Preface

This self-study report is the culmination of more than two years’ of work by the Steering Committee and one dozen subcommittees representing the faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community members associated with Southern Utah University. Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of all data, statements, exhibits, and supporting materials. The report itself is organized sequentially to follow the standards and elements of the 1999 Accreditation Handbook prepared by Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities, Commission on Colleges and Universities (NASC). Most standards and elements are included verbatim (in italics) throughout the body of this report to ensure SUU’s full compliance with each standard, each element, and all applicable policies.

While the report provides documentation and analysis for all nine standards, most major sections conclude with an “appraisal” for that standard or section. These appraisals provide a summary of strengths, weaknesses, achievements, and proposed remedies and recommendations. As this self-study report “went to press,” the Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities, Commission on Colleges and Universities, announced the formation of a separate nonprofit 501 (c) 3 corporation, the “Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities” (NWCCU). This entity became effective September 1, 2003, yet this self-study report refers consistently to its predecessor with the acronym NASC.

In addition to the self-study report, the Commission asked for an annual progress report on the MBA program as part of a substantive change. Referenced in the text of the self-study, the progress report is provided as an exhibit for Commission and team review.
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

Organized into four major parts, this introduction provides an executive summary, a short review of past evaluations, an explanation of the accreditation self-study process, and verification of SUU’s compliance with the Eligibility Requirements stipulated by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC), Commission on Colleges.

Part I: Executive Summary

Now in its second century as an institution of higher education, Southern Utah University continues to provide quality educational opportunities in a beautiful rural environment. SUU is located in Cedar City, a community of about 25,000 people in southwestern Utah. Undergraduate and graduate programs are administered in Richfield, about 100 miles northeast, and selected graduate programs are offered in St. George, about 50 miles south. The attractive main campus in Cedar City serves nearly 6,000 students. Despite significant growth in the past decade, the university still provides a personalized learning environment.

SUU’s beginning dates back to 1897, when it was founded as a state normal school. SUU provides post-secondary education as one of two Carnegie Masters II institutions in Utah, and is a statutory member of the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). The University mission statement encourages campus citizens to “instill ethics and values” and to “affirm integrity, the search for the truth and respect for all people as the foundation of education.” SUU maintains policies and procedures that support the institution’s mission to serve students, employees, and the community with honesty and integrity. [Standards 1, 9]

Students

From 1993 to 2002, SUU experienced a marked increase of about 54% in student enrollment. Utah’s birth rate and migration patterns accounted for an increase that only slowed in 2002 when enrollment dropped about 2% from the previous year. SUU has directed significant effort and resources toward accommodating growth and to providing more and improved institutional services to students. Student satisfaction surveys indicate that student experience at SUU is positive, satisfying, and appreciated. Facilities have been added or planned to accommodate projected growth. [Standards, 2, 3]

The remarkable growth and achievement of SUU students is readily seen by many factors, including: 1) the excellent placement of students in business, teaching, government, and other positions; 2) the exceptional performance of senior business students on the nationally-normed Princeton exam (99% in 2003); 3) the very high rate of placement (90% or higher acceptance rate in many cases) in professional and graduate programs such as medicine, dentistry, law, pharmacy, veterinary science; 4) the development of outstanding leaders in student government programs that thrive on participation and responsibility; 5) athletic programs in which students have won national academic honors and graduation rates are substantially higher than the student body at large; and 6) the flourishing arts and cultural endeavors, including the Tony-award winning Utah Shakespearean Festival that was founded on SUU’s campus more than forty years ago.

Within the Student Life area, a variety of activities – student events, intramurals, service learning, and entertainment bureau – are open for students. Students are extensively involved in institutional governance, including a voting seat on SUU’s Board of Trustees. Student government – specifically the Student Senate – is comprised of three representatives from each academic college/school, and the Assembly is composed of representatives from clubs and organizations. Together they work to identify the needs of students, including special "Academic Focus Weeks" for each College and School within the institution.

The Southern Utah Thunderbirds compete at NCAA Division I level in baseball, men’s golf, men’s and women’s basketball, cross country,
indoor and outdoor track and field, women’s gymnastics, soccer, softball, and tennis. Football competes at NCAA Division I-AA. The women’s gymnastics team has been named Academic National Champions six of the last ten years and has never placed lower than third. Softball received the same honor in 1997 and 1998, as did men’s cross country in 1997 to make three Academic National Champions in the same year! The women’s cross-country team placed second academically in the nation in 2003.

Facilities and Infrastructure

In 1993, the NASC on-site evaluators noted that the SUU “campus is well maintained and is immaculate.” Since then, improvements in the campus physical plant have continued at apace, and one-third of all facilities were built in the last decade. The university’s academic and service programs have been greatly enhanced by completion of the J. L. Sorenson Physical Education Building (2000), the Sharwan Smith Center (1997), and the Gerald R. Sherratt Library (1996). [Standard 8]

Since the last accreditation self-study of a decade ago, information technology has transformed much of higher education. SUU has responded through appropriate and often significant investments in its computing resources and infrastructure. Most accreditation reports, assessment studies, and surveys of student satisfaction commend SUU for its computing access and applications, its technology planning and improvement, and the sophistication and support of staff working in information technology. SUU supports 85 major software applications, 68 mediated classrooms or class labs, along with specialized applications in statistics, graphics, geographic information systems, mathematics, and CAD-CAM. [Standards 2, 5]

One hallmark of SUU is the availability of campus computer resources for students: the student-computer ratio in open computer labs is 10:1, significantly better than national averages. All SUU students, staff, and faculty have access to high-quality computer resources, software, and auxiliary materials. The Administration has invested in new administrative software, especially SCT Banner, to improve data access, analysis, and storage. SUU’s informative website has been overhauled to make it more attractive and useful, particularly for recruiting new students. All faculty, staff and students can create homepages hosted by campus servers, and faculty are encouraged by policy to place their course materials online to improve student access.

The Sherratt Library, Instructional Media Center (IMC), and Information Technology (IT) are an integral part of fulfilling the institutional mission. Since 1996, when the Sherratt Library was completed, the total library budget has increased 53% percent. The Library has been acclaimed for its aesthetic and functional design, and draws in students with nearly 100 computer workstations that facilitate teaching and learning. Access to electronic databases and online resources has increased dramatically in the past decade and connects the SUU campus to a world of academic resources.

All together, SUU has 75 facilities, including those supporting the Utah Shakespearean Festival. The most recently completed academic building is the new South Hall that houses many activities of the College of Performing and Visual Arts. Residence facilities can accommodate 448 students and a new Eccles Living Learning Center is in the construction stage. When completed in 2004, it will be home to 300 students.

Faculty

SUU faculty members provide academic quality through their primary role as teachers, and are known and respected for their rapport with students. Faculty with professorial rank teach undergraduate courses at all levels, advise students, provide leadership to the University, and engage in scholarly and creative activities. SUU has gathered a diverse group of faculty from 73 academic institutions, public and private, foreign and domestic. About 70% hold a doctorate, first professional, or other terminal degree. In Fall 2001, SUU employed 220
regular faculty, and in Fall 2002, the student-to-faculty ratio was 21.3 to 1. [Standard 4]

Superior teaching remains central to the institutional mission and responsibilities of all faculty members. In fact, 77% of total instruction is by full-time faculty, a figure 20% higher than USHE system averages. Through faculty dedication, diligence, and expertise, SUU offers applied technology, baccalaureate, and graduate programs of uncommon distinction. Faculty with professorial rank teach undergraduate courses at all levels, advise students, provide leadership to the University, and engage in scholarly and creative activities.

More than before, faculty are fully integrated into the curriculum process at the unit, college, and university level. Annual assessment has been institutionalized and most departments have filed assessment plans and evaluation reports. Many faculty serve as role models for life-long learning, and nearly forty courses have integrated service-learning activities that connect the classroom to experiences in the real world. Finally, teaching at SUU embraces a vibrant mixture of pedagogical strategies and technique, e.g., large lecture formats, small group discussion, active participation assignments, multiple assessments of student learning, and integration of new technologies. [Standards 2, 3]

Planning and Effectiveness

Like other USHE member institutions, SUU has confronted significant funding and budgetary issues in recent years. Indeed, external challenges – marginal funding levels, increased competition for students, “mission creep” by other institutions, and a downturn in the economy – have been persistent. SUU has responded through a redoubling of efforts in its fiscal and strategic planning, and in its budgetary and program adjustments. The institution’s system of governance facilitates the successful accomplishment of its mission and goals. USHE has developed policies and procedures that direct member institutions, define roles and missions, and form the foundation for institutional plans, goals, staffing, programs, and accountability. [Standard 6]

To address present and future challenges, the University has engaged in meaningful scrutiny. For the last three years, the University has engaged in a systematic process to evaluate and revise as necessary its academic policies, procedures, and publications to ensure continuing integrity throughout the institution. Furthermore, the accreditation self-study process, actively commenced in Spring 2001, is evidence of the institution’s commitment to continuous improvement and reflects its accountability to all stakeholders. The institution adopted a new mission statement in 1998, conducted a two-year prioritization process (1999-2001), and developed a vision/goals statement and strategic plan in 2002. Since 1999, SUU has implemented an assessment program that is now the responsibility of a University Committee for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. [Standards 1, 2]

SUU has made great strides in connecting its mission, vision, and goals to measurable objectives, assessment activities, and a systematic process of strategic planning. Faculty Senate leaders have worked closely with the Provost and Dean’s Council in an ongoing “Policy Update Project” to streamline and improve a variety of academic policies. To ensure a more complete integration of academic programs and student support, the Provost’s Office has taken steps to oversee elements of academic-related support services, including functions of the Registrar’s Office.

SUU has implemented several structural changes reflecting the need for improved governance and administration. Changes have included two new units (College of Performing and Visual Arts, 1998, and School of Applied Science and Technology, 2002), the establishment of departments in the College of Education and School of Business, and departmental changes in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Departments have been repositioned to maximize and consolidate administration.
Educational Programs

Dedicated faculty, support staff, and administrative leaders have made a concerted effort to review, assess, and build curriculum and provide a personalized culture for student learning. Policy was created to measure outputs of general education and make recommendations for improvement. These changes have responded directly to NASC standards and to USHE policies. In particular, SUU has strengthened the general education program by providing goals, competencies, and learning objectives. [Standard 2]

A major thrust in the revamped general education program is to provide interdisciplinary courses, along with curriculum in philosophy and a required computer literacy course. To enhance both retention and learning, a student success course for all incoming freshmen has been implemented. Institutional assessments affirm SUU’s strength of faculty, staff and program quality. Over the past three years, responses to the National Survey of Student Engagement indicate that SUU was at or above the 80th percentile in class size, faculty respect for students, quality of instruction, library services, and the quality of their program of study.

SUU is dedicated to seeking excellence in all educational programs. A vital component of planned growth is to pursue selective masters-level programs while enhancing the undergraduate programs’ quality. SUU recently added two new master’s degrees (MFA in Arts Administration and MBA) and a baccalaureate degree in Integrated Engineering. Furthermore, SUU is committed to specialized accreditation, and has been successful in music (NASM), education (NASDTEC), and business (ACBSP). We are actively working to achieve additional selective national accreditations for teacher education (NCATE, April 2003), business (AACSB, 2004), computer science (ABET) and engineering (ABET). [Standards 1, 2]

SUU continues to make a new Teacher Education Building its top capital facilities project in battling for state funding. Centered in the institution’s oldest and most historic building (Old Main) with faculty spread in various campus locations, Teacher Education has plans for an $11 million facility that will provide an up-to-date teaching and learning environment for its large and successful program. Also, operating and maintenance funding remains a challenge for the institution, especially in light of recent budget cuts.

Student Retention and Success

Officially, 6,630 (headcount) students enrolled in Fall 2001, and 6,134 annualized FTE were served during 2001-02, the data year for this self-study. This represents a 54% headcount enrollment increase in ten years. For Fall 2002, headcount enrollment was 5,881. (See Table i.1 at the end of this section for a summary of key statistics.) About 56% of the student body is female, 96% are undergraduates, and 76% are full-time students. Nearly 86% of headcount students are full-time equivalent students enrolled in 56 bachelors programs (down from 61 programs in FY 2001), 21 associate of applied science programs (down from 27 programs in FY 2001), and four graduate programs. The consolidation of academic program offerings through the prioritization and review process was completed in January 2002. Exhibit i.1 contains SUU Fact Books from which much of the data for this introduction are derived.

The President established as goals in 2001-2002 the improvement of student recruitment and retention, and two special committees were established to study the issues. Reports of these committees are provided as Exhibit i.2. The issues were raised in task force discussions, and suggestions for improvement emerged in subsequent recommendations. Internal studies (surveys and focus groups) identified needs for a comprehensive first-year experience program, improved student advisement, greater diversity, and systematic learning outcomes in academic departments along with sustained academic rigor.

To address these needs: 1) the student success course was added to general education and new
students were advised into the course; 2) all general education courses were resubmitted for approval with explicit learning outcomes and assessment activities; 3) each general education course was expected to have a diversity element and new diversity courses were added to general education; 4) general education was further revised for 2003; and 5) the ETS Academic Profile survey was tested in 2002 to assess general education as a body of knowledge (more details offered in Standard 2).

Because student retention is often tied to the quality and consistency of academic advising, SUU has taken steps to improve advising functions and responsibilities. The Student Development Center/Student Success Center (SDC/SSC) provides general education advisement and assists students with variety of inventories that help them to evaluate academic, career, and life decisions. The SDC/SSC’s advising programs have been strengthened, and recent realignments of the Registrar’s Office, the SDC/SSC, and the First-Year Experience program with the Provost’s Office will improve academic oversight. Furthermore, as of July 2003, each College and School had hired and trained their own academic advisor, another step expected to improve advising and student retention. Four new college advisors were funded through a tuition increase in 2003-04.

The higher education budget process for Utah historically has been enrollment-driven (i.e., increased students often equaled increased appropriations), and thus enrollment management and student retention are significant fiscal matters for SUU. In 2003 the Board of Regents introduced a new funding model that moves away from an approach based solely on enrollments. In Summer 2003, SUU hired its first Executive Director of Enrollment Management, a position that should improve the institution’s recruitment and retention efforts.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

The University has mechanisms for including faculty in planning and governance, in developing curriculum, and in shaping direction at the college, department and program levels.

A University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is comprised of faculty and engages in curricular oversight and review. The Faculty Senate is representative of the faculty with a well-defined system of operations. The Senate is actively involved in policy review and is currently revisiting its Constitution and composition with an eye toward strengthening its effectiveness.

