

MEMO

To: Curriculum Committee
From: Louise Excell
Re: Program Reviews
Date: December 8, 2008

You have three program reviews on your agenda for the December 9 meeting: Composition, Communication, and Medical Radiography. Sharon has linked you to the full program reviews if you wish to do the heavy reading, and I am enclosing drafts of executive summaries for each one as well as the program responses to the evaluations for Composition and Medical Radiography (I haven't received the response from Communication yet).

As a reminder, we have revised the Program Review policy to make it more user-friendly and to more closely align it with Board of Regents' policy on program review; however, there were a number of program reviews already in the pipeline under the old policy, which required faculty approval via the Curriculum Committee. These are three of that group going through under the old process.

The program review authors for these three programs have been very cooperative and diligent and although a few details are yet to be supplied before they go on to the Regents, I believe that you have enough here to consider them for recommendation to the Academic Council.

Because of a conflicting committee assignment, I will not be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to address questions, so I urge you to contact me via email in advance if you need more information or have questions.

Program: Communication

Review Date: Reviewed 2006-2007. Previous review: 2002.

Internal Reviewers:

Frank Lojko, Vice President of Student Services; Director of Institutional Research
David Zielke, Librarian

External Reviewers: None

Program Description:

Degrees, certificates, other credentials: The Communication Department of Dixie State College of Utah is a four-year program that prepares students to work in a wide variety of fields in both human and mass communication and also in the digital film industry. Additionally, the department offers media and film students a hands-on component to their learning called the Student Media Center, where students participate in the production of media content of all kinds in a semi-professional environment under the tutelage of trained faculty and industry professionals

Support function and interaction with other programs: As an academic unit of Dixie State College, the Communication Department is located within the School of Arts and Letters. It is part of an undergraduate teaching institution and gives primary emphasis to this activity, in support of the General Education program of the college. This does not preclude research and other scholarly activity, which is encouraged on an individual basis, but must never come at the expense of effective course development and instruction.

Faculty:

Name	Area	Rank	Credentials	Year
Rhiannon Bent	Mass Communication	Instructor	MA, Washington State U	2004
Randal S. Chase	New Media, Communication History, Theory	Professor	Ph.D. University of Utah	1997
Jon Pike	Mass Communication	Asst. Professor	Ph.D. N. Dakota State U	2008
Wayne Shamo	Rhetoric, Public Speaking, Interpersonal Comm.	Assoc. Professor	Ph.D. Southern Illinois U	
Adi Thelen	Speech Comm; Health; Organizational Comm	Asst. Professor	Ph.D. U. of South Florida	2007
Phil Tuckett	Digital Film Production	Asst. Professor	Honorary Ph.D. Dixie State	2007
Dennis Wignall	Rhetoric/Public Speaking Interpersonal Comm	Assoc. Professor	Ph.D. University of Denver	

Eric Young	Comm. Education, Digital Film Motion Picture Production	Asst. Professor	M.Ed. SUU	
------------	---	-----------------	-----------	--

Adjunct Faculty: Nine adjunct faculty are named, but credentials are not supplied.

Staff: Communication has 0.5 FTE secretarial support.

Students:

Five-year Enrollment and Student Data	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Student Credit Hours Generated	2,325	2,610	2,490	2,445	2,205
Majors	NA	NA	NA	NA	77
Enrollment Trends		+9%	-1%	-.1%	-1.1%
Graduation	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Students Enrolled	1502	1744	2003	1690	1632
Student FTE	154.72	174.34	166.22	163.43	146.89

Program Costs:

Instructional Costs per SCH	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
	136.40	112.26	135.66	161.26	175.33
Instructional Costs per FTE	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
	2,049	1,684	2,035	2,419	2,630

Student-Faculty Ratio	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
	19.05	23.09	21.67	20.64	20.29

Program Assessment:

Measure: Because of the broad range of communication-related topics, the indicators of student achievement vary across our curriculum. In heuristic courses, student achievement is measured by academic knowledge of the principles and theories which have been studied. In performance-oriented courses, principles and theory are also important but must be accompanied by a hands-on demonstration of skills, such as in public speaking, journalism, or media production. The expected indicators are defined for each course in the Course Outline.

Exams/Quizzes: Exams and quizzes help determine if the students have basic understanding of core knowledge of the course. They also provide a method for student accountability in relation to reading the textbook and being engaged in class. Finally, exams and quizzes allow an opportunity for students to demonstrate their ability to apply their learning to communication problems described in the exam or quiz.

Papers: Communication courses are generally writing-intensive, especially at the upper-division level. It is not uncommon for students to write 3 to 5 analytical papers in a semester for a single course. We believe this is important for a number of reasons. First, writing is one of the most fundamental forms of human communication and a Communication major is expected by others—both personal and professional associates—to write well. Secondly, papers allow students to do critical thinking and problem solving in a concrete way that requires them to apply what they're learning to a particular problem or question. Lastly, through this kind of application of knowledge, students are more apt to make real world connections between what they learn and why it matters. The length and nature of the papers vary with each assignment. The emphasis is on the quality of the content—both mechanically and intellectually—and not on how many pages are produced.

Performance Tasks: Particularly in the field of communication, being able to demonstrate your ability to communicate in all social settings is essential. In dyads and small groups and organizations and across cultures, our graduates must be able to apply their learning in concrete and productive ways. This makes the application of knowledge in our classes particularly important. Service learning, demonstration of techniques, and group problem solving are particularly well-suited to our discipline. Students also apply their knowledge and skills in presentations, debates, heuristic discussions, production projects, and many other settings. Any such performances are accompanied by criteria for evaluation of tasks.

