	Art Faculty	3 years

<b>Program</b>	<b>Prior Eval</b>	<b>2005 Dean</b>
<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>

Commendations:

- Carefully thought out and articulated Program Review
- Major improvement in this year's program review

- Good follow up of students leaving DSC tied to course completion & acceptance in other programs.
- Excellent course objectives

Concerns:

- Needs to create and implement an ongoing assessment program.
- Needs to document efforts made to achieve recommendations from prior reports.
- Assessment, once in place, needs to be linked to course objectives.

Plans for Improvement

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Create and implement an ongoing program assessment	Course Instructor	2 years

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Tie assessment results to course objectives and goal attainment	Course Instructors	3 years

<b>Action</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Time to Completion</b>
Needs annual effort from the department to push attainment of recommendations within the program review.		1 year