The term scholarship is interpreted to be inclusive of the variations in the work of faculty across all disciplines, including scientific research, invention, and creative activities. Despite their primary teaching focus, faculty continue to demonstrate significant professional accomplishments. Faculty publish scholarly books and articles in peer-reviewed journals, obtain external grants, and receive internal funding. Recent steps by the Provost have reallocated funds to provide for more professional development monies awarded on a competitive, university-wide basis. Furthermore, faculty in many disciplines involve students in undergraduate research opportunities.

Faculty compensation is a continuing challenge for SUU, as noted in more detail below. One goal of SUU’s strategic plan includes an objective of hiring, rewarding, and retaining qualified faculty. Although total compensation for faculty is near that of peer institutions, salaries at all ranks remain below 90% of peers. In Fall 2001, 54 (or nearly 25% of all SUU faculty members) were below 90% of market salaries, and improving salaries and achieving more equitable salaries remain a long-standing top budget priority of the administration.

Finance

Planning for and acquiring adequate funding continues to pose challenges and provide opportunities for SUU to achieve its defined mission within the USHE. SUU has confronted budget reductions and diminished funding over the past two years while striving to maintain program and service quality. Since 2000, the University has implemented a financial plan to improve its fiscal condition. The plan,
developed in consultation with Regents, Trustees and others, remains the operating guide for the institution. [Standard 7]

In addition to seeking, and at times receiving, more appropriated dollars, SUU has embarked on an ambitious capital campaign. As of December 2002, the campaign raised over $43 million in funding and pledges to be used for facilities, scholarships, and campus improvements. This campaign exceeded its goal by over $1 million and more than doubled the largest previous development campaign (of $17.5 million) at the institution. SUU has also initiated opportunities to better align the mission and resources of the institution through 1) prioritizing academic programs, 2) equalizing academic operating budgets through a formula distribution, and 3) making internal adjustments for better program support.

In response to recent budget cuts and revenue shortfalls, SUU responded with tuition increases and cuts in expenditures. SUU reduced its total expenditure budget by 3.3% in FY 2001-02 and by 4.1% in FY 2002-03. Concurrently, tuition has been increased, 30.0% from 1997-98 to 2002-03, and another 23.5% for 2003-04 alone. These difficult decisions came only after much discussion with faculty, staff, and student leaders, most of whom recognized the need for higher tuition levels. New tuition revenue is earmarked for student recruitment and retention efforts in 2003-04.
Table i.1
Southern Utah University, Key Statistical Comparisons
Ten-, Five-, and Base-year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs, Ratios and Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Study, Annualized FTE Students</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>4,748</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cost of Instruction Per FTE</td>
<td>$4,441 $5,328 $6,200</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost of Instruction</td>
<td>$2,217</td>
<td>$2,810</td>
<td>$3,142</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular FTE Faculty</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>174.2</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Rated/Supplemental/Overload FTE Faculty</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Faculty</td>
<td>174.2</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>249.0</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with terminal degree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified &amp; Professional Staff</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>259.37</td>
<td>431.0</td>
<td>155.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation and Qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave All Ranks Faculty Salary--Peers</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$48,900</td>
<td>$57,104</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave All Ranks Faculty Salary--SUU</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>$38,600</td>
<td>$45,800</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits as % of Salary</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Faculty with doctorate/terminal degree</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G Expenditures in Constant Dollars (000)</td>
<td>$22,863</td>
<td>$31,182</td>
<td>$36,252</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G Expenditures per Annualized FTE Student</td>
<td>$6,646</td>
<td>$6,567</td>
<td>$6,569</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Tax Funds (E&amp;G) in Constant Dollars (000)</td>
<td>$17,012</td>
<td>$21,848</td>
<td>$26,440</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees Revenues (E&amp;G) in Constant Dollars (000)</td>
<td>$5,727</td>
<td>$9,646</td>
<td>$9,719</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU Instructional Expenditures per FTE Student</td>
<td>$2,694</td>
<td>$3,133</td>
<td>$3,501</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Dollars Expended per Ann. FTE Student</td>
<td>$4,907</td>
<td>$5,819</td>
<td>$6,588</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G Funds from State Tax Funds</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>70.80%</td>
<td>73.60%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of E&amp;G Funds from Tuition</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>30.90%</td>
<td>26.40%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Market Value</td>
<td>$2,703,667</td>
<td>$5,045,890</td>
<td>$7,911,732</td>
<td>192.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Collection Volumes</td>
<td>195,324</td>
<td>208,702</td>
<td>236,688</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Admissions and Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Freshmen Applications</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen Enrolled as a % of Applicants</td>
<td>53.20%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financial Aid Amount</td>
<td>$9,646,106</td>
<td>$14,083,376</td>
<td>$18,991,826</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Awards (duplicated)</td>
<td>6,774</td>
<td>8,339</td>
<td>9,881</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: USHE Data Books, SUU Cost Studies, IPEDS On-line
Part II: Progress Made On Past Accreditation Recommendations

In 1993, the NASC Commission conducted a full-scale re-accreditation evaluation (Exhibit i.3). The evaluation report commended the University for 1) “a remarkable level of commitment to the institution and its goals by faculty, administrators, and students”; 2) “signal improvements and expansion of its physical facilities”; 3) “a strong commitment to the use of technology in its educational programs”; 4) “a superior capacity to tap the private sector for major gifts to improve the base of public support”; 5) “a faculty [disposition] to strive to nurture their students on a personal and individual level.” Sections of this self-study report highlight continuing efforts in these areas of commendation.

General recommendations from the 1998 Interim Report (Exhibit i.4) may be more germane since they reflected recommendations made both in 1993 and 1998. As a result, the NASC Commission requested that SUU submit annual progress reports (Exhibit i.5) beginning in 1999 that focused on Financial Standards 7A and 7C. Reports were submitted in 1999 and 2000. In 2001 and 2002 focused interim visits were conducted on SUU’s MBA program prior to its acceptance as a substantive change, and an update of the MBA program was requested as part of the self-study process. See Exhibit i.6.

Significant Events and Contexts

This self-study report shows progress, some dramatic, some limited, on all of the recommendations issued in accreditation reports over the past ten years. Specific USHE and SUU changes have shaped the direction, operating climate, and current context of the University. Because these changes are so significant, they are briefly described here.

Semester Conversion and New Calendar

The Utah Board of Regents directed that all nine campuses convert from a quarter calendar to a semester calendar beginning in the fall of 1998. Through a remarkable effort of faculty, staff, and administration, the transition was carried out smoothly in less than eighteen months. The curriculum was analyzed and downsized to fit the semester model.

Restructuring

Since 1998, SUU has implemented several structural and organizational changes. Two new colleges have been created (Performing and Visual Arts, and Applied Science and Technology), and several academic departments have been restructured.

Prioritization

Beginning in 1999-2000, SUU engaged in a comprehensive process of prioritizing academic programs through the use of nationally-accepted criteria and mechanisms. Prompted by the aim to better align mission and resources, for two years the entire campus engaged in a prioritization process (illustrated in Exhibit i.7). The President’s Prioritization Report was issued in January 2002 (Exhibit i.8), and all relevant documents were posted to the University’s web site.

General Education

In 1999-2000, a comprehensive overhaul of general education began with a thorough review of similar programs in other states and universities. The University adapted as its operating framework the general education model of the Missouri system of higher education. Much of the faculty-based curriculum was adopted in 1999-2000 and further revised in 2003. This campus initiative compelled all general education courses to include explicit learning
outcomes and assessment activities. Core requirements were strengthened, an interdisciplinary requirement was added, and diversity elements were encouraged in each knowledge area and to be embedded in each course where appropriate.

Specialized Accreditation

A major goal of the University is to acquire specialized accreditation in every field where such accreditation is offered. Since 1993, SUU’s business program was accredited through ACBSP (Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs), and the music program through NASM (National Association of Schools of Music). Since 1998, when Utah became an NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) state, SUU’s Teacher Education program was accepted for NCATE candidacy and its evaluators were on campus in April 2003. (Initial feedback from NCATE evaluators was very favorable, and we await the final written report.) The business program became a candidate for AACSB (International Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) in 1999 and is completing that accreditation process.

Additionally, SUU has added a BS degree in Integrated Engineering designed to eventually meet ABET (Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology) standards. The chemistry curriculum was revised to meet American Chemical Society (ACS) standards. The computer science curriculum was revised and restructured in 2000 to meet ABET standards for computer science. The dance program was externally reviewed in 2001 for NASD (National Association of Schools of Dance), candidacy and the art program was externally reviewed in 2003 for NADA accreditation, and both programs are working toward candidacy.

Graduate Education

To better fulfill its mission and service to the people of southern Utah, SUU determined in 1998 to add selected master's degrees as student demand justified and resources allowed. With the approval of the Board of Regents and SUU’s Board of Trustees, and with consent and appropriations from the Utah Legislature, a Master's of Fine Arts degree in Arts Administration and a Master's of Business Administration degree were initiated in 1999. Documents regarding substantive changes were forwarded to the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges that same year (Exhibit i.9). The University also expanded options in the existing M.Ed. program and added a licensure program in educational administration and supervision in 2000.


Expressing concern about “the adequacy of financial resources,” the evaluation team stated that “the University is seriously under funded in relation to its mission, its objectives, its programmatic obligations, and its enrollment.” Other recommendations included that updated information be provided about the “consequences of the debate about funding for the University Center in St. George and the results for continued accreditation of SUU and the financial health of SUU.”

The 1993 and 1998 evaluation reports, as well as the 1999 and 2000 annual progress reports, cited SUU’s financial adequacy and planning. The administration has worked tirelessly toward improving the funding position of the institution, as noted in annual progress reports and addressed more fully in Standard 7 of this self-study report. Figure i.1 summarizes expenditure changes as recorded in University Fact Books.
Figure i.1

Expenditure Changes at Southern Utah University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Change Instruction &amp; Acad. Support</th>
<th>% Change Non-Instructional Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appropriations and Internal Actions**

In FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03, SUU responded (as did most institutions nationally) to budget cuts and revenue shortfalls with tuition increases and cuts in expenditures. SUU reduced its total expenditure budget by 3.3% in FY 2001-02 and by 4.1% in FY 2002-03. Since the interim visit in 1998, some requests to the Utah legislature for increased funding have resulted in greater appropriations. For example, salary increases for faculty and staff in 2000-01 and 2001-02 averaged 5.75% and 7.5%, respectively. For several years, SUU received appropriations greater than the average of the USHE, as noted in Table i.2. Concurrently, tuition has been increased, 30% from 1997-98 to 2002-03, and another 23.5% for 2003-04.

Table i.2
SUU and USHE Percent Change in Appropriations, 1997-98 to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>USHE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>-3.30%</td>
<td>-1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritization

Begun in 1999, SUU’s two-year prioritization process provided opportunities to review programs by 1) developing criteria; 2) assessing programs and productivity; 3) weighing market data and employment trends; 4) writing program evaluations for 134 academic programs and other support activities of the University; and 5) scoring the programs and arraying them in quintiles with recommendations for the President. Departments examined courses and curricula; colleges and schools assessed programs, resources, and priorities; and the University added and deleted programs, consolidated and restructured functions, and then adopted a systematic process of program review as part of its assessment plan (mandated in 2003 as a regular process by the Regents). In total, 25 academic programs were deleted, and others were consolidated.

Faculty and Staff Salaries

Prior to FY 2002-03, faculty salaries improved over a three-year period (in current dollars). Figure i.2 shows the latest average salary and compensation data. In FY 2002-03 (and again in 2003-04), the Utah Legislature did not fund salary increases, and faculty salaries at SUU remain behind the average of peer institutions. Total compensation, however, is more comparable. Faculty and staff salary studies are conducted each year by the USHE staff as well as by SUU Human Resources (examining CUPA data) preparatory to Legislative sessions each year. In 2002, studies indicated that 54 faculty and 118 staff employees had salaries below 90% of market. Recent salary studies for faculty and staff are included in Exhibit i.10. Improving faculty and staff salaries and salary equity remain top budget priorities of SUU in annual budget requests to the Regents and to the Legislature.

![Average Faculty Salary & Compensation by Rank, 2001-02](image)

**Source:** USHE Data Books and Academe, 2002
**St. George Center**

A second financial element of the 1998 NASC evaluation was related to events and questions associated with the St. George Center. SUU had offered courses and programs at Dixie College, but the citizens of St. George and their community leaders sought authority and resources for their own programs. The Utah State Board of Regents and the Utah Legislature granted that authority in 1999 along with a name change to Dixie State College in 2000. Dixie State College is now authorized by legislative and regental action to offer a limited number of bachelor’s degrees in high demand fields. By authorization of the Regents, the University Center at the St. George campus was transferred from the aegis of SUU to DSC in 1999, and the funding for the program offered in business and education was likewise shifted. SUU has been offering master's degree courses in education at DSC the past few years and began offering courses in its MBA program in Fall 2003.

**Recommendation 2**

“Recognizing . . . initiatives undertaken for faculty development and encouragement of scholarship and research,” the NASC evaluators in 1998 urged improvements in the library collection and in leave, rank, and tenure policies.

In the past ten years, the library collection has increased 21% and electronic databases have increased 468%. The latest comparative study of the SUU library and its peers found commendations for patron service, interlibrary loan, computing capacity, and the facility. It also found that acquisitions and total budgets were markedly below peer institutions, and staffing below peer averages.

Incrementally, SUU has been revising its leave, rank, and tenure policies. Deadlines were revised in 1999 and 2000. Criteria were revised in 2000 and 2001. In 2002 a concerted effort was made to finish a comprehensive revision by the end of Spring 2003.

Initiatives in faculty development, undergraduate research, faculty scholarship and research (also documented later in this report) extended the University’s investment in faculty, staff, and student learning. Each college or school has funding in place for faculty development, and the Provost’s office provided funding for faculty development grants in 2002-03 that are expected to sharply increase in fiscal year 2004 due to increased tuition levels.

**Recommendation 3**

Evaluators foresaw opportunities for broader involvement in policy-making. This recommendation resulted in delegation of curriculum decisions to faculty, greater emphasis on “shared governance,” and demonstrated involvement of students in making policy. One of the more significant and successful endeavors has been the “Policy Update Project,” begun together by the Deans’ Council and Faculty Senate in 1999. To date, some thirty-four (34) policies have been addressed, refined, or replaced in the spirit of shared governance for the academic programs of the University.