Reflection : Many communication courses require students to engage in reflection on a regular basis. Students are asked to make personal connections, ask questions, state opinions, clarify understanding, and generally try to make sense of what they learn throughout the program.

Summative Learning Experiences

Research and Senior Capstones: Desiring our students to be scholars of communication, not just practitioners, we hold them to rigorous standards of inquiry into and the application of the fundamental theories of human and mass communication. Students are exposed in their freshman year to Communication theory, and their education continues at the upper-division level with increasingly-demanding research-oriented courses such as Communication Theory and Communication Research, which all graduates are required to complete. To complete their academic experience, all Communication graduates are required to complete a research-based senior seminar (capstone) during the final semester of their senior year, which provides an opportunity for them to explore in a scholarly manner an important issue or phenomenon within their chosen profession. Students are expected to present their findings to their peers at the end of the semester in a department-sponsored conference setting.

Internships: All Communication graduates are also required to complete an internship in an appropriate major-related setting. This is generally not done until the summer between the student's junior and senior year, so that there can be an appropriate application of upper-division learning to the internship situation. The department maintains strict procedures for how these internships are to be conducted. We expect the internship to be a learning experience, with defined learning goals that are appropriately measured and assessed. The form on the following page, and the syllabus which follows it, are the instruments we use to initiate and to evaluate the student's internship experience.

Improvements as a Result of Assessment Results: See individual course reports in the program reviews for the varied plans for improvements based upon assessment.

Strengths Identified by Evaluators:

Program Description:

- More than enough information on the program, with options, class lists, schedules, courses and syllabi
- Excellent program mission statement; mission and goals well defined.
- Program description very clear
- Great illustrations of program's degree emphases and tracks
- Student progress checklists and student course planning sheets are very helpful
- Inclusion of the Department Course List is an excellent idea

Faculty:

- Great information overall
- Good information on contract faculty, including headcount

- Well-qualified and experienced instructors

Students:

- Information that is reported is useful.

Assessment:

- Several indicators listed.
- Lots of individual and course evaluations and assessment information included.
- Well-defined explanation of how assessment results are used to improve learning and instruction.

Facilities:

- Facilities well described, including schematic of building.
- Excellent review of library resources and needs.

General Comments:

- Several well-written paragraphs from various individuals in the program about the strengths and challenges to the program.
- The 2002 review in Appendix A was helpful in seeing the improvements made in the program since then.
- Plans and Improvements were definite and succinct.
- Actual program costs based on 5-year trends are required to be reported by the Regent policy. This should be included.

Challenges Identified by Evaluators:

Program Description:

- It appears the program is making the most of the opportunities in supporting other programs, departments, and divisions, including classes, equipment, etc. A future challenge that could be addressed would be continuing this support with other departments and divisions outside of Allied Health when the program moves to the new facility.
- The review could benefit from identifying more clearly where the SMC is or would be located on campus.
- I was unable to locate the organizational chart that would have the program detail I was expecting to see. I did try a Google search, but to no avail.
- The mission section could benefit with an inclusion of DSC's mission statement and detail of how the program articulates with the college mission.

Faculty:

- Insufficient faculty to meet the rapid enrollment growth
- Review would benefit from inclusion of pertinent information on faculty diversity and attainment of tenure and any information on those striving for or interested in obtaining tenure status.
- Calculate and report the contract faculty FTE
- Calculate and report the adjunct faculty FTE
- Missing faculty-student ratios. Either not given or not well reported and explained (see page 236). Calculate and report faculty/student ratios
- Calculate and report clearly the SCH/FTE ratios
- Report support staff in this section
- Insufficient support staff for number of students and faculty served

Students:

- Enrollment is reported but attrition trends not identified; if attrition numbers are available for the old program, including them would be helpful.
- Graduation/retention data not supplied.
- Placement and transfer data not mentioned; if any information could be gathered from graduates of the old program, this would be beneficial to be included in the program review.

Assessment:

- A lot is said but no real evidence is shared in the four paragraphs on page 165.

Facilities:

- The review would benefit from some specific listings of what lab equipment is available.
- Most of the equipment lists were needs for equipment the program does not have.
- Include in the review a list of actual current equipment and technology available to the program.

Specific Recommendations:

- Supply missing data to the extent that it is available, specifically regarding graduation rates, enrollment trends and program costs since the last program review.
- Continue to monitor and refine assessment strategies and begin to accumulate evidence that assessment results in improvements to pedagogy, learning and curricula.
- To avoid creating a demoralized faculty, continue to seek funding for additional faculty and support staff.
- Encourage and support valuable faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees.

Program: Composition

Review Date: Reviewed 2007-2008. Previous review: 2002.

Internal Reviewers:

Dr. Carole Grady, Professor and Associate Dean of Nursing
Steven Sullivan, Associate Professor of Physics
Jonathan Morrell, Director of DSC Trio Programs

External Reviewers: None

Program Description:

Degrees, certificates, other credentials: None; the Composition Program supports the Baccalaureate degrees in English and the General Education Program.

Support function and interaction with other programs: The English Composition Program has its home within the English Department, which resides in the School of Arts and Letters. It serves DSC students by offering two general education writing courses required for graduation, English 1010 (Introduction to Writing) and English 2010, (Intermediate Writing). The Composition Program also works in conjunction with the Developmental Education Program.