Policy revisions have been complemented by improved communication within and across campus. In addition to addressing previous accreditation recommendations, periodic campus feedback identified perceived problems with campus morale (illustrated by survey data on faculty satisfaction in 1999 and in 2001; see Exhibit i.11). Internal communication has been improved though various methods and media, among them campus e-mail bulletins; direct and monthly messages from the President to faculty and staff; informal meetings and luncheons with the Provost, President, faculty, and staff; and regular meetings between the Provost and the Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee.

Web-based communications are improving the timeliness and scope of sharing information with the campus community. A good example is that of the NASC accreditation self-study that has used its web page (plus emails, newsletters, and campus presentations) to share materials and create an open process of institutional self-study.
The recently revamped SUU web site also promises new means of enhanced communication across campus. The input of faculty and students, though improved, needs to continue. Standards 2, 4, and 6 delineate a number of other, more specific changes that have improved shared governance.

**Recommendation 4**

Since the 1998 report (and prompted by subsequent institutional and program growth), SUU has “made some organizational changes both in the administration and in the academic units.” Changes have come as a result of proposals, recommendations, and input from the campus community, as documented elsewhere in this self-study report.

Because SUU supports significant cultural arts programs, a College of Performing and Visual Arts was created in 1998 to administer the Department of Art, Department of Music, and Department of Theatre Arts and Dance. This college also became home to the Utah Shakespearean Festival, the American Folk Ballet, and the Braithwaite Fine Arts Gallery. In 2002, the creation of a School of Applied Science and Technology was approved by the Utah State Board of Regents. Now operational, the new school administers the Department of Applied Science, the Department of Applied Technology, Short-term Intensive Training (STIT) and related programs, and it serves as liaison to the new Utah College of Applied Technology with its multiple campus locations. As a result of this structural change in 2002-03, the Departments of Family and Consumer Science, Technology and Criminal Justice, Agriculture division, and Business Education/Computer Information Systems were consolidated into two departments within the new School.

Other campus restructuring included the relocation of the Department of Communication to the College of Humanities and Social Sciences in 2001. Within the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Department of Language and Literature was divided into the Department of English and the Department of Foreign Languages and Humanities, effective July 1, 2002. To more effectively administer business programs and faculty, the School of Business was divided into four departments: Accounting and Information Systems, Economics and Finance, Management and Marketing, and Military Science. In July 2003, the Teacher Education department was divided into three units within the College of Education. Within some departments, structural changes have included forming divisions for programmatic oversight.

**Recommendation 5**

An important recommendation in 1993 and reaffirmed in 1998 was that “SUU needs to make a systematic and disciplined effort to conform with the Commission’s standards on educational assessment.” Strategic planning efforts and assessment activities focus on improving SUU as a “sensing organization” that can capably collect and use information.

University assessment has progressed in a systematic fashion, bringing a change in the campus culture as well as demonstrable results that could be used for the improvement of academic programs and institutional effectiveness. In 1999, assessment and institutional research were enhanced by creating the position of Associate Provost, who helped to establish a University Assessment Committee in 2001 with faculty, staff, and student representation. Administration consolidation and reallocation brought support of assessment activities on campus. As a result of institutional assessment, as well as the self-study process, a log of projects and “fixes” was developed to directed institutional actions. See Exhibit i.12. The committee guided the University’s assessment activities, such as a series of workshops in 2001-02 that centered on effective assessments and NASC standards. See Exhibit i.13.

Although additional staffing and budget support could enhance campus assessment activities, some significant improvements have been
documented, distributed to University administration, and posted on the SUU web site. Ongoing institutional initiatives now include the following:

- Participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs, and other national studies.
- Regular newsletters are issued to the campus community and provide links to additional resources.
- Assessment workshops are offered for faculty and staff.
- Systematic assessment at the academic unit includes plans outlined in Fall and reports in Spring (both posted to the web).
- Preparation of special studies that relate to central assessment issues (e.g., student retention, library comparisons, diversity contexts, and survey findings).

During Fall 2002, the University Assessment Committee was restructured and organized as an Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee, charged to serve as a resource for campus-wide assessment. SUU administrators recognize the need to continue assessment efforts that will effectively “close the loop” to improve student learning and document educational effectiveness.

Recommendation 6

A model for faculty evaluation has been selected, but “what is needed is the communication of this process to all concerned and its consistent application on a regular basis in the future,” as evaluators noted previously. Further, the institution needs to fully address the “problem of differential perceptions about workload and its relation to promotion, tenure, recognition, and compensation.”

In 1996-97, the Faculty Senate took responsibility for developing a new faculty evaluation policy and mechanism; the evaluation system of Raoul Arreola was adopted as a framework but has yet to be implemented. In 2000, the Provost requested that departments develop, within the parameters of University policy, plans for merit pay, recognition, and advancement. Four departments responded, and the plans were approved. In 2002, the faculty began in earnest to revise leave, rank, and tenure policies and develop a policy on faculty evaluation. However, the issues raised in this recommendation have yet to be comprehensively addressed.

Also relevant are faculty workloads and policies governing teaching responsibilities as these may impact on opportunities for scholarly and creative endeavors. A new faculty workload policy was adopted in 1999-2000, curriculum was streamlined in many departments, and a guideline for class preparations was adopted in 2001. Currently SUU faculty average 12.4 credit hours per faculty member and 3.6 class preparations per semester. Specialized accrediting agencies (e.g., AACSB and NCATE) have their own standards that have helped specific disciplines to better manage faculty assignments.

Recommendation 7

Evaluators in 1998 made it clear that SUU “cannot claim to represent diversity as it is commonly understood,” restating a concern expressed in 1993, as well. SUU was encouraged to make demonstrable progress toward increased gender and ethnic diversity.

Some data show improvements in the composition of SUU faculty and students. In 1993, for example, SUU employed 111 (75.5%) male and 36 (24.5%) female faculty members. In 2002-03, the figures show that 150 male (70.4%) and 60 (29.6%) female faculty were employed. Further, an internal study on diversity was published and distributed to the campus community based on the 2000 U. S. Census and other demographic information (Exhibit 1.14). Figure i.3 summarizes faculty distribution by gender and by rank, and Figure i.4 shows student enrollment by residence and ethnicity. Because of its geographic isolation, SUU faces a difficult challenge with ethnic diversity. To supplement recruitment efforts and
Introduction

Awareness, SUU has 1) required a diversity element in each appropriated general education course; and 2) added courses to the curriculum that contain a strong diversity theme or are explicit introductions to diversity issues.

Figure i.3
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Source: IPEDS Reports

Figure i.4
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Source: SUU Fact Books
Evidence of Success

In 1999 SUU began participating in two nationally normed surveys that better assess strengths and weaknesses. ACT’s College Outcomes Survey (COS), administered to graduating seniors, and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), administered to first-year and senior students, assess student satisfaction. See Exhibits i.15 and i.16, respectively. The latest results of the COS, administered in 2002, are summarized in Table i.3.

NSSE provides both survey results and an institutional benchmark report that aggregates item scores by category to indicate relative performance of the institution. The institutional score is then compared to the score for peer institutions as an indicator within each category of comparison. Table i.4 summarizes the latest information within five categories for first-year and for senior year students. While the first-year scores show areas needing improvement, the senior year is near or comparable to scores of masters-level peers. Table i.5 summarizes from the 2002 NSSE study indicators of positive, practical significance at SUU. Items in bold typeface are repeat items from the 2001 survey. Each indicator cited in the table scored above masters-level peer institutions.

Table i.3
College Outcomes Survey, 2002
Respondents “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>National Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty respect for students</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This college in general</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of my program of study</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student access to computer facilities and services</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table i.4
National Survey of Student Engagement
Institutional Benchmark Report, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Senior Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUU Score</td>
<td>Masters Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Challenge</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active &amp; Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interactions with Faculty Members</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table i.5
National Survey of Student Engagement, 2002
Indicators of Positive Practical Significance

Note: += 10 points above national peers, +++= 20 points above national peers, +++= 30 points above national peers, ++++= 40 points above national peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-year</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>Attending campus events &amp; activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Voting in local, state, and national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of written papers of fewer than 5 pages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing care for dependents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of academic advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of books read on own outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked for pay off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships with administrative personnel and offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing support needed to thrive socially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence for Improvement

Table i.4 above highlights several disparities among first-year students and their experience at SUU. To help address these issues, SUU has implemented a student success program as a core course in general education beginning in Fall 2003. The first-year program was implemented as a result of a two-year pilot study to improve student retention. The study also validated a problem with new student placement in math courses specifically highlighted in the COS. Tables i.6, i.7, and i.8 summarize areas needing improvement, according to student responses from graduating students taking the COS and from first-year and senior students responding to NSSE in 2001 and 2002. The COS results must be considered in the context that 81% of the respondents had some transfer credit; 30% had 45 credit hours or more. Again, the items in bold in Table i.8 are repeat indicators from the previous year.

Table i.6
College Outcomes Survey, 2002
Lowest Percentages of Respondents “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>National Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus AIDS education program</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New student placement in reading/writing, math courses</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New student orientation services</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table i.7
National Survey of Student Engagement
Institutional Benchmark Report, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Areas Below Peer Score Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Academic Challenge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment emphasizing time studying and on academic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes analyzing the basic elements of an idea or theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes applying theories or concepts to practical problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes synthesizing and organizing ideas, information or experiences into new interpretations of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length course readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Interactions with Faculty Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked or planned to work with a faculty member on a research project outside of course requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enriching Educational Experiences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language coursework and study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study or self-designated major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating senior experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of different religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used electronic technology to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment encourages contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, internship, or clinical assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Campus Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment helps you cope with your non-academic responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment provides the support you need to help you succeed academically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table i.8
National Survey of Student Engagement, 2002
Indicators of Negative Practical Significance

Note: *= 10 points below national peers, **= 20 points below national peers, ***= 30 points below national peers, ****= 40 points below national peers, *****= 50 points below national peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-year</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** ** *** Thinking critically and analytically
*** Writing clearly and effectively
*** *** Number of assigned textbooks or books of course readings
** *** Analyzing quantitative problems
*** Developing a personal code of values
** *** Speaking clearly and effectively
** ** Requiring written papers between 5 and 19 pages
** Preparing for class
** Study abroad
** Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
** Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds
** Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
** Worked harder than you thought
** Analyzing basic elements of an idea, experience or theory
** ** Holding conversations with students of a different ethnicity
** Foreign language coursework
* Included diverse perspectives in class assignments
* * Synthesizing and organizing ideas
* * Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or new situations
* Making judgments about the value of information
* Commuting to class
* Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class.
* Solving complex real-world problems
* Number of papers of 20 pages or more

Part III: The Accreditation Self-Study Process

Exhibits required for the self-study are generally incorporated by reference into the text. However, a few exhibits are not incorporated, but are available separately among the exhibit materials for this introduction.

Prioritization preceded the accreditation self-study process and provided opportunities for intense introspection based on assessment, data, mission and goals reviews. Preparation for accreditation *per se* began in earnest in February 2001 after the Provost and Associate Provost attended an NASC training workshop in Seattle. The Provost returned from the workshop to recommend Dr. Earl Mulderink, Associate Professor of History, to serve as Chair of an Accreditation Steering Committee. By the end of Spring 2001, the Steering Committee was formed, accreditation handbooks were distributed to the Steering Committee and to campus administrators, and initial training began.

The Steering Committee members and others soon realized that the new standards described in
the 1999 edition of the handbook required considerably more self-analysis, assessment, introspection, and appraisal than some faculty and staff had expected. The self-study process initiated a number of changes to academic and other programs of the University. To assist the self-study process, in August 2001, Ron Baker, Associate Executive Director of the NASC, Commission on Colleges, presented an accreditation orientation to SUU’s faculty and staff. He visited with campus administrators and provided an in-depth training session for the Steering Committee. These August 2001 presentations launched in earnest the campus-wide accreditation effort.

During Fall 2001, subcommittees were formed and charged with specific duties, a timeline was adopted, general working parameters (e.g., formats, assignments, regular meetings, data collection templates, and training aids) were implemented, and an accreditation web page was set up and is accessible at www.suu.edu/ad/accreditation.

Developed from similar accreditation web pages at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, and the University of Montana, the site included an introduction to accreditation, timelines, committee members, past evaluations, templates, newsletters and resource material. The web site was accessible globally, but the templates, drafts of subcommittee work, and drafts of the self-study report were all password-protected. The web site has been a valuable tool in communicating with the Steering Committee, subcommittee members, and the campus community.

In January 2002, data templates were distributed to appropriate academic and non-academic units. The templates were to guide unit self-studies and to gather information for subcommittees to respond to specific accreditation standards. In February 2002, President Steven Bennion and four faculty members (Drs. Deborah Hill, Suzanne Larson, Earl Mulderink, and Carl Templin) attended the 2002 NASC accreditation workshop and returned with new insights and raised levels of anxiety. As a result of that training, they and the Steering Committee made modifications to 1) the information-gathering processes; 2) the timetable; and 3) expectations about the preparation and format of the finished self-study report. In sum, the NASC workshops and the campus visit by Ron Baker were invaluable aids in pursuing the self-study and preparing the report and documentation.

Another suggestion implemented as a result of the accreditation workshop was the creation of an executive committee to keep the self-study process moving forward, and it began operating during Spring 2002. By the end of that same semester, unit templates were collected and responses were sorted by accreditation standard. An additional template was created during the summer of 2002 to facilitate updating unit information during Fall 2002 and for creating departmental self-study reports. To further accelerate and guide the process, drafts of the Introduction and Standard 1 were circulated to Steering Committee and subcommittee members.