Faculty:

Name	Area	Rank	Credentials	Year
Albertini, Diane	Composition	Associate Professor	M.A., Colorado State U	1981
Armstrong, Stephen	English	Assistant Professor	Ph.D. ,Florida State U.	2004
Bacabac, Florence	Technical Writing	Assistant Professor	Ph.D., Bowling Green	2008
Barry, Brad	Composition	Professor, Director of Composition	Ph.D., Bowling Green	1998
Bennett, Sue	English	Assistant Professor, Department Chair, Associate Dean	Ph.D., Texas Tech U	1995
Burton, Terre	English & Humanities	Associate Professor	M.A. U. of Wyoming	1974
Bywater, Timothy R.	English	Professor	Ph.D. ,U. of Utah	1974
Comeford, AmiJo	English	Assistant Professor	Ph.D., UNLV	2006
Crenshaw, Cheri	Technical Writing	Assistant Professor	Ph.D., Texas Woman's University	2008
Jasmine, Randell J.	English	Assistant Professor	A.B.D. U. of Mississippi	Defense scheduled for 11/08
Kauer, Suzanne	English	Instructor	M.A. Washington Univ.	2002
Pilkington, Ace G.	English	Professor	D. Phil.,Oxford	1988

			University	
Reber, Edwin P.	English	Associate Professor	M.A. Brigham Young U.	1980
Wrede, Theda	English	Assistant Professor	Ph.D. U. of South Carolina	

Name	Credentials	Year
Backman, Nickole	M.A. , Secondary Ed.,Utah State University	1993
Burton, Denise	M.A., English, Hardin-Smmons University	2002
Combs, Julia	M.A., Literature; ABD, Rhetoric & Composition, UNLV	M.A. 2005
Engstrom, Louise	M.A., Humanities, Cal State, Dominguez Hills	2002
Excell, Louise	M.A. University of Utah	1983
Garner, Susan	M.Ed., Utah State University	1981
Hayes, Toby	B.A. Journalism and Communication, USU; MBA, University of Phoenix	2004 2007
Hennessy, Terri	M.A. (in progress; coursework completed), National University	B.A. 1989
Ohrn, Lisa	B.A. English, BYU; MAT, Secondary Ed., Grand Canyon University	1995 2002
Perkins, Helen	B.A., English & German, U of U; M.A. Education, USU	1966 1986
Roberts, Jeanette	Ph.D., Adult Education and Instructional Design, U. of Wyoming	2001
Scott, Amanda	M.A. (in progress; coursework completed), Northern Arizona University	B.A. 2007
Sirls, Kate	MFA , English & Creative Writing (in progress) Spalding University	B.A. 2007
Sutton-Linderman, Chelsi	M.A. (in progress; expected by summer 2008), Utah State University	B. A. 2006
Westegaard, Elaina	MFA, English & Creative Writing (in progress) Chatham University	B.A. 2008
Woffinden, Tammy	M.A. English Education, NYU	1993

Staff: Staff consists of 1.5 FTE, which are shared by four departments containing eleven subset programs/emphases. These employees are shared by 61 instructors including 29 full-time faculty and 31 adjuncts.

Students:

	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Students Enrolled	2406	2499	2371	2177	2147
Student FTE					

Five-year Enrollment and Student Data	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Student Credit Hours Generated					
Majors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Enrollment Trends		+ .96%	-1%	-1%	-.01%
Graduation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Student-Faculty Ratio	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
				17.42:1	

Program Costs:

Instructional Costs per FTE	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08*
	NA	NA	NA	241.07	

Instructional Costs per SCH	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08*
	NA	NA	NA	3,615	

*Cost Study not available

Note: Data here is incomplete; traditionally, English and Composition have been reported as one set of data and isolating data for composition courses only has been problematic.

Program Assessment:

Summative assessment is implemented in the form of pre/post tests comprised of multiple choice questions, a tool that examines indicators of student achievement. The multiple choice questions in the test directly correlate with stated program objectives.

Measure:

An analysis of achievement indicators indicate student success in the following learning objectives:

- Understanding of modifiers
- Understanding of semi-colons
- Understanding of sentence concision
- Understanding of documentation style
- Analysis of source credibility
- Analysis of other texts (i.e. reading)

Assessment revealed the greatest increase (30 percentage points or more) in terms of the above learning objectives. While students showed improvement in almost every area, the following areas showed less significant gains:

- Understanding sentence clarity
- Understanding paragraphing concepts
- Recognizing rhetorical modes
- Understanding effective writing processes
- Understanding parallel sentence structure.

Improvements as a Result of Assessment Results

Starting in Fall 2009, an essay assessment will be added. The department has agreed upon common ingredients for the pre-essay (a diagnostic essay given at the beginning of English 1010) and the post-essay (the culminating 10-12 page research essay of English 2010). Furthermore, teaching source integration has been enhanced with the inclusion of a requirement for a 5-page research paper in English 1010.

Strengths Identified by Evaluators**Program:**

- Articulation with GE is very well described;
- Description, objectives and minimum writing requirements well defined;
- Meets mission and goals of the college, works with developmental and library departments;
- Good articulation with college's mission;
- Solid placement plan;
- Clear and complete learning outcomes.

Faculty:

- Full time faculty have many years of teaching experience;

- Well-seasoned and experienced full time faculty members;
- A “majority” of full time faculty attend and present at regional and national meetings.

Students:

- Faculty-student ratios are acceptable;
- Great faculty to student ratios;

Assessment:

- Quantitative measure of student outcomes with plans to add essay assessment;
- Clear and complete learning outcomes;
- Great ideas on how to determine the validity of the data;
- Excellent use of assessment data to improve the composition program;
- Solid placement plan

Facilities:

- Excellent library resources (except for the subject-specific encyclopedias);
- Full time faculty have many years of teaching experience;
- Well-seasoned and experienced full time faculty members;
- A “majority” of full time faculty attend and present at regional and national meetings.