First established in Spring 2001, the Accreditation Steering Committee was comprised of the following:

- **Earl Mulderink***, Associate Professor of History and Chair, Department of Social Sciences, Chair
- **Joe Baker**, Associate Professor of Managerial Economics (Standard 4)
- **Kim Craft**, Associate Professor of Economics (Policies)
- **Kolby Day**, Student (Standard 3)
- **Don English**#, Director of Off-Campus Degree Programs (Policies)
- **Brian Foisy**, Budget Director (Standard 7)
- **Cyndi Gilbert##**, Member of the Board of Trustees (Standard 6)
- **Kate Grandison**, Associate Professor Biology and Chair, Department of Biology (Standard 4)
- **Abe Harraf***, Provost and Professor of Management (Standard 1)
- **Deborah Hill***, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education (Standard 2)
- **Connie Jones**, Academic Advisor, Intercollegiate Athletics (Standard 3)
Suzanne Julian, Associate Professor of Instructional Media and Serials Librarian (Standard 5)
Suzanne Larson*, Director of the Honors Program and Professor of Communication (Standard 2)
Shauna Mendini, Associate Professor of Dance and Associate Chair, Department of Theatre Arts and Dance (Standard 8)
Craig Morrison, Professor of Physical Education and Chair, Department of Physical Education (Standard 9)
Kenneth Munford#, Interim Director of Applied Technology and Associate Professor of Electronics Technology (Standard 6)
Jennifer Powell#, Student (Standard 3)
Michael Richards*, Associate Provost and Associate Professor of Management (Standard 1 and Assessment)
Delilah Schwaner#, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education (Standard 9)
Becky Stucker, Business Manager, Utah Shakespearean Festival (Standard 6)
Richard Tebbs, Professor of Mathematics (Standard 2)
Carl Templin*, Dean of the School of Business and Professor of Management (Standard 1)
Georgia Beth Thompson, Vice President of Student Services (Standard 3)
Cynthia Wright, Dean of the School of Applied Science and Technology and Professor of Family and Consumer Science (Standard 6)
Bonny Rayburn, Information specialist and administrative assistant

*Member of the Executive Committee
#Served on Steering Committee through 2001-2002
##Term on Board of Trustees completed in Summer 2003

Also assisting:
Jill Ormond Whitaker, Web designer

As suggested above, each member of the Steering Committee chaired or co-chaired a subcommittee that focused on one Standard. Standard 2 was served by two subcommittees, and separate subcommittees were formed for review of NASC policies and for data and assessment, respectively. The names of the chairs and members of the subcommittees are listed in Exhibit i.17.

Following the lead of other institutions, particularly the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, SUU adapted electronic templates for gathering data and for assessing and appraising information. Shaped by all members of the Steering Committee and with input from faculty, staff, and administrators, these templates were an excellent resource and dynamic tool.

Throughout this process, the Steering Committee made it clear that the self-study was to be mission-driven and fully documented. Subcommittees invested considerable effort to demonstrate an assessment perspective; some impressive efforts, for example, were made to develop, articulate, and implement assessment at the program level in Teacher Education, Psychology, Business, and Mathematics. The self-study report documents an extraordinary faculty effort that was greatly facilitated by workshops and materials provided by the Data and Assessment subcommittee. The Office of Institutional Research supported the workshops to strengthen unit assessment planning and reporting across campus.

The Chair of the Steering Committee published regular newsletters to inform the entire campus about the accreditation standards, process, web site, and other details. He also met with administrative councils, committees, and the Board of Trustees to discuss the process and to ensure that campus stakeholders were informed. As early as March 2002, data-based extended outlines of portions of the Standards were submitted as drafts to circulate electronically on campus. This gratifying event demonstrated faculty and staff participation in the self-study process, affirming a 1993 commendation about the deep commitment to SUU by its faculty and staff.

The submission of drafts in mid-Spring 2003 permitted extended discussion and review within the campus community. Drafts of all sections of the self-study report were first reviewed by the Steering Committee and then opened to campus review through the accreditation web site. A
short “Review Sheet and Checklist” was available online for downloading and forwarding with comments to the Steering Committee Chair. In April 2003 a consultant (Dr. Elizabeth Street of Central Washington University) visited SUU to evaluate the self-study draft and exhibits, and met with numerous members of the campus community. Throughout the revision process, participants made a continuous and conscientious effort to update and improve the self-study report before submitting it to NASC in Fall 2003.

The process, in summary, has been comprehensive, thorough, and engaging. It has generated a number of “fixes” and countless improvements to the operation of the University and its units. Perhaps most significant has been the thoughtful introspection induced by the process itself. Faculty, staff, administrators, students, and trustees know more about the University, its outstanding features, and its challenges. Areas that need attention are more clearly defined. Processes are in place to move beyond this accreditation self-study to a pattern of sustained assessment and continuous improvement at SUU.

Part IV: Eligibility Verification

The Steering Committee has verified that SUU is in compliance with the Commission’s eligibility requirements (revised 2001) as enumerated and detailed below:

1. **Authority.** Laws of the State of Utah and policies of the Utah State Board of Regents formally authorize SUU to grant degrees.

2. **Mission and Goals.** SUU has a mission statement and goals appropriate to an institution of higher education approved by the Board of Trustees. SUU’s purpose is to serve the education interests of its students and its principal programs lead to formal degrees.

3. **Institutional Integrity.** The institution is governed and administered in a manner responding to the educational needs and legitimate claims of the constituencies it serves, as determined by its chartered purposes and accredited status.

4. **Governing Board.** The Utah State Board of Regents is comprised of 18 voting members appointed by the Governor with consent of the Utah State Senate. None of the Board members works for or has any financial interest in SUU. Some powers of the Board of Regents are delegated to a Board of Trustees, comprised of 10 voting members appointed by the Governor with consent of the Utah State Senate. None of the trustees works for or has any financial interest in SUU. The Board of Trustees is generally advisory to the President of the University, and has policy, budget, and program approval responsibilities.

5. **Chief Executive Officer.** The University’s president is a full-time chief executive officer appointed by the Board of Regents. His primary responsibility is to SUU. He does not chair the governing board or the advisory board.

6. **Administration.** The institution provides administrative and support services necessary to achieve its mission and meet its goals.

7. **Faculty.** SUU employs over 200 full-time faculty representing every discipline in which it offers major work. Within available resources, the faculty is adequate in number and qualifications to meet its obligations. Faculty are involved, and getting more involved, in the formulation of institutional policy and participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, student academic advising, and institutional governance. Faculty are evaluated in a periodic and systematic manner under revised or new policies and initiatives. Faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty while allowing time and support for professional growth and renewal.

8. **Educational Program.** SUU offers associate, baccalaureate, and master's degrees congruent with its mission and based on recognized fields of study. The programs are of sufficient content and length to be comparable to
similar programs nationally. Integral to the programs are library and information resources. The programs are conducted at levels of rigor and quality appropriate to the degrees offered. The University sees itself as a community of learners enriched by faculty and student interaction that is a primary strength of the institution. Some programs of the University such as Music, Teacher Education, Business, Athletic Training, and Nursing (cooperative program with Weber State University) have received or are candidates for specialized accreditation.

9. General Education and Related Instruction. By policy of the Utah State Board of Regents, two-year degrees require a minimum of 64 semester hours, four-year degrees a minimum of 120 semester hours. All baccalaureate degree programs and all academic or transfer associate degree programs require a substantial and coherent component of general education. AAS degrees require a minimum of 18 semester hours in a specified array of general education coursework. BA/BS degrees require a minimum of 37 semester hours general education credits. Bachelors and advanced degree programs require a planned program of specialization delineated by major field of study. All degree program requirements are published in the SUU Catalog.

10. Library and Learning Resources. The University has a core library with a book collection and with the learning resources appropriate to the mission of the institution. Access is provided to specialized and electronic resources. These learning resources are available to students wherever located and however programs are delivered.

11. Academic Freedom. The University espouses academic freedom and intellectual independence of faculty and students. Faculty and students are free to examine and to test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline as judged by the academic community in general and as expressed in the University’s policy on academic freedom.

12. Student Achievement. All program requirements are published in the Catalog and in course syllabi. The majority of programs have clearly defined and published student learning objectives, and the means for achieving them, which are appropriate to higher education in level, quality and standards. Through regular and systematic assessment at unit and institutional levels, the University demonstrates that students who complete their programs will achieve these outcomes to the extent resources allow.

13. Admissions. For admission to the University, a recommended preparatory curriculum is published for prospective students and for high school counseling. Admissions policies of the University specify the qualifications for admission to SUU programs. Admissions decisions adhere to University policies and practices.

14. Public Information. The official Catalog, the student handbook, the University’s web site and other appropriate publications of SUU set forth a number of information items, including, the mission and goals; admission requirements and procedures; rules and regulations for conduct; academic regulations; degree-completion requirements; programs and courses with specific indications of when they are offered; tuition, fees, and other costs; refund policies; and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it.

15. Financial Resources. SUU has a relatively stable funding base from the State of Utah and the tuition of its students. Financial resources and plans for financial development are stretched to carry out the mission and goals of SUU within a balanced budget and safe level of debt.

16. Financial Accountability. Financial records are externally reported and audited annually. The audit includes an opinion on the financial statement.

17. Institutional Effectiveness. The institution has initiated systematic evaluation and planning procedures. SUU assesses the extent to which it
fulfills its mission and achieves its goals, and periodically publishes the results to its constituencies.

18. **Operational Status.** SUU has entered its second century of operation by offering education programs and courses of study. Students pursue general education, certificates, associates, baccalaureate, and graduate degrees at the time of this self-study.

19. **Disclosure.** SUU is committed to the accreditation process and to disclosing all information relevant to that process, as the NASC Commission on Colleges (now NWCCU) may require.

20. **Relationship with the Accreditation Commission.** SUU accepts the policies and standards of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges, and agrees to comply with them. The University understands and agrees that the Commission on Colleges may, at its discretion, make known to the public requests for information, the nature of any accreditation action, and the results of the evaluation.

The Steering Committee and SUU’s Administration are grateful for the tireless work, collaborative efforts, and multiple insights of many individuals across campus. From the outset, the goal of this self-study was to provide a balanced, honest, thorough, and useful appraisal of SUU as an institution and community of learners. We believe our goal was achieved, and we hope our readers concur.
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STANDARD 1

Institutional Mission and Goals
STANDARD ONE:
INSTITUTIONAL MISSION,
GOALS, PLANNING AND
EFFECTIVENESS

Since its founding in 1897, Southern Utah University has undergone several name and mission changes. For nearly seventy years it was a two-year institution, starting as a Branch Normal School (1897-1912), then as Branch Agricultural College (1913-1952), and College of Southern Utah (1953-1968). In the early 1960s the legislature changed its mission to a four-year college and subsequently it became Southern Utah State College (1969-1990).

In January 1991, the institution was recast as Southern Utah University and another process of mission change began. In 1993, the Utah State Board of Regents adopted a policy statement on institutional missions and roles as part of its planning processes and SUU was designated as a “comprehensive, regional university.” The regental policy process culminated in 1998 when the Regents adopted a faculty workload policy, formally defining the faculty teaching load for regional universities at 24 credit hours per year and recognizing that faculty members have scholarly and service obligations.

In 2002, the Regents were prompted to revise policies regarding institutional categories, missions, and roles. Under the current policy, both Weber State University and SUU are classified as Master’s Colleges and Universities with the following mission:

The institution’s mission is to transmit knowledge and skills primarily through undergraduate programs. Emphasis is placed on teaching, scholarly/creative effort and community service. Scholarly/creative effort is complementary to the teaching role. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the metropolitan area or region. Student success is supported through developmental programs and services associated with a comprehensive community college; education and training programs at the associate and baccalaureate levels, including applied technology education program; and selected graduate programs in high demand areas.

The University is in the process of adapting to this policy. See Exhibit 1.1.

Since the last accreditation self-study and visit in 1993, SUU has experienced a significant period of transition. Student enrollment grew from 4,293 students to over 6,000 students, and dropped in 2002 to 5,881 headcount enrollments. From 1993 to 2002, baccalaureate degree awards increased 48 percent. Significant administrative and organizational changes also occurred. SUU installed a new president in 1997, transitioned through two new provosts in 1998 and 2002, respectively, and with two new vice presidents in 2002. SUU added the College of Performing and Visual Arts in 1998 and the School of Applied Science and Technology in 2002.

In the past five years, SUU has adapted to several major external challenges, including increased competition for students from other institutions plus adverse financial and fiscal conditions in the state of Utah and the nation. Heightened competition for students has come from Utah Valley State College in Orem/Provo (the number of baccalaureate degree programs jumped from one in 1994 to 32 today); Dixie State College in St. George (45 minutes south) became a state college in 1999 and added three baccalaureate programs despite duplication at SUU; and the former Ricks College in Rexburg, Idaho, changed from a two-year to a four-year college in 2000. Out-of-state enrollments have been impacted by the state of Nevada’s "Millennium Scholarship Program," funded with tobacco settlement monies that encouraged attendance at in-state colleges and universities. In 2002, the Utah state legislature essentially doubled the time required for a non-resident student to attain residency for tuition purposes.

Furthermore, SUU and other public institutions of higher education have been affected by decreased Utah state tax dollars for higher education and tax revenue shortfalls. SUU has remained under-funded for growth and
witnessed significant budget cuts in 2001 and 2002, as did other state colleges and universities. Finally, in 2002 the Utah State Legislature created the Utah College of Applied Technology with ten campuses throughout the state to provide applied technology training, adding more competition for scarce state resources.

To address these and future challenges, the University re-examined its mission statement in 1998, conducted a two-year prioritization process (1999-2001), and developed a vision/goals statement and strategic plan in 2002. As a consequence of the 1998 Interim Visit, the University implemented an assessment program. SUU is now in the process of connecting the mission, vision, and goals to measurable objectives, assessment activities, and a systematic process of strategic planning to better fulfill its institutional mission and demonstrate its effectiveness.

**Mission and Goals – Standard 1.A**

SUU’s mission and goals derive from, or are widely understood by, the campus community, are adopted by the governing board, and are periodically reexamined. (1.A.1) A committee of faculty and staff, charged by the President, developed the current mission statement in 1998, a year prior to the publication of the latest edition of accreditation standards of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. The revision received broad campus review and input and was approved by the Board of Trustees on June 5, 1998. See Exhibit 1.2. The mission statement reads as follows:

**SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY’S MISSION STATEMENT**

As a community of learners, Southern Utah University serves as a comprehensive regional university to encourage a lifelong love of learning, to foster academic excellence, to instill ethics and values and to honor thought in all its finest forms. Foremost to our role and central to our disciplines are superior teaching and quality service to students. Fundamental to our purpose are scholarly activities and public service.

Our mission is to provide students a personalized learning environment to foster meaningful experiences involving the mind, heart, and hands, which:

1. Affirm integrity, the search for truth and respect for all people as the foundation of education;
2. Develop communication, analytic, creative and information gathering skills;
3. Prepare students as informed and responsible citizens and for effective roles in families and other societal organizations;
4. Afford opportunities for success in students' personal and professional lives by providing service and leadership experiences in a residential campus setting;
5. Enhance economic, technological and cultural development of the communities served.

Southern Utah University provides baccalaureate, applied technology, and selected graduate education. We address the unique needs of rural students and communities; serve as a major cultural center for southern Utah; and create partnerships with public and higher education, government, business and industry.

In addition to defining SUU as a comprehensive regional university, the mission statement underscores the values that support and sustain this institution, namely, a lifelong love of learning, academic excellence, and honoring thought. SUU aims to create and maintain a personalized learning environment in a residential campus setting.

SUU’s mission, as adopted by the governing board, appears in appropriate institutional publications, including the catalog. (1.A.2) The mission statement has been widely distributed on- and off-campus. It is posted to the University’s web site and is included in the University’s Catalog and course schedule. Furthermore, departmental responses during the self-study process found acceptance of the University’s mission statement and discussion of it as needed in departmental meetings. Generally, it forms the basis for department and college missions and student learning outcomes.
SUU’s progress in accomplishing the institution’s mission and goals is documented and made public. (1.A.3) Institutional assessment activities demonstrate that University goals are being achieved or, in some cases, are in progress. Results of many of these assessment activities and other studies are posted on the SUU web site: http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/, and reference is made to the following activities and documentation:

**The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**
A national survey of first-year and senior students is administered to a random sample of students enrolled at SUU and at other comparable institutions annually. The survey indicates the extent of student involvement in learning and in the general collegiate experience. SUU’s response rate to the survey has been at or above the national average. See Exhibit 1.3 for further information and findings. The exhibit includes both the NSSE institutional reports and the benchmark reports.

**College Outcomes Survey (COS)**
The COS is a nationally-normed ACT instrument designed to assess the outcomes and effects of college on students. SUU administers the survey to graduating and senior students each Spring semester. ACT compiles the results and issues a report with comparisons to other institutions. See Exhibit 1.4 for further information and findings. The exhibit includes annual reports and studies of graduating seniors.

**Faculty Senate Recruitment and Retention Survey (FSRRS)**
Internally generated and reported, the Faculty Senate conducts an attitudinal survey of faculty to help improve faculty recruitment and retention. It is used to identify faculty concerns. See Exhibit 1.6.

**Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)**
Based at UCLA, CIRP provides specialty research on the effect of college on students and particularly on freshman students. In recent years about 270,000 students nationally have participated in CIRP research. SUU uses CIRP for perceptual studies on entering freshman students. See Exhibit 1.7 for further information and findings.

**Fact Books and Studies**
Each year descriptive information about SUU, its students, faculty, facilities, funding, and resources are published to the campus community and posted to the web. Additionally, institutional studies are issued on special topics such as student retention, diversity, and the library. Some information for this self-study is drawn from SUU institutional research. Exhibit materials for the Introduction include SUU Fact Books. The institutional research web site posts all institutional studies: http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/

At each fall opening meeting of faculty and staff, the President reports on the state of the University and on the status of its goals. See Exhibit 1.8.

**Administrative & Financial Services**

**Goals & Objectives and Accomplishments**
Annually published documents outline the planning, evaluation, and change process that takes place each year. These documents report an assessment process whereby departmental directors and the respective vice president derive mutually agreed upon goals for the unit. In addition, the University relies on managerial reports and plans to guide its operations and affect policy decisions. The reports, available as exhibits, contribute to the strategic management of the University.

**Financial Indicators Report**
Issued annually, this report documents SUU’s financial condition and trends in that condition. It uses ratio analyses as an objective assessment of the University’s financial performance, allowing readers to determine the impact of managerial decisions on its financial health and demonstrating the impact financial decisions can have on operational goals.

**Annual (Internal) Financial Report**
This annual report analyzes the institution’s financial condition, its financial viability, and its
ability to "live within its means". It includes historical information, revenue source breakouts, auxiliary and building activities, debt levels, and other data useful in assessing SUU’s financial position. Exhibit 1.9 contains the documents listed above.

**Campus Master Plan**
A written document updated annually, this facilities plan defines strategy and current capital development and capital improvements requests. A public hearing is held annually on this plan.

**SUU’s goals are determined consistent with the institution’s mission and its resources - human, physical, and financial. (1.A.4)** Shortly after the adoption of the mission statement, campus dialogue, led by the President and Provost, shifted to the vision and future of the University. During the 2000-01 academic year, the Provost formed a committee of faculty to reexamine the mission statement and add a vision statement, goals and measurable objectives. The committee researched mission statements at other institutions and derived goals and objective statements that would measure institutional effectiveness in a systematic, regular manner. See Exhibit 1.10. That work was submitted to the President’s Council, which elected to retain the 1998 mission statement but to augment it with a vision and goals statement. From September to November 2001, the President sought and received input regarding the vision and goals. The Board of Trustees approved the current vision and goals statement on November 29, 2001.

**The Vision and Goals of Southern Utah University**

**Vision:**
Building on hallmarks of a safe, beautiful campus, with a personalized learning environment, SUU strives to be an outstanding public regional teaching university, offering high quality undergraduate, professional and selective graduate programs.

**Strategic University Goals:**
1. To provide exceptional service to students and facilitate excellence in learning and student achievement.
2. To foster superior teaching, scholarly/creative endeavors and public service.
3. To increase enrollment to 9,000 students by 2011, increase student retention and graduation rates, and within the context of our distinct mission, increase student, faculty, administration and staff diversity.
4. To enhance students' personal and professional development as responsible citizens through academic, co-curricular, social, service-learning, residential, cultural and athletic activities.
5. To ensure human, financial and physical resources necessary to fulfill the University's mission.
6. To strengthen SUU's mission and role as the regional university of southern Utah by obtaining selective accreditations, and by enhancing and expanding the programs and services available, including at least five additional master's degree programs by 2011.
7. To encourage effective communication on campus and with external constituencies.

These goals were distributed widely on campus and will guide the University through the next five to ten years.

SUU’s mission and goals give direction to all its educational activities, to its admission policies, selection of faculty, allocation of resources, and to planning. (1.A.5) The mission statement provides the context and focus for SUU educational programs, its admission policies, its selection of faculty, allocation of resources, and for planning. For example, the first goal of SUU is “To provide exceptional service to students and facilitate excellence in learning and student achievement.” The goal reflects a primary interest in educational quality and in responding to students as they learn and grow.

Assessment activities demonstrate that student learning is enhanced through the SUU experience, and documented through results from two assessment instruments (NSSE and ACT COS). SUU has shared this information.
with academic leaders and policy makers, and has implemented a new general education program effective Fall 2002 and initiated a first-year success program for new students beginning Fall 2003. SUU also has strengthened academic requirements for English composition and degree requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree. SUU relies on ACT’s College Outcomes Survey to provide institutional assessment of its goals and of institutional effectiveness. Results of the survey (see again Exhibit 1.5) provide recent evidence that SUU adds value to students and to its graduates.

Multiple types of assessment information examine teaching, scholarly/creative endeavors and public service (see Standard 4, Faculty). Dominant among the assessments are course and instructor evaluations. Some enhanced mechanisms were recently put in place to improve three aspects of faculty involvement: a systematic plan for faculty evaluation, objective salary equity and merit pay plans, and improved incentives for quality teaching and scholarship.

As discussed in the Introduction, COS results suggest that SUU instruction is on par with national peers. The University would like to move higher in that area. Academic departments and individuals compile information on scholarly/creative endeavors and public service, which are used in annual faculty evaluations as well as for tenure and rank advancement decisions. New policies recently adopted by the University require: 1) systematic program reviews to further assess and document faculty quality and performance, and 2) annual reports of the colleges and schools to show faculty and student achievements. These enhancements were adopted in response to the goal, but also as a result of the accreditation self-study process.

Studies within colleges and schools of alumni and former students validate that the first and second goals of the University are being achieved through a continuous process. Exhibit 1.11 documents this conclusion and further information is found in department notebooks in the Exhibits area.

Public service is consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution. (1.A.6) SUU’s public service ties directly to its mission and role as a comprehensive, regional institution. The following service examples validate the connection to mission:

- The Governor’s 21st Century Program for Rural Utah is headquartered at SUU.
- The Utah Rural Development Council, the state arm of a federal program, operates from SUU.
- The University has established an official function, under the Vice-President for University Advancement and Regional Services, which offers programming to southern Utah and reports directly to the President.
- SUU operates a Small Business Development Center for southern Utah.
- SUU hosts and is the fiduciary agent for a six-county Head Start program.
- A Center for Rural Life is housed at SUU.
- Non-credit and credit programs through continuing education are provided to residents of southern Utah.
- The Utah Shakespearean Festival (2000 Tony Award Winner) brings about 130,000 patrons to Cedar City and SUU each year.
- The SUU American Folk Ballet and Braithwaite Art Gallery are additional extensions of art and service to southern Utah.
- Utah Summer Games, an athletic competition for state residents of all ages, is hosted at SUU for two weeks in June.
- SUU’s Center for Economic Education conducts teacher workshops throughout the region.

SUU reviews with the Commission contemplated changes that would alter its mission, autonomy, ownership or locus of control, or its intention to offer a degree at a higher level than is included in its present accreditation, or other changes in accordance with Policy A-2 - Substantive Change, pages 100-105. (1.A.7) Program changes that are substantive are reviewed with
the Commission. Exhibits 1.12 and i.13 (in the Introduction) provide documentation of reviews, focused visit reports, and relevant correspondence from the Commission.

**Appraisal**

Adoption in May 2003 of Regents Policy R-312 changed SUU’s general role and mission in the USHE. SUU is required to develop a more specific mission statement for regental approval. In the process of mission development with statements of vision and goals, SUU will fully develop an integrated, revised strategic plan (academic, physical, technology, and financial), and include broad campus input and discussion, environmental analysis, and measurable objectives. The current strategic plan, a solid basis for revision under R-312, was approved by the Board of Trustees and has served SUU well.

A succeeding step will be to make explicit connections of unit missions and goals to the institutional mission and goals will be incorporated. Then, regular consideration of the University mission and goals will be integrated into the ongoing institutional planning cycle. The current Strategic Plan, as approved by the Board of Trustees, starts this process; the revised plan will extend it.

**Planning and Effectiveness - Standard 1.B**

The institution clearly defines its evaluation and planning processes. It develops and implements procedures to evaluate the extent to which it achieves institutional goals. (1.B.1)

The institution engages in systematic planning for, and evaluation of, its activities, including teaching, research, and public service consistent with institutional mission and goals. (1.B.2)

The planning process is participatory involving constituencies appropriate to the institution such as board members, administrators, faculty, staff, students, and other interested parties. (1.B.3)

In August 2002, a new provost directed that a strategic plan be crafted using existing documents and processes. A plan was prepared in early September that included assessment activities and offices of responsibility. The document was then circulated on campus for comment. The plan was specifically prepared as a result of the self-study process. The Strategic Plan identified measurable objectives for each goal, as well as assessment activities to gauge success or failure, and a timeline for revision. It was approved by the SUU Board of Trustees on October 17, 2002. Exhibit 1.13 is the current planning document.

The Strategic Plan documents a planning, assessment, and improvement process in progress. Attached to each goal are measurable objectives and assessment activities. Assessment results are shared with University officers who can use the results to influence resource allocations and to improve instructional programs, institutional services, and activities. The President’s Council sets priorities for improvement and initiates action. Complementing the Strategic Plan (and the elements of teaching, research, and service) are departmental assessment plans and reports, documentation of an annual cycle of unit assessment planning (Fall semester) and reporting (after Spring semester).

In November 2002, the University Assessment Committee was restructured with broad campus representation and a charge to monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Furthermore, this committee serves as a resource for institutional effectiveness and assessment, and provides an annual report to the President’s Council on the status of each assessment activity, objective, and goal. The committee began its work in January 2003. The committee tracks progress on the Strategic Plan through an interactive web document with links from each indicator to the appropriate assessment activity or report. Standard 2 provides more information.
Assessment and Effectiveness

More and more, results of assessment and institutional research are being used and integrated into a pattern of continuous improvement. For example, Goal Three from the Strategic Plan is: “To increase enrollment to 9,000 students by 2011, increase student retention and graduation rates, and within the context of our distinct mission, increase student, faculty, administration, and staff diversity.” This complex goal reflects the institution’s desire to grow, better retain freshman students, graduate more “native” students, and increase diversity among student, faculty, administration and staff populations.

Attaining the enrollment goal will require a concerted campus-wide effort. The projected average annual enrollment increase dropped a tenth of a percent from 2000 to 2001 (to 2.7%) and three-tenths of a percent from 2001 to 2002 (2.4%). The Board of Regents projects an SUU fall headcount enrollment of 7,870 in 2011. First-year retention rates have increased two percentage points since 1993 (56% to 58%) and graduation rates for the six-year cohort (1996) have remained level at 32%.

SUU has increased diversity in terms of students and faculty/staff. Minority students increased from 4.8% of all students in 1993 to 7.4% in 2001 and 6.5% in 2002. The female student population has remained steady at 56%. Non-resident students grew slightly from 7.4% of all students in 1993 to 8.9% in 2002. The university hired two female minority counselors, and the percentage of minority faculty members has tripled from 2.0% in 1993-94 to 6.3% in 2002-03. Similarly, the percentage of female faculty members has grown from 24.0% to 29.3%. We now have two female deans and a female vice-president. Table 1.1 compares employee diversity in 1993 and 2002. Research and assessment results indicate some improvement toward Goal Three, but efforts to diversify the campus remain a priority of SUU.

Table 1.1
Employee Diversity Comparison
1993 and 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1993-94</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS Reports

As another example, Goal Four of SUU is: “To enhance students' personal and professional development as responsible citizens through academic, co-curricular, social, service-learning, residential, cultural and athletic activities.” Results from NSSE, as detailed in Exhibit 1.3, found that both first-year and senior students were involved in academic, intellectual and social experiences, in and out of the classroom, at a rate near or slightly higher than similar students at peer institutions. Selected indicators of personal and educational growth are provided in Table 1.2. SUU students are slightly lower in some key areas.

Table 1.2
Selected NSSE Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td>3.01 1st Yr.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.81 Senior</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly &amp; effectively</td>
<td>2.80 1st Yr.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.74 Senior</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically &amp; analytically</td>
<td>2.95 1st Yr.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.19 Senior</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td>2.93 1st Yr.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.06 Senior</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding yourself</td>
<td>2.93 1st Yr.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87 Senior</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of your community</td>
<td>2.14 1st Yr.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.21 Senior</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSSE Means Summary Report
In response, SUU has initiated improvements in general education and developed specific learning objectives for written and verbal communication and for thinking critically and analytically.

Goal Five of SUU is: “To ensure human, financial and physical resources necessary to fulfill the University's mission.” This goal remains elusive and problematic, as research data indicate and are developed further in Standard 7. This is a problem faced by all public institutions of higher education in the state of Utah due to unique demographic characteristics of large families and historical sensitivity to tuition rates. Recent budget cuts (FY 2002-03) prompted by shortfalls in tax revenues have further exacerbated the problem.