Students:

- Faculty-student ratios are acceptable;
- Great faculty to student ratios;

Assessment:

- Quantitative measure of student outcomes with plans to add essay assessment;
- Clear and complete learning outcomes;
- Great ideas on how to determine the validity of the data;
- Excellent use of assessment data to improve the composition program;
- Solid placement plan

Facilities:

- Excellent to sufficient library resources (except for the subject-specific encyclopedias);
- Sufficient but not excellent IT resources.

Challenges Identified by Evaluators:

Program Description:

- No mention of Bachelor’s Degree.

Faculty:

Professional activities not specified; no “detailed information” on specialization, rank and tenure, and memberships for individual faculty members; needs more information on full and part time faculty experience and professional activities.

- Too high FT-PT ratios;
- Too high secretary-faculty ratio;

Students:

- Enrollment/attrition trends not identified; graduation/retention data not supplied; placement and transfer data not mentioned (all three evaluators noted this deficiency).

Program Costs:

- Secretary paid by department funds, not college.

Assessment:

- Built-in dilemma about quantifying outcomes. How to determine significant and moderate improvement on pre/post tests? Statistically? Use IR for test analysis.

- Plans to add essay component delayed until 2009. Why?
- Not clear if student evaluations of teaching used to improve teaching;

Facilities:

- Classroom shortage;
- Maintenance a problem;
- Needs new facility(all three evaluators made these comments);
- Some IT old;
- Some outdated library resources;

Specific Recommendations:

- As health sciences enrollments increase, add APA format to curriculum.
- Decrease the number of adjuncts and increase number of FT faculty;
- Describe professional activities of FT faculty;
- Increase secretarial support; secretaries should be paid by college, not department funds;
- Add other qualitative indicators of student learning such as open-ended student survey, focus groups, portfolios;
- Develop more sensitive indicators of student learning, e.g. pretest-posttest for each course;
- Continue to refine assessment;
- Continue to increase the data pool as planned; perform needed research and report in next program review;
- Develop a formal plan for reviewing library holdings involving librarian and faculty;
- Request funding for subject-specific encyclopedias.

MEMO

To: Louise Excell and Donna Dillingham-Evans

From: The English Composition Program

RE: Our response to the critique of our Composition Program Review

Date: November 4, 2008

Thank you for sharing with us the readers' responses to our program review. Thank you also for the chance to respond. First off, we'd like to say that we appreciate the reviewers' acknowledgments of our program's strengths. Second, the reviewers also commented on the following concerns, which we address:

□ "No mention of Bachelor's Degree"

○ We did not mention the English bachelor's degree because we view Composition as a program that serves the entire institution, particularly its GE goals and objectives. In other words, we view the English 1010 - 2010 course sequence as something that serves all baccalaureate programs on our campus.

□ "Too high secretary-faculty ratio" *and* "Secretary paid by department funds, not college"

○ We agree that this is a significant concern, and we look forward to hearing from the DSC administration as to how they will help us resolve this dilemma.

□ Louise Excell wrote that "All three evaluators wanted more detailed information on our program's instructors."

○ To that end, we have created a complete list of our program's teachers (full-time and part-time), with their hire dates, types of degrees, specialties, and degrees earned. And while we did not list conference presentations in this follow-up document, we hope to do so in our larger, overall English self-study.

□ "Too high FT-PT ratios"

○ By this comment, we are assuming the reviewers meant that there were too few full-time faculty per adjunct instructor. Due to funding, however, this continues to be a concern, **and one that has become even more of a concern since the time of writing the original report.**

Combine enrollment growth with the limits on how many courses instructors can teach, and our pressure to hire adjuncts increases all the more. Additionally, relatively few people in Washington County have the educational qualifications to teach at the adjunct level, which further exacerbates the disparity. Since we would not want to lower the educational requirements for adjuncts, we propose the following two solutions:

A) Fund the hiring of more full-time English faculty.

B) Increase adjunct pay, which may cause more qualified adjuncts to "come out of the woodwork," so to speak. This solution would also be a great way to help us retain the adjuncts we do have, as they have not received a pay raise in four years (since the fall semester of 2004).

□ "Enrollment/attrition trends not identified; graduation/retention data not supplied; placement and transfer data not mentioned (all three evaluators noted this deficiency)."

○ At the time of writing the report, its primary composer (Brad Barry) mistakenly assumed this information was only required of baccalaureate-level programs. (The English 1010-2010 course sequence, after all, does not have graduates per se). We are pleased to have since learned that we have campus departments tracking this data for all programs. Louise Excell has also notified us that these campus entities will compile this data and put them in the Board of Regents' required template.

□ Under the category of “Assessment,” readers expressed three concerns:

- “Built-in dilemma about quantifying outcomes. How to determine significant and moderate improvement on pre/post tests? Statistically? Use IR for test analysis.”

- We will continue to work with IR on our analysis of future data, and we will also continue refining our ability to interpret future assessment results.

- “Plans to add essay component delayed until 2009. Why?”

- We are choosing to wait until 2009 to begin our essay layer of assessment until we have a pattern of everyone being “on board” with our multiple-choice layer of assessment. (We reason that it is better for us to do one layer of assessment well, before tackling another layer. We also don’t want to reduce morale by inundating instructors with too many assessment demands at one time.)

- “Not clear if student evaluations of teaching used to improve teaching”

- We have a new mentoring program that includes both formal and informal mentoring—including an annual self-assessment (full-timers only), peer evaluation and one-on-one consultation about improvements based on student feedback (full-timers and adjuncts). In addition, we believe that our instructors are also making improvements based on their individual readings of their evaluations from students. When patterns of concern arise in student evaluations, the Chair discusses such concerns with the full-time faculty, and the Director of Composition discusses such concerns with the adjuncts.