Academic programs are responsible for roughly two-thirds of the total institutional budget. Because of fiscal limitations, academic units generally work very hard to stretch the human and financial resources as far as possible. Department self-studies recognize the limitations of the University’s budget, particularly in FY 2002 and FY 2003. Some respondents observed that resources were “barely above marginal.” There were also comments regarding equity in distributing resources. In dealing with the state mandated budget cuts, an attempt was made to develop a “rational” distribution model for the allocation of current expense, travel, and capital funds, which was adopted for fiscal year 2002-03. That effort corrected some inequities, but left some program-unique needs largely unmet.

Efforts are underway to develop a better model for allocating academic resources to satisfy strategic and program-unique needs as well. A prioritization effort (between 1999 and 2001) eliminated nearly 25 programs, but did not result in significant cost savings. SUU will strive to achieve economies through better management of faculty loads and preparations, as well as better course scheduling aimed at meeting student needs while still achieving economies of scale in section sizes.

Within administrative and financial services (AFS), there remains a strong budgeting focus with each fiscal cycle. Critical needs are identified and funds are shifted to meet those needs. Within the framework of an overarching fiscal environment that limits available resources to marginally adequate levels, the AFS units have worked well together in addressing unit financial demands. Further, AFS directors have made a concerted effort to leverage the use of technology in meeting service demands without budget increases. This effort has enabled AFS to eliminate numerous staff positions without negatively impacting services rendered.

To further address the resource goal, SUU has 1) lobbied in annual budget presentations (Exhibit 1.14) to improve its financial position; 2) raised tuition; and 3) completed a recent capital campaign for scholarships, capital projects, and long-term investment in the University. As with nearly every institution, achieving the goal of resource adequacy remains a challenge. SUU uses the results of its systematic evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve its instructional programs, institutional services, and activities. (1.B.4) Ongoing reviews, assessment, and evaluation of the University from the self-study process itself have suggested some areas for improvement. An institutional process is in place linking mission, vision, goals, objectives and assessment. As noted, SUU established an Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee with broad campus representation to monitor the Strategic Plan. Clearly, the Strategic Plan with its specific mission and goals of the University provides a framework and general direction to its educational activities. For example, the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) used the mission extensively in revising the general education curriculum.

SUU both initiates plans and reacts to the changing conditions it faces. Planning initiatives include undertaking a capital campaign, adding new programs, and focusing on key strategic institutional initiatives such as
marketing, recruitment, and retention. External conditions in SUU’s environment likewise stimulate action, be it budget reductions imposed for fiscal year 2001-02 or 2002-03, accreditation findings, or new competitive programs at other Utah institutions. In 2002, SUU introduced a formula for resource allocation based on objective criteria and strategic priorities. The formula was expanded and made more comprehensive in 2003. Funding for academic advisors in each college and a student success program were the product of assessment findings related to student retention.

SUU has also used interim and general accreditation review findings to focus some of its planning and resource allocation. With the establishment of a separate institutional research and assessment office nearly four years ago, SUU now utilizes results of surveys, reviews, and data analysis as a systematic input into the university planning process. Budget priorities address institutional goals.

When available, resources are applied to top institutional priorities such as improved salaries for faculty and staff, starting new academic programs or reallocating funds to address critical student retention/recruitment and institutional marketing initiatives. Regrettably, in a state where funding availability is at best decent, and where enrollment growth is often dramatic, the ability of the University to obtain major blocs of new resources is quite limited. This limitation of financial resources makes planning and funding for some institutional needs more problematic.

SUU integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify institutional priorities for improvement. (1.B.5) SUU has assessment processes in place to evaluate student perceptions, student engagement in learning, success in achieving learning outcomes in many disciplines, and general institutional effectiveness. SUU has recently articulated measurable institutional objectives to connect its assessment activities to its goals. See Exhibit 1.15 for summaries of assessment activities and uses of results.

To assist in gauging institutional effectiveness, the Institutional Research office prepares and updates two documents: an institutional performance “dashboard” of key measures and trends, and an analysis of comparative data, benchmarking SUU to its peer institutions. See Exhibit 1.16 for copies of these documents and peer listings. Each Utah institution has a set of peer institutions selected and approved by the Board of Regents for compensation and other studies. In addition, SUU uses a set of additional peer institutions (initially developed by NACUBO and supplemented over the years) for internal benchmarking studies. Key Performance Indicators are being identified at the unit, college and institutional levels for additional benchmarking and as a measure of performance.

Until 1999, academic program reviews were prepared according to criteria and standards of the Utah Board of Regents. The Regents dropped that policy, delegating program reviews to the Board of Trustees at individual institutions. SUU, however, engaged in a process of academic prioritization from 1999 through 2001. See Exhibits i.6 and i.7 from the Introduction and Exhibit 1.17. Essentially, this process was a comprehensive review of all of SUU’s 134 academic programs. In 2002-03, the University adopted a policy for systematic program review using many of the standards and criteria from the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Once approved by the Board of Trustees, the review cycle will begin in 2003-04. The Board of Regents, coming full circle, has adopted a new policy to re-establish academic program reviews as part of its curriculum analysis process. In turn, SUU has responded with a policy containing explicit review criteria, a specific process and review cycle. To begin in 2004, this process will require documentation and a feedback loop for program assessment.

SUU provides the necessary resources for effective evaluation and planning processes. (1.B.6) Assessment began in the mid-1990s at SUU, but was not ongoing and systematic until 1999 when institutional research and assessment were localized in the office of the Associate
Provost. As a result of that organizational change, a University Assessment Committee was formed with student, faculty, and staff representation in an advisory role. Formal, regular assessment activities were implemented to the extent resources ($19,000 in FY 2002-03) allowed. Workshops for faculty and staff were common during the 2001-02 academic year as an initial step in changing the campus culture toward assessment. At the same time, the State of Utah became an NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) state. NCATE standards, combined with AACSB standards in business, have helped the campus to articulate student learning outcomes, implement assessment activities (e.g., portfolios, surveys, focus groups), and develop ways to use assessment findings as never before.

The institution's research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning. (1.B.7) Assessment, cited in 1998 as an accrediting recommendation, has had and is having an extensive impact on the campus. Exhibit 1.18 provides evidence of institutional studies. These and other exhibit materials document and summarize current assessment activities at the University and their frequency. Nearly all results are posted to the University’s web site.

In addition to surveys for the accreditation self-study process, departments were asked to provide summary information on articulated mission statements, learning objectives, and assessment activities at the unit level. The results, summarized in departmental binders and other exhibit materials, indicate that a culture of assessment is growing at SUU, a credit to faculty and staff. Many of the departments provided examples of how assessment results were used to improve learning, curricula, pedagogy, and student assessment activities. Departments report these results each spring in formal Assessment Reports that are posted on the SUU web site. Examples of the results are also described in Exhibit 1.19.

SUU systematically reviews its institutional research efforts, its evaluation processes, and its planning activities to document their effectiveness. (1.B.8) SUU has institutional research and assessment processes in place, and more importantly, assessment is a growing activity of the University and its academic departments. The current Strategic Plan calls for a regular revision of the strategic plan and a re-examination of goals, objectives, and assessment activities. This will be an important step in ongoing planning and evaluation of the University.

SUU uses information from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate evidence of institutional effectiveness to its publics. (1.B.9) Faculty surveys and some anecdotal input found that campus communication was sometimes a challenge. The administration has addressed this goal in recent years through a series of measures:

- Presidential e-mails to the campus community several times a month.
- Monthly meetings of the President’s advisory council, include leaders from the Faculty Senate, Staff Association, and Student Executive Council.
- Regular campus e-mail bulletins and the “T-Bird Talk” (electronic and paper).
- Faculty lunches with the Provost.
- One-on-one meetings between the faculty and the Provost and the faculty and the President.
- Improved meetings with deans and department chairs, and regular visits from the Provost to departments and to colleges/schools.
- Forums and faculty meetings with the Provost.
- Promotion of campus visits by politicians, governing board members, and agency personnel.
- Web pages have been updated throughout the university with ongoing improvement efforts underway.
- The SUU intranet as well as conversion to the SCT Banner software will greatly increase the ability to communicate and share information across the campus.
Significantly, SUU has engaged the services of a marketing consultant to assist with external and internal communications and marketing. The intention is to improve the marketing message, focus on SUU’s strengths for enrollment management, and to enhance public perceptions of SUU’s role and mission. The challenge to communicate regularly and in a timely way continues. Progress has been made during the past few years by utilizing all of the above mechanisms and through periodic surveys of faculty and staff.

**Appraisal**

SUU is a campus of uncommon beauty and unique potential. Faculty and staff are committed to its role and mission, and students receive quality learning experiences. The self-study process has prompted mechanisms for planning, assessment, institutional research, and institutional effectiveness that have demonstrated promise. Within its resource constraints, SUU is committed to improving its programs and services to the citizens of Utah.

A strategic plan (an integrated approach to planning), campus-wide assessment (an institutional commitment for continuous improvement), and application of evaluation and institutional research findings are in place, but their tardiness has delayed results. Campus communication and leadership will be taxed as these repetitive processes begin again. Attention to faculty and staff morale will challenge SUU.

**Recommendations**

The self-study process revealed many areas of strength and also some areas of inconsistency and challenge in this standard, prompting the following recommendations:

- Align SUU with Regents’ Policy R-312 and engage in more proactive, longer-term planning.
- Publicize the outcome of planning processes by regular reporting to University constituencies.
- Continue to provide training for faculty in the uses and structure of assessment at the unit level, particularly through the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee.
- Publicize the results of current assessment activities that showcase students, faculty, and the institution.
- Implement program reviews as planned, starting with a new policy on academic program reviews adopted by the Board of Trustees with a cycle to begin in 2003-04.
- Link planning, goals, and objectives, assessment activities, and resource allocation in decision making and as a measure of the University’s continuous improvement.
- Conduct niche (selected programs) and general program marketing to aid student recruitment and retention efforts.
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STANDARD 2

Educational Program and its Effectiveness
STANDARD TWO: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS

SUU’s role and mission in the USHE is that of a comprehensive, public, masters-degree institution (formally, a Carnegie Masters II University). The University awards certificates, associate of applied science, bachelors, and masters degrees with a commitment for high quality and for engaging educational experiences.

Briefly, since its founding in 1897 as a branch campus of the University of Utah, SUU has grown from a normal school to its present role as a comprehensive, regional university. Since 1965, SUU has awarded baccalaureate degrees. SUU presently delivers its programs through six colleges and schools, plus a School of Continuing and Professional Studies. See annual Fact Books in the exhibit area for organizational charts and for demographic and other student information. Educational programs are collaboratively supported by divisions of Administrative and Financial Services, Student Services, and affiliates such as the Utah Shakespearean Festival, the American Folk Ballet, crime lab, and the Mountain Science Center. SUU’s regional role is highlighted by offices that focus on rural development and advancement, which are partially funded by the state.

General Requirements – 2.A

SUU offers collegiate level programs that culminate in identified student competencies and lead to certificates or degrees in recognized fields of study. (2.A) Programs of the University provide high quality undergraduate and graduate education in the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, applied disciplines, and selected professional fields. Most programs are delivered from SUU’s main campus in Cedar City, but also from sites in Richfield and St. George. Through distance education technologies, selected courses and program offerings have expanded worldwide.

Exhibit 2.1 summarizes SUU’s approved academic programs, including four master’s degrees, 56 bachelors degrees (with emphases), and 21 associate degrees. SUU also collaborates with Weber State University for Associate of Science in Nursing and Bachelor of Science in Nursing degrees and with the University of Utah for a Master's of Social Work degree.

Table 2.1 offers a five-year profile of SUU from an accountability perspective: Section 1 summarizes resources, Section 2 shows how resources were used, and Section 3 documents outcomes.
Table 2.1

**SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY**

**ACADEMIC PROFILE, 1998-99 to 2002-03**

### SECTION 1--WHAT RESOURCES HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 1998-99</th>
<th>FY 1999-00</th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
<th>FY 2002-03</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Instruction (Total)</td>
<td>$16,900,080</td>
<td>$18,339,078</td>
<td>$18,505,186</td>
<td>$17,339,368</td>
<td>$17,020,373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Research</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Academic Support</td>
<td>$4,495,939</td>
<td>$4,276,647</td>
<td>$4,356,304</td>
<td>$2,995,770</td>
<td>$2,100,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$21,396,019</td>
<td>$22,615,725</td>
<td>$22,861,490</td>
<td>$20,335,138</td>
<td>$19,120,593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant & Contract Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,074,201</td>
<td>$10,909,291</td>
<td>$12,092,742</td>
<td>$12,359,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2--HOW WERE THESE RESOURCES USED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-appropriated</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCH Instruction**

| SUU Total instructed by full-time faculty | 76.4% | 75.2% | 77.0% | 77.4% |
| USHE Total instructed by full-time faculty | 57.6% | 57.6% | 58.3% | 56.5% |
SECTION 3--WHAT WERE THE OUTCOMES DURING THE LAST ACADEMIC YEAR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduating Student Satisfaction (COS 2002)</th>
<th>National Norm Ave.</th>
<th>Faculty Satisfaction (2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5 to 1 scale with 5 = very satisfied)</td>
<td>SUU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my accomplishments</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU helped me achieve the goals I set</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of program of instruction</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU in general</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Course Evaluation (Fall/Spring Averages) (percentage scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall demonstration of effective teaching</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to affect SUU decisions</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time to Degree (Biennial Report to the Legislature, 2000-01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree &amp; Status</th>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Graduation Efficiency</th>
<th>Ave. Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99-00 00-01</td>
<td>99-00 00-01</td>
<td>99-00 00-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than baccalaureate</td>
<td>121.3 108.0</td>
<td>1.8 1.6</td>
<td>8.1 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USHE average</td>
<td>94.3 93.8</td>
<td>1.6 1.6</td>
<td>6.3 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degrees</td>
<td>143.2 144.5</td>
<td>1.2 1.2</td>
<td>9.5 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USHE average</td>
<td>136.6 138.0</td>
<td>1.1 1.2</td>
<td>9.1 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degrees</td>
<td>154.4 148.9</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>10.3 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USHE average</td>
<td>145.2 144.9</td>
<td>1.2 1.2</td>
<td>9.7 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>151.4 147.7</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>10.1 9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated July 2003
Adapted from the University of Washington

All approved programs and their associated courses are listed in SUU’s Catalog. Program productivity and performance are annually tracked, recorded and published in SUU’s annual Fact Book(s). See Exhibit i.1.