□ Under the Category of “Facilities” readers expressed 4 categories of concern:

- “IT old”

- We are confused by this reader’s interpretation of our report’s IT section. We are very happy with and appreciative of the excellent help that IT employees give us (as we said in our original report). We are also thankful for the many improvements over recent years to our IT equipment. Again, IT equipment—and especially personnel—have been fantastic. Please refer to page 22 of our original report.

- “Outdated library resources”

- This comment also confused us, as we are very happy with the library’s excellent resources (with only one minor concern). Please refer to pages 23-24 of our original report.

- “Classroom shortage”

- We look forward to hearing from DSC administration on how this problem can be alleviated. (Please note that Sharon Lee has also repeatedly requested help with this.) For more details, please refer to pages 22 and 40 of our original report.

- Similarly, as of Fall 2008, our shortage of faculty and adjunct **office space has significantly worsened since the time of writing our original report.** We have two of our full-time faculty residing in buildings away from our home building, and we have twelve adjuncts crammed into an “office” located in an old closet located under a McDonald Building staircase. Again, in regard to this, we look forward to hearing from the DSC administration.

(Please see page 22 of our original report.)

- “Maintenance a problem” *and* “Needs new facility; needs new building; old building; need a new building (all three evaluators made these comments)”

- We look forward to hearing from administrators about this, especially in light of a recent report listing the priorities for campus physical improvements—a list on which the McDonald Building did not gain even a mention. This continues to concern us. Please refer to page 22 of our original report.

□ Under “Specific Recommendations” readers mentioned the following:

- “As health sciences enrollments increase, add APA format to curriculum.”

- We have talked about this for years, and have not been able to come to a department-wide consensus. Four solutions, however, are already in place:
 - 1) Most textbooks used in our composition program have clearly written sections on both MLA and APA citation styles.
 - 2) Several composition teachers offer students the option of doing APA rather than MLA if the students know they are going into fields that use APA.
 - 3) The Writing Center offers APA guidance to all students.
 - 4) DSC's OWL website (Online Writing Lab) has a guide to the APA style, as well as links to more complete guides for student use.
- **“Decrease the number of adjuncts and increase number of FT faculty”**
 - Please see earlier section of this memo.
- **“Describe professional activities of FT faculty”**
 - Please see earlier section of this memo.
- **“Increase secretarial support; secretaries should be paid by college, not department funds”**
 - We look forward to hearing from DSC administrators on this topic. (Please see pages 3 and 4 of our original report.)
- **“Add other qualitative indicators of student learning such as open-ended student survey[s], focus groups, [and] portfolios”**
 - While it is a good idea to add such third, fourth, and fifth layers of assessment, we would like to focus on successfully launching our two-layer assessment plan—and doing it well over time. After we get “in the groove” of using our two-layer assessment, we can then consider whether or not to add more layers.
- **“Develop more sensitive indicators of student learning, e.g. pretest-posttest for each course”**
 - We are doing this. Please see sections 6 – 9 of our original report for the many indicators of our progress and our success in this area.
- **“Continue to refine assessment”**
 - Please see earlier section of this memo, as well as Appendix C of our original report.
- **“Continue to increase the data pool as planned; perform needed research and report in next program review”**
 - We agree, and plan to do so. (Again, please see Appendix C of our original report.)
- **“Develop a formal plan for reviewing library holdings involving librarian and faculty”**
 - It seems that the overall DSC program-review process requires this, and we are happy to continue fulfilling this criterion as called for by the overall DSC expectations. In short, as the program-review cycle dictates, we will continue to integrate reviews of library holdings into our already-required program assessments. It behooves us and our students to continue doing so—and the current expectation seems to be enough. We come to this conclusion, in part, because of the excellent liaison system that the library has created. We know that, as concerns arise about holdings, we can always communicate with our library liaison. We have had much success with this in the past.
- **“Request funding for subject-specific encyclopedias”**
 - We look forward to hearing from DSC administration on this issue, as it was the one and only concern about library holdings (i.e. the need for more up-to-date print versions of subject specific encyclopedias). Please see pages 23-24 of our original report.

Our Action Plan:

Please refer to the above comments, as well as to pages 34 and 36-40 of our original report.

Program: Medical Radiography

Review Date: Reviewed 2007-2008. Previous review: None; program was implemented in 2006.

Internal Reviewers:

Dr. Robert Huddleston, Professor of Accounting.

Dr. Ami Comford, Assistant Professor of English

External Reviewers:

Linda Pearson, Ph.D., R.T. (R) (M) (QM), Program Director, Carl Albert State College, 1507 S. McKenna, Poteau, OK 74953

Ray Gisclair, M.S., R.T. (R), Assistant to the Dean, Delgado Community College, 615 City Park Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70119-4399

Program Description:

Degrees, certificates, other credentials: Associate of Applied Science in Medical Radiography

Support function and interaction with other programs: This is a two-year, full-time program which includes didactic and clinical experience at cooperating hospitals, clinics and doctors' offices. It consists of six semesters of academic studies with coordinated practice in area imaging departments. The program is a part of the Division of Health Sciences and is housed within the former School of Business, Health and Science (now the School of Science and Allied Health). Many of the prerequisite courses are through the Sciences program.

Professional Accreditation: The Medical Radiography Program received 3-year accreditation from the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology located at 20 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2850, Chicago, IL 60606-3182. This is the national accrediting agency for radiography programs. The next review date is scheduled for the First Quarter of 2010.