Tables 2.2 through 2.5 summarize departmental FTE enrollments, student credit hours, degrees awarded, and faculty FTE for the past five years as an indicator of activity.
## Table 2.2
FTE Enrollment by Department
Fall 1998 to Fall 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Info Systems</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang. &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing &amp; Other General Education</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,839</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>4,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SUU Data Warehouse*
## Table 2.3

**Student Credit Hours**

**1998-99 to 2002-03 Academic Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Info Systems</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>5,582</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>4,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>12,173</td>
<td>13,291</td>
<td>13,629</td>
<td>13,766</td>
<td>11,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>7,391</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>8,375</td>
<td>8,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>3,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>6,773</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>7,462</td>
<td>7,397</td>
<td>7,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9,961</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>11,316</td>
<td>11,314</td>
<td>8,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>4,407</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>5,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td>7,798</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>7,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang. &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>5,863</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>6,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>4,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>12,206</td>
<td>12,092</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>12,571</td>
<td>12,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,853</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>6,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>9,602</td>
<td>8,849</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>7,899</td>
<td>8,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>6,212</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>6,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>11,783</td>
<td>11,890</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>17,242</td>
<td>15,553</td>
<td>16,411</td>
<td>18,748</td>
<td>17,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>7,388</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>5,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing &amp; Other General Education</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>5,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144,581</td>
<td>148,748</td>
<td>149,067</td>
<td>152,348</td>
<td>144,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SUU Data Warehouse*
Table 2.4
Bachelor’s Degrees
1998-99 to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Info Systems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang. &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi/Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SUU Data Warehouse
Table 2.5  
Faculty  
FY 1999 to FY 2003*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Info Systems</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lang. &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing &amp; Other Education</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217.4</td>
<td>230.2</td>
<td>232.1</td>
<td>231.4</td>
<td>203.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some changes in faculty counts are due to definition and organizational changes.

Source: SUU Data Warehouse
Program Changes and Redefinition for Quality

Exhibit 2.2 provides a list of programs added or eliminated since 1993. The recent erosion of institutional budgets through a series of mandated cuts have affected SUU’s educational programs. The prioritization process was intended to establish both criteria and processes to better align SUU’s mission, resources, and programs. As fiscal crises impacted SUU (and all institutions and agencies in the state of Utah), program redefinition and change became more real and extensive. Table 2.6 summarizes recent budget reductions at SUU.

Table 2.6
Recent Budget Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SUU Total</th>
<th>Academics Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002-03</td>
<td>$1,071,722</td>
<td>$664,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>$735,258</td>
<td>$342,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>$557,400</td>
<td>$340,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SUU Budget Office

During the past decade, a number of changes were made to SUU’s educational programs, a process accelerated by the institutional self-study process. Some of the most significant changes are outlined below:

- Responsibility for the curriculum was (re)assigned to faculty through new committee structures and assignments.
- The general education program was overhauled with a revised rationale, structure, assessments, and articulation with transfer campuses.
- In 2002, the Board of Regents reduced the number of credits needed for a bachelor’s degree to a range of 120 to 126 semester hours, and SUU worked toward meeting the new standard.
- Graduate degrees (MFA and MBA) were authorized and funded (and the respective substantive change processes were completed with NASC).
- An Army ROTC program was initiated in 1999.
- Academic policies have been systematically reviewed, revised, or created, as needed, including policies on course syllabi, course preparations, credit loads for students, transfer credits, curriculum development and revision, grading, course fees, administrative personnel returning to teaching, and faculty workload.
- Numerous policies are under review through joint efforts of the Administration and Faculty Senate, including those for academic program review, internships, faculty evaluation, faculty appointments and contracts, graduate policies, academic rank, and faculty leaves.
- New undergraduate degrees were added or deleted (as summarized in exhibit materials).
- Distance education was revitalized through new policy, expanded course offerings, and an external review of distance education and continuing education.
- Assessment was integrated into the education program through 1) systematic planning and reporting requirements for each academic unit; 2) required learning outcomes for each degree program; 3) creation of a standing committee on institutional effectiveness and assessment to be a resource and a reporting body; 4) revitalizing institutional research and uses of research data; 5) linkages of institutional mission to college and department missions and outcomes.

Additional changes occurred in individual colleges, schools, and departments and are reported below and in exhibit materials for each unit.

SUU demonstrates its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning by providing sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its educational programs and to facilitate student achievement of program
objectives whenever and however they are offered. (2.A.1) Resource adequacy has been a challenge for SUU, as described in Standard 7. Although the tax fund base budget for the university has increased from $19,286,00 in 1997-98 to $25,634,000 in 2003-04, resources remain limited. Through its comprehensive fiscal plan and its strategic plan, SUU continues to align its resources to the educational program.

A number of initiatives and tools have helped that process from an academic program perspective:

- In 2001-02, the Board of Regents introduced a budget request approach that is not entirely based on enrollment growth. Program maintenance and support is included in the model. See Exhibit 2.3.
- Beginning with FY 2003, an internal budget formula was introduced to academic units that emphasized productivity and performance. With FY 2004, a more comprehensive formula, driven by SCH’s, will be implemented. See Exhibit 2.4.
- Complementing the budget formula, the Provost’s Office prepared a “break-even” analysis for each department, establishing an optimum class size that is expected, funded in the formula, and tracked and reported each semester.
- A five-year departmental activity report is annually prepared and distributed to the deans. See Exhibit 2.5 for a sample. Departmental binders in the exhibit area have individual reports.
- Budget reductions have compelled SUU toward strategic choices, first as “horizontal” cuts were made in 2002 and second, as “vertical” program cuts were made in 2003. See Exhibit 2.6.

If the State continues to use a funding model based solely on enrollment growth, the above initiatives and tools will not be sufficient by themselves to preserve program quality. In effect, the university would face an almost impossible task to maintain current quality of programs. Recent experience may be instructive and is detailed in Standard 7.

Since the university's last accreditation, the legislature authorized Dixie State College to offer a limited number of four-year programs. Dixie College is located 50 miles south of Cedar City in St. George. This decision impacted resource distribution for the entire state, but particularly for SUU. Blurred roles and missions of recent years have also led to duplicative programs and competition. Also in the general environment of higher education, the mission and role change at BYU-Idaho has had an impact on SUU, as has the rapid expansion of four-year programs at Utah Valley State College in Orem.

Table 2.7 examines human resource (i.e., faculty) sufficiency. The summary is based on an academic budget formula that reflects the number of FTE faculty needed each semester to deliver the curriculum. Current data in the SUU Fact Book and in exhibit materials summarizes faculty and staff counts. Of the tenured faculty, 70% have the highest terminal degree in their field of study. The current student-faculty ratio, as reported in the Common Data Set, is 21.3 to 1. See Exhibit 2.7 for copies of Common Data Sets. As a general trend, through a combination of actual increases and data definition changes, both faculty and staff numbers have increased in the last three years.

Other imbalances facing the university are the discrepancies in both salary level and rank distribution between men and women, as detailed in Standard 4. While SUU faculty salaries are 21% below the national average, they range from 5%-11% below the averages at other four-year Utah higher education institutions. As noted earlier, prior to the recent economic downturn, average salary increases among SUU faculty and staff were 5.75% and 7.5% in 2000-01 and 2001-02, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>Amounts from Model</th>
<th>Formula Average</th>
<th>Contract FTE</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Staffed</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Net FTE</td>
<td>Spring Net FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECI</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST NET</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIS</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Acc.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFN</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMK</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILS</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU NET</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELED</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED NET</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLHU</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS NET</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVA NET</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR &amp; PHSC</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGIE, GEOG,</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC NET</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "Delta" column represents how many faculty a department needs.

The table compares what the academic budget formula says each department needs to cover the SCH it generated in the last two years and the actual budgeted FTE faculty positions. These figures suggest, for example, that the Social Sciences department is short faculty. (Note that national and specialized accreditation standards may differ and are not reflected in these figures.) The formula also addresses the adequacy of clerical support and actual professional staff, both of which were concluded to be sufficient if not equitably deployed.

Physical resources through which SUU offers its education programs are extensive, well-maintained, and generally excellent. The main campus in the center of Cedar City plus valley farm acreage, mountain property, an observatory, an archaeology site, and other property all contribute to the mission of SUU.

Standard 8 more fully addresses facilities and equipment, but the connection between high-quality facilities and academic programs must be noted:

- There are 75 buildings on the main campus with 66 schedulable classrooms used for instruction.
- The Gerald R. Sherratt Library (completed in 1996) has over 209,759 bound volumes and over 10,000 serials in various formats.
- Dedicated in 1997, the Sharwan Smith Student Center serves as a major campus facility for student services and activities, and includes a large bookstore, cafeteria, and conference facilities.
- In 1998, SUU purchased sixteen acres on the north side of campus from the Iron County School District. This land provides substantial expansion space for future building needs as well as the site for the Sorenson physical education complex and a planned teacher education building.
- The old library, renamed the Electronic Learning Center, was renovated to house open computing labs, five departmental computing labs, EdNET studios and equipment.
- SUU is building a new residence hall and replaced South Hall with a new building to house the College of Performing and Visual Arts in 2003.
- During the past two years, SUU has mediated many classrooms on campus, leading to 24 departmental computer laboratories and 65 media-equipped rooms.
- To reduce costs and improve communication, SUU has emphasized computerization and disseminates much information through its web resources and the email network.
SUU’s administration, other USHE administrators, and members of the Board of Regents have attempted to educate the current state legislature on the extreme financial exigencies facing higher education. In addition, SUU conducted a successful capital campaign (described in Standard 7) and raised undergraduate resident tuition more than 23% for 2003-2004. With the current state and national economic climate, the primary responsibility of providing adequate additional resource support may rest on legislators, donors, and alumni.

The goals of SUU’s education programs, whenever and however offered, including instruction policies, methods, and delivery systems are compatible with the institution’s mission. They are developed, approved and periodically evaluated under established institutional policies and procedures through a clearly defined process. (2.A.2) The mission of SUU is detailed in Standard 1. In 1998 each unit prepared a mission statement. Along with the mission statement, departments also established goals. The specific mission statements and goals have been published in the Catalog each year since that time. Each mission statement is linked to objectives and, in most cases, to learning outcomes. During the self-study process, departments also were required to compare unit goals statements to SUU’s mission statement. See notebooks in the exhibit area for assessment plans for each department.

Program and curricular development is governed by SUU Policy 6.8. All curricular changes must go through the school or college curriculum committee and the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Among other things, this process is to assure adherence to the institutional mission of the university. Ten criteria for assessing proposed curricular development and revision are illustrated in Exhibit 2.8. As a result of several changes in the past two years, faculty members have a clear, more specific role in curriculum at the institutional level. All courses that earn credit toward graduation are the purview of the faculty. In addition to these internal reviews, proposals for new programs, majors, and minors must also go through the Board of Trustees, the council of chief academic officers, and the Board of Regents. Each level of external review and action considers the same criteria set. All courses and programs are expected to have “clearly articulated assessment activities embedded” in courses and materials, including syllabi.

SUU adopted a policy on course syllabi, Policy 6.36, that compels all faculty to follow guidelines and a template. Included in this template is a listing of “course objectives/learning outcomes: measurable objectives of the course.” These syllabi are kept on file centrally and available for inspection by the various deans, department heads, and curricular committees. Syllabi are reviewed to determine whether particular classes meet the goals and objectives of the institution and various sub-units.

In follow-up to work done by SUU’s Assessment Committee, SUU implemented its assessment program (see SUU’s Institutional Research and Assessment web site and Standard 2.B). Each unit is to provide annual assessment plans at the first of each academic year, followed at the end of each academic year with an assessment report. Each unit’s plans and reports are accessible through the web site. This process encourages university-wide understanding of the institutional mission and each unit is expected to support that mission. See Standard 2.B and departmental binders for additional information on assessment.

For example, among the stated goals of SUU is the need to help students develop communication, analytical, creative, and information gathering skills, and to form partnerships with business. The School of Business developed an assessment plan that includes periodic employer surveys to determine how SUU prepares its business students, and survey results are shared with business faculty to make curricular changes and instructional improvements. This process provides an
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Assessment mechanism to determine program coherence and learning effectiveness.

As an integral part of the self-study process, unit administrators were asked to attend workshops for instruction on outcomes assessment. Individualized workshops were also provided by members of the university’s Assessment Committee. Over time, assessment plans and reports have demonstrated significant improvement, although not all departments and units have moved forward at the same speed or with the same level of understanding.

Degree and certificate programs demonstrate a coherent design; are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, synthesis of learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes; and require the use of library and other information sources. (2.A.3) In general, the accreditation self-study templates affirm compliance with this standard. In 2003, guidelines for this standard from both the Regents and the University curriculum committee have become more explicit. Regents Policy R-401 specifies that bachelors degree programs will have 120-126 semester hours. SUU’s new curriculum policy (Policy 6.8) states that majors, minors, composite majors have a coherent, uniform design.

As a result of the self-study process, the administration and faculty realized that advisement needed revision. Improvements in advising have resulted in 1) recommended curricula for new freshmen, including general education, major, minor and electives on prepared worksheets; 2) curricular sequencing examples in the Catalog for most departments; and 3) advising worksheets for each college/school and for undecided majors.

External events over the past decade have also spurred attention to and improvements in curricular design. Four major events have impelled significant university-wide assessment of programs and curricula, and are briefly highlighted below.

First, when the university converted to the semester system from the quarter system in 1997-1998, units were required to evaluate their degree programs, course offerings, sequencing of classes, consolidations of overlapping classes, and other issues. SUU’s administration imposed strict credit-hour constraints to avoid “program creep” in the conversion process. Most programs examined catalogs from comparable institutions to see how their offerings were designed and sequenced. Many programs were externally reviewed.

The massive transition to a semester system was completed without reductions in faculty workload or additional remuneration to faculty and staff. Because the Board of Regents limited the required units for graduation, the Provost and supporting committees obligated departments to reduce by one-third the total number of courses they offered. All retained courses were redesigned, and most departments used semester conversion to strengthen the learning objectives in their courses and programs.

A second large-scale experience that shaped SUU’s educational program began with a campus-wide prioritization process in the 1999-2000 school year. Every unit was required to evaluate its functions and responsibilities. Exhibits associated with Standard 1 explain the criteria and consequences of prioritization. As a result of prioritization, 25 programs were deleted or revised.