Faculty:

Name	Area	Rank	Credentials	Year
Sherry Floerchinger	Medical Radiography	Assistant Professor & Program Director	MA, Organizational Learning and Training Technology - University of New Mexico; RT (R) (N) (QM)	1991
Rebecca Lowell	Medical Radiography	Assistant Professor & Clinical Coordinator	MS, Radiologic Science w/ emphasis in Education – Midwestern State University; RT (R) (MR)	

Staff: The Medical Radiography Program does not currently have dedicated staff but receives some secretarial support from the Administrative Assistant to the Dean of Business, Science and Health.

Students:

FTE Students	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	12	25

Five-year Enrollment and Student Data	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Student Credit Hours Generated	NA	NA	NA	180	375
Majors	NA	NA	NA	12*	25
Enrollment Trends	NA	NA	NA	NA	+100%*
Graduation	NA	NA	NA	12	13

*A lack of clinical sites necessarily limits enrollment to 12 students per cohort.

Student-Faculty Ratio	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
	NA	NA	NA	12:1	12:1

Program Costs:

Instructional Costs per FTE	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08*
	NA	NA	NA	8,238.08	

Instructional Costs per SCH	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
	NA	NA	NA	549.20	

*Cost Study not available

Program Assessment: JRCERT accreditation requires programs to develop and implement an assessment plan that identifies benchmarks for the measurement of outcomes in relation to program completion rate, credentialing exam pass rate, job placement rate, clinical performance, problem-solving and critical thinking, communication skills, professional development and graduate and employer satisfaction. This data is required to be analyzed and utilized in continuous improvement of the Medical Radiography program.

Tools utilized in data collection include ARRT exam pass rates, job placement, and graduate and employer surveys, clinical evaluations completed by students, lab practicum scores, test scores, and scores on the Student Professional Development Evaluation performed by clinical instructors working with the students in the clinical site.

Benchmarks are set and adjusted by program faculty. JRCERT accreditation mandates two benchmarks: exam pass rate and job placement. These must be 75% over five years. DSC's Medical Radiography program has increased this benchmark to 85%.

Results of the outcomes assessment are used to improve instruction in the classroom, lab and clinic setting, prioritize budgetary items, and modifications of policies and procedures. Examples of recent changes include:

- eliminating a clinical site as a second-year rotation due to the lack of number and diversity of radiographic exams;
- changing the Likert scale on the Student Professional Development Evaluation to ensure a more realistic representation of student performance.
- sharing data analysis with all communities of interest including college administration, advisory committee, clinical instructors and students.

Measure:

ARRT Pass-Rate: Of the 12 students taking the ARRT exam in 2007, 92% passed. The average score was 92 with 7 of the 12 students (58%) scoring in the 100 percentile. The national median score was 84.7%.

Placement/Salary: The first medical radiography class completed the program in October 2007. All 12 students who graduated are currently employed in the profession. Three have applied to Weber State's baccalaureate completion program. Four of the thirteen second-year students are currently employed part-time as limited practical technicians at Dixie Regional Medical Center. All program graduates are employed in the state of Utah with 92% having found employment in Washington County. According to the 2007 Radiologic Technologist Wage and Salary Survey, conducted by ASRT, the median salary for a technologist in Utah is \$50,073. Starting wage at Dixie Regional Medical Center, in St. George, Utah, is \$18.15.

Strengths Identified by Internal Evaluators

Program:

- JRCERT accreditation reflects well on the program;
- Mission statement creates continuity between the program and the college at large;
- Course descriptions are well written and have appropriate co requisites and prerequisites clearly outlined;
- Admission criteria are logical and easily understood.

Faculty:

- Good job of outlining the faculty experience and the necessary requirements for the faculty. They look highly qualified for running the program and the long years of experience seem especially important in a Health Sciences Program.
- Faculty-student ratios are low, a key selling point for the program.

Students:

- See faculty-student ratios comment above;
- Number of male students has increased;
- AART scores are impressive compared to the national median; it would be useful to know how this program compares with others USHE schools.
- High retention rates—97%;
- Placement statistics are outstanding—92% of graduates are placed in Washington County, and that raises the question: Will the county soon reach the point of being over-supplied?

Assessment:

- The specificity of this segment of the Program Review was especially good, particularly in regard to the "tools utilized in data collection" for the JRCERT accreditation.

- Generally, language is measurable and specific in Outcomes Assessment.
- This is a thoughtful analysis that does not seek to justify problems or questionable areas but rather seeks to explain very methodically what might account for those concerns. The specific comments under Goal 1.4 were especially interesting and a unique addition to the program narrative. It also appears from the provided narrative that faculty are engaged with modifying the outcomes when necessary and examining the reasons for those modifications before coming to a conclusion. Specific decisions were made and implemented immediately.
- The initial outcome assessment plan appears to be well designed. The benchmarks, methods, time frames and planned action follow a methodology that would assure that the program evaluates its mission, goals and assessment plan in a coherent fashion. The outcome assessment plan for the year 2007 indicates progress on five goals. The narrative discusses the results and plans on improving student academic achievement.

Facilities:

- The medical radiography program has moved into the new Russell Taylor Health Science building with 6,000 square feet of dedicated classroom and lab space. This consists of two-state-of-the-art classrooms, computer/study area, a darkroom, lab for diagnostic radiography and one for sonography.
- The radiography lab equipment is cutting-edge technology with stationary GE Proteus units, a mobile x-ray unit, Konica CR (computed radiography) reader and PACS. This equipment is, in majority of instances, exactly like the equipment the radiography students will be using at the clinical sites which makes transferring of learning much easier.

General: The Medical Radiography Program has a bright future on the campus of Dixie State College. While the program is at an acceptable level today, it has the capability to be an exemplary program.

Challenges Identified by Internal Evaluators

Program:

- The admissions requirements are grades of C or better but the core class requirements are only a C- or better. This seems problematic for students entering the medical profession. C- grades would not seem to illustrate proficiency for the material even though the program is based on certain standardized testing requirements.
- Though the Outcomes Assessment Plan does contain measurable outcomes, the Program Goals could also be revised to reflect that same type of language. Rather than use “demonstrate,” which is not measurable or descriptive, re-word this idea into something more measurable so that students can see exactly what they will be achieving in the program. Particularly Goal #2 seems more like a mission statement than a testable outcome.

Faculty:

- “Professional activities” is an area that could probably be enhanced, as it appears that both faculty members have only become involved in those activities in the past two years.

Students:

- The finite number of clinical sites is limiting enrollment and that is an issue that must be addressed if the program is to grow enrollment.

- Starting salaries of \$18.15 per hour seem low for such a rigorous program; this may be a deterrent in recruiting new students, since they will be able to make so much more in nursing or dental hygiene.
- Apparently, DRMC hires many program graduates only as part-time employees. Is this by students' choices or is this a problem?

Program Costs:

- The cost per FTE seems high, even for a health science program; these might be lowered by adding more clinical sites and using adjunct instructors.

Assessment:

- Good employer component of the assessment plan. This seems particularly pertinent for a Health Sciences degree; however, can you trust the absolute accuracy of the numbers obtained from both the employer and the graduate surveys, as the number returned from year to year vs. the number sent out could potentially skew any results that might prove useful? Recommend including a brief explanation about how this potential problem has been addressed within the program. The certification numbers on the ARRT exam, would, however, seem to offset the graduate surveys on the quality of their education at DSC, since if they passed the exam, then the program can claim success regardless of if the graduates send back affirmative surveys or not.
- A narrative devoted to the assessment results overall and how the individual faculty have been impacted at the classroom level, particularly since only two faculty members are involved at this point would be useful. The Assessment Narrative seemed to focus on the changing strategies of the goals involved and the specific benchmarks, not the actual teaching.
- According to the JRCERT, "the program has developed a plan to assess student learning outcomes, however, much of the required data is lacking because the program has recently developed. Therefore, priorities for improvement have not been identified. The program has not had the opportunity to review its assessment plan or goals."
- Certain benchmarks may need to be adjusted to better reflect a more objective sense of accomplishment for a new emerging program.

Facilities:

- While the didactic facilities are excellent, the limited number of clinical sites is a problem that must be addressed.

Recommendations

- The administration needs to secure a competitive compensation package for its health science faculty. If this fails to occur, it will be challenging to retain quality staff; consequently, this will have a direct impact on the quality of instruction.
- Work to resolve the problem of clinical sites; develop the relationship with Valley View Medical Center so sites can be found in Cedar City. The Review could be benefitted by more information regarding the unsuccessful goal of making Cedar City a clinical site. Why has this pursuit failed? What needs to be done to make this more successful?
- Consider using adjunct instructors.

**Response to Medical Radiography Program Review
October 27, 2008**

Specific Recommendations

#1 The administration needs to secure a competitive compensation package for its health science faculty. If this fails to occur, it will be challenging to retain quality staff; consequently, this will have a direct impact on the quality of instruction.

The program director concurs with the above recommendation. As true in the majority of Health Science programs, radiographers are able to earn more as practitioners than as educators. It therefore becomes paramount that educational institutions provide competitive compensation packages to maintain qualified instructors to preserve the quality of instruction.

#2 Work to resolve the problem of clinical sites; develop the relationship with Valley View Medical Center so sites can be found in Cedar City. The Review could be benefitted by more information regarding the unsuccessful goal of making Cedar City a clinical site. Why has this pursuit failed? What needs to be done to make this more successful?

Without additional clinical sites, it will not be possible for the radiography program to grow. The failure to secure Valley View Medical Center as a radiography clinical site is a three-fold issue. First, the imaging department has a long history with Weber State's outreach program and therefore, they are reluctant to oust Weber students for Dixie State College. Secondly, students who participate in Weber's program are local residents who will, more than likely, become employed in the imaging department after graduation. The third reason is economics and is more complex in nature.

The ARRT, the national certification body for radiography, recognizes two types of program accreditations – regional and programmatic. Regional is through the eight divisions recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Programmatic accreditation is through the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology who is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Currently, there are approximately 17 radiography programs regionally accredited and over 600 programs accredited through JRCERT. Programmatic accreditation is a much more rigorous form of review and has nine Standards that programs are required to adhere to in order to maintain accreditation. Part of these Standards address the way in which students must be supervised in the clinical setting, shifts that they can be on and the number of hours a program can require them to be there. In essence, students from a regionally accredited program can be used anywhere the department sees fit. Valley View has stated that by using students in this capacity, their department costs are reduced by 1½ FTEs.

DSC's medical advisor for the radiography program, Dr. Austin, has recently met with Valley View's administrator, head radiologist and the manager of the imaging department. Because of the economic impact that it would have in the department, it is unlikely that they will accept DSC radiography students. Both IHC and DSC administrations are aware of the problem. It should also be noted that several of DSC's medical radiography students have been residents of Cedar City but relocated to attend the program here.

#3 Consider using adjunct instructors.

The key to growth in the medical radiography program is directly linked to clinical sites. The program must assure that students have access to a sufficient variety and volume of procedures to achieve competency. In most cases, this is only available in a hospital setting. The Clinical Coordinator is currently looking at possible clinical sites in the Las Vegas area; however, UNLV has a large program as well as Pima Medical Institute. As additional clinical sites are added to DSC's radiography program and the student enrollment increases, the hiring of adjunct faculty will be better justified and the cost per FTE will be lowered.

Areas of Concern under "Students":

#1 There is no information about possibly oversupplying Washington County with graduates.

In keeping with the college's mission statement, the program is dedicated to supplying the local healthcare community with qualified professional radiologic technologists. However, just as the college is moving toward a more global mission and embracing additional advanced degrees, the radiography program recognizes the future need for technologists nationwide. The Bureau of Labor Statistics still recognizes health services as one of the most in-demand careers stating that 30% of jobs created within the next ten years will come from healthcare. The Utah Department of Workforce Services considers radiologic technology to be a 5-star occupation which is the strongest employment outlook with high wages. Where there is no guarantee that a graduate may find full-time employment in Washington County, it is fairly certain that they will find employment within the state of Utah.

#2 Starting salaries of \$18.15 per hour seem low for such a rigorous program; this may be a deterrent in recruiting new students, since they will be able to make so much more in nursing or dental hygiene.

The American Society of Radiologic Technologists conducted a wage and salary survey in 2007. The results indicated a mean salary of \$58,673 for a staff radiologic technologist. The mean for Utah was \$52,741. For most graduates, staff technologist is their entry into the imaging field. Most continue their education in other modalities such as sonography, CT, MRI, nuclear medicine or radiation therapy. All of these modalities come with a sizeable salary increase, some up to \$100,000 plus.

Response to Medical Radiography Program Review October 27, 2008

Specific Recommendations

#1 The administration needs to secure a competitive compensation package for its health science faculty. If this fails to occur, it will be challenging to retain quality staff; consequently, this will have a direct impact on the quality of instruction.

The program director concurs with the above recommendation. As true in the majority of Health Science programs, radiographers are able to earn more as practitioners than as educators. It therefore becomes paramount that educational institutions provide competitive compensation packages to maintain qualified instructors to preserve the quality of instruction.

#2 *Work to resolve the problem of clinical sites; develop the relationship with Valley View Medical Center so sites can be found in Cedar City. The Review could be benefitted by more information regarding the unsuccessful goal of making Cedar City a clinical site. Why has this pursuit failed? What needs to be done to make this more successful?*

Without additional clinical sites, it will not be possible for the radiography program to grow. The failure to secure Valley View Medical Center as a radiography clinical site is a three-fold issue. First, the imaging department has a long history with Weber State's outreach program and therefore, they are reluctant to oust Weber students for Dixie State College. Secondly, students who participate in Weber's program are local residents who will, more than likely, become employed in the imaging department after graduation. The third reason is economics and is more complex in nature.

The ARRT, the national certification body for radiography, recognizes two types of program accreditations – regional and programmatic. Regional is through the eight divisions recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Programmatic accreditation is through the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology who is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Currently, there are approximately 17 radiography programs regionally accredited and over 600 programs accredited through JRCERT. Programmatic accreditation is a much more rigorous form of review and has nine Standards that programs are required to adhere to in order to maintain accreditation. Part of these Standards address the way in which students must be supervised in the clinical setting, shifts that they can be on and the number of hours a program can require them to be there. In essence, students from a regionally accredited program can be used anywhere the department sees fit. Valley View has stated that by using students in this capacity, their department costs are reduced by 1½ FTEs.

DSC's medical advisor for the radiography program, Dr. Austin, has recently met with Valley View's administrator, head radiologist and the manager of the imaging department. Because of the economic impact that it would have in the department, it is unlikely that they will accept DSC radiography students. Both IHC and DSC administrations are aware of the problem. It should also be noted that several of DSC's medical radiography students have been residents of Cedar City but relocated to attend the program here.

#3 *Consider using adjunct instructors.*

The key to growth in the medical radiography program is directly linked to clinical sites. The program must assure that students have access to a sufficient variety and volume of procedures to achieve competency. In most cases, this is only available in a hospital setting. The Clinical Coordinator is currently looking at possible clinical sites in the Las Vegas area; however, UNLV has a large program as well as Pima Medical Institute. As additional clinical sites are added to

DSC's radiography program and the student enrollment increases, the hiring of adjunct faculty will be better justified and the cost per FTE will be lowered.

Areas of Concern under "Students":

#1 There is no information about possibly oversupplying Washington County with graduates.

In keeping with the college's mission statement, the program is dedicated to supplying the local healthcare community with qualified professional radiologic technologists. However, just as the college is moving toward a more global mission and embracing additional advanced degrees, the radiography program recognizes the future need for technologists nationwide. The Bureau of Labor Statistics still recognizes health services as one of the most in-demand careers stating that 30% of jobs created within the next ten years will come from healthcare. The Utah Department of Workforce Services considers radiologic technology to be a 5-star occupation which is the strongest employment outlook with high wages. Where there is no guarantee that a graduate may find full-time employment in Washington County, it is fairly certain that they will find employment within the state of Utah.

#2 Starting salaries of \$18.15 per hour seem low for such a rigorous program; this may be a deterrent in recruiting new students, since they will be able to make so much more in nursing or dental hygiene.

The American Society of Radiologic Technologists conducted a wage and salary survey in 2007. The results indicated a mean salary of \$58,673 for a staff radiologic technologist. The mean for Utah was \$52,741. For most graduates, staff technologist is their entry into the imaging field. Most continue their education in other modalities such as sonography, CT, MRI, nuclear medicine or radiation therapy. All of these modalities come with a sizeable salary increase, some up to \$100,000 plus.