A third factor that prodded SUU to examine its programs relate to significant changes in the NASC, particularly those issued in 1999. Like all other accredited institutions in the region, SUU reviewed and, when necessary, changed policies and procedures to conform to NASC standards. Indeed, the self-study process has been invaluable in promoting much-needed internal examinations of the educational program in all of its elements. The Introduction to this self-study report develops these changes further.
A fourth and final issue relates to SUU’s major revision of its general education curriculum in the 2000-2001 academic year. Each academic unit was required to demonstrate how its classes fit into the general education program. The General Education Curriculum Committee developed criteria for the review and acceptance of every course into the revamped program. The process and criteria applied both to existing general education classes and to new courses. See Standard 2.C for more details.

SUU has adopted a goal of seeking specialized accreditation where that accreditation is available. Such accrediting agencies require evidence that the various degree programs are coherently designed, require appropriate depth and sequencing of coverage, are adequately staffed, and meet other criteria. Copies of the supporting documentation required in these specialized accrediting processes are available in Exhibit 2.9.

To assess and evaluate the achievement of desired learning outcomes, various units on campus require their students to take national tests. For example, the School of Business administers the ETS Business Field Exam each term in its capstone class, Strategic Management (MGMT 4950). The School of Business has set a goal that its students, on average, rank in the top 25% in the nation in accounting, business law, economics, finance, management, and marketing. It has consistently exceeded that goal.

In line with SUU policy, faculty are expected to systematically review curriculum on the department level and on an annual basis (Policy 6.8). A solid example is found among faculty in the Accounting Department in the School of Business who collectively agreed on goals for the unit. During the 2001-2002 school year, each faculty member was asked to explain how the classes he or she teaches achieved departmental objectives. Then, through exit interviews with graduating students, the department evaluated students’ perceptions and compared these with faculty perceptions. A final example of compliance with this standard is seen in the Course Syllabus Policy put in place in Fall 2002.

SUU uses degree designators consistent with program content. In each field of study of technical program, degree objectives are clearly defined: the content to be covered, the intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry to be acquired; and, if applicable, the specific career-preparation competencies to be mastered. (2.A.4) SUU uses degree designators consistent with program content and is approved by the state to offer master’s, bachelor’s of arts, science and interdisciplinary studies, associate’s of applied science, and certificate programs. SUU does not offer the doctoral degree. The Catalog outlines the credit hours for each degree. All bachelor’s programs require 37 units of general education, and completion of a minimal 36 credit major and minimal 18 credits for a minor. BA degrees require 16 hours of language instruction. BS degrees require completion of 12 credit hours in mathematics or laboratory science that emphasize scientific inquiry through experimental, analytical, or statistical methods.

Further, bachelor’s degree candidates must complete a minimum of 40 credit hours of upper division coursework at accredited senior colleges and at least 50 percent of the credit hours required for the major must be completed at SUU. National accreditation entities require consistency in degree designators with program content.

An associate degree in pre-engineering requires completion of 65 credit hours and 10 credits of general education. An associate of applied science degree requires 64 credit hours and a completion of 18 credit hours in general education. Teacher licensure in secondary education requires 29 semester credit hours in pedagogy courses.

The objectives for each program are defined in the Catalog along with the program requirements. Annual assessment plans tie program objectives to learning outcomes and assessment measures. The course syllabi
explain the specific intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry. In the technology and professional areas such as business and education, specific career-preparation competencies are detailed.

Advisory boards are established in each college or school as a source to review programs and curricula and keep programs relevant for careers and for graduate education. Many units, when completing program review, request an audit by an outside specialist in the field. For example, Craft Committee Advisors in Applied Technology recommend that one-third of instruction time be spent in the classroom and two-thirds on practical, hands-on lab experiences. In Art, the ceramics, sculpture and 3-D curriculum have had external reviews by Brigham Young University, University of Utah, Kansas State University, University of Florida, Dartmouth, and Emporia State University, to name a few. When developing a new emphasis in actuary math, the department consulted with experts at the University of California, Santa Barbara and Brigham Young University. Further external review occurs, of course, through specialized accreditation processes and pre-candidacy reviews.

The institution provides evidence that students enrolled in programs offered in concentrated or abbreviated time frames demonstrate mastery of program goals and course objectives. SUU operates on approximately a 16-week semester. Summer sessions are each five weeks or 10 weeks for a full session. Regent policy stipulates that 122 semester credits is the benchmark for requirements for graduation. Departments can exceed the 122 credit limit if national discipline accreditation has higher standards. A minimum of 40 credits of upper division credits with at least 20 credits and 50 percent of the major coursework must be completed at SUU. For a second bachelor’s degree, students must earn 30 credit hours after the first degree was completed and awarded. A minimum GPA requirement for course work in the major and a minimum GPA of 2.0 overall in work taken at SUU as well as a combined SUU and transfer GPA is required.

In the last biennial report to the Utah Legislature, SUU reported the lengthiest time-to-graduation ratio for Utah state institutions. Based on a fifteen-hour load (2000-2001 averages), the average student in the Utah system can expect to graduate in 4.77 years. This compares to 4.92 years for the average student enrolled at SUU. Decreasing the time to graduation for native and transfer students is an explicit objective of the Strategic Plan as well as a goal of the Board of Regents. See Table 2.8 below for a summary of graduation efficiency. In 2002, some improvement was noted as the average number of credits to graduation dropped from 147.7 to 142. This trend is encouraging and similar tracking of data will continue in future internal reports.
Table 2.8
Graduation Credit and Efficiency Ratios for Native and Transfer Students – Bachelor’s Degree 1999-00 and 2000-01
(All Utah Public Bachelor’s Granting Institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Native Students</th>
<th>Transfer Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00 00/01</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of U</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU</td>
<td>151.4</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>138.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVSC</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>145.1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Biennial Report to the Legislature

Based on a fifteen-hour credit load and the 2000-2001 ratings, native students can expect to complete their program of study in 4.82 years. Transfer students can expect to complete their program of study in 4.96 years.

SUU does not have any program-specific tuition requirements for undergraduate students. Tuition is based on in-state and out-of-state status. Tuition is calculated on a per-credit basis from one to ten credits and in excess of 20 credits.

Responsibility for design, approval, and implementation of the curriculum is vested in designated institutional bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. The faculty has a major role and responsibility in the design, integrity, and implementation of the curriculum. (2.A.7)

Multiple policies of the University vest faculty with specific responsibilities for the curriculum. During the past five years, the campus culture and personnel have changed, resulting in new policies and procedures for the curriculum. During Spring 2001, the Deans’ Council recommended policy to establish a University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) and laid out a curricular review process emanating from individual faculty to curriculum committees at department, college, and university levels.

The newly-established UUCC represents a major step for SUU. Faculty are in charge of the curriculum, as illustrated in supporting exhibits that detail the committee’s membership, structure, charge, and by-laws. Specifically, this committee is to:

- Receive, evaluate, and act on requests for curricular changes from the colleges and schools with a resource neutral approach.
- Review, evaluate, and recommend general education curricular revisions, as needed.
- Assist with general education assessment and curricular mapping as needed.

Many individuals on campus deserve credit for formalizing the revised curriculum review process. Members of the UUCC belong to one of three subcommittees for, respectively, general education, policy, and academic programs. Each subcommittee is chaired by a faculty member and all committee members are faculty members. Assignment to the UUCC has led to extensive work within and outside of committee meetings. This policy and committee structure mandates the substantive review of programs and course proposals by faculty. Some assistance is provided by the Faculty Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee, as well. To reduce the load of the UUCC, in Fall 2002 the
Provost’s Office established a Graduate Curriculum Committee.

*Faculty, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.* (2.A.8) SUU realizes that information and technology literacy enable students to locate, evaluate, and use information efficiently while becoming independent and lifelong learners. The Gerald R. Sherratt Library provides services and materials to support the entire university system and curriculum, as detailed in Standard 5.

Library and information technology resources are full partners in the educational process. The University continues to invest in and maintain collections, serials, electronic materials, mediated classrooms, computer labs, web-based resources and similar assets. Further, SUU requires in its general education core an Information Literacy Course (LM 1010), that students are encouraged to take before they accrue 30 semester hours.

Library collection development is also a campus-wide function. Each year funding for books is mandated and prorated to instructional units based on the number of full-time faculty. The library asks for periodic review of its serials by the departments and the faculty in each respective unit. Bibliographic instruction and library tours for new students are also provided as services of the library.

SUU’s curriculum (programs and courses) is planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling. (2.A.9) The institution’s programs and courses have been planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling. Required general education core courses are offered each semester. All general education courses are taught annually. Each semester students can select from a variety of general education courses in both the first and second sessions. The on-line information literacy course has no limit on the number of individuals who can enroll.

The general education core is designed to provide basic skills in math, English, information literacy, computer literacy (starting 2003-2004), and American Government. Students are tested in Math during new student orientation for accurate placement. Some departments require that students select general education courses as prerequisites for the major (sciences) or require students to complete a pre-core to assure students have adequate skills before admission to the major (business).

With respect to majors and minors, prerequisites dictate a student’s path through a program of study. The prerequisites and course level numbering encourage students to enroll in the curriculum to optimize learning. Transfer students may be delayed in taking upper division courses because they have not fulfilled required lower division classes in the major/minor.

SUU’s *Catalog* lists the prerequisites and the semester(s) each course will be offered. Many disciplines provide a suggested schedule by year printed in the *Catalog*. The UUCC now requires departments to submit prerequisite changes to assure accuracy in the catalog. The university offers required courses at least once in each two-year cycle.

Credit for prior experiential learning is awarded only in accordance with Policy 2.3 – *Credit for Prior Experiential Learning*, page 39. (2.A.10) Through its policies and practices, SUU complies with the Commission’s policy regarding credit for prior experiential learning.

Policies, regulations, and procedures for additions and deletions of courses or programs are systematically and periodically reviewed. (2.A.11) SUU’s policies, regulations, and procedures for additions and deletions of course or programs are systematically and periodically reviewed. The Board of Regents stopped
program review in 1999. In 2003, the Regents will reinstitute program review. They have created a new template that higher education institutions must use in implementing new reviews. SUU has drafted its own policy for academic program review that includes criteria and a regular review cycle. The policy draft is included in the exhibit materials for this standard. The curriculum committee reviews courses systematically.

In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, institutional policy requires appropriate arrangements to be made for enrolled students to complete their program in a timely manner and with a minimum of disruption. (2.A.12) SUU’s Policy 6.12, Financial Crisis and Bona Fide Financial Exigency, includes arrangements for students to complete their programs through “teach-out” or course substitutions as approved by respective deans.

Appraisal

The institutional self-study process has engendered authentic reflection and improvements. Perhaps the best example is that of the academic templates requested from units by the Accreditation Steering Committee during the self-study process. These templates guided unit self-studies and provided valuable opportunities for careful review of each unit’s mission, goals, and assessment procedures. Units also have gained a chance to step back and examine the “big picture” in which they play important roles.

Dedicated faculty, support staff, and administrative leaders made a concerted effort to review, assess, and build curriculum and provide a personalized culture for student learning. As a result of the change of status to a university in 1991 and changes in role and mission adopted in 1999 and 2003, SUU has created, refined, and implemented policies as the university matured. Such redefinition has insured that SUU offers quality, collegiate-level programs that are current.

Emerging from the self-study process were many observations, improvements, and challenges regarding academic programs. In recent years, faculty have made extensive reviews of curriculum three times: for semester change, for reprioritization, and for NASC review. Most departments annually assess curriculum and make appropriate changes, and a number of departments have aligned their curriculum with national accrediting standards in their fields. Academic programs have mission statements, goals, and measurable objectives, and course syllabi include explicit objectives. In countless ways, SUU’s curriculum reflects the faculty commitment to providing students with a quality education. Where used, service learning activities connect the classroom to experiences in the real world, and new learning and teaching technologies have been employed throughout undergraduate and graduate educational programs. Many units require capstone courses prior to graduation that allow students to integrate general education and major and minor courses.

SUU’s faculty members continue to serve as role models for life-long learning. Student evaluations suggest that faculty are effective teachers who are respected for their rapport with students and their efforts to sustain a personalized learning environment. In recent years, faculty have made noteworthy strides in their professional and scholarly endeavors, a trend that befits SUU’s status as a university and reflects the multiple responsibilities of full-time faculty. Across campus, faculty actively attend conferences, workshops, and seminars to remain current in their teaching and research endeavors. Recent efforts to fund professional development have been well-received by faculty.

Some improvements have been suggested. For example, more academic programs should seek external reviews of their curriculum. Academic programs could do a better job of prioritizing and planning for the replacement of instructional equipment. Units should improve their integration of student research and strengthen such requirements at the senior or capstone level. The large number of course preparations
for many faculty has hindered their opportunities for scholarly and service endeavors, and may cut into program quality. Most academic units could improve their student recruitment efforts and link them more effectively to those of the institution. In general, faculty could be better trained in alternative assessment methods, such as the use of traditional and electronic portfolios. SUU could improve its allocation of and requirements for scholarship aid to attract more students who are better-prepared for academic success.

There remain challenges for academic programs. Increasing competition with Dixie State College, Utah Valley State College, and new technology initiatives demand, that SUU consistently develop programs that are unique and competitive. Results from the National Survey of Student Engagement validate faculty concern about use of academic support resources. Academic rigor ranks below the average of peer institutions; student assignments to write long papers rank below the average of peer institutions; the number of assigned readings ranks below the average of peer institutions. Students suggest that their instructors are not using e-mail comparable to that of other institutions.

A statement should be added to the university’s Strategic Plan concerning increasing the rigor of classes over the next three years, and improving academic rigor should be a campus-wide initiative. Department and College/School curriculum committees, with assistance from the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, will conduct and document syllabus audits to measure current levels of academic rigor to establish pre-existing levels and paths to improve rigor in course work. In consultation with the Faculty Senate, workshops will assist departments and faculty improve the rigor of their courses.

Educational Program Planning and Assessment - Standard 2.B

**NASC Policy 2.2 Policy on Educational Assessment**

Planning and assessing educational programs supports SUU’s mission and is a continuing response to student needs and curricular relevance. The University’s assessment approach places emphasis on “outputs” rather than “inputs.” Assessment occurs at the institutional, program, and course levels, the latter two assessing student learning at the most meaningful level.

Since 1999, SUU’s assessment accomplishments have included:

- An institution-wide consensus has been achieved in understanding the purposes and importance of educational assessment.
- Assessment has been defined both in terms of its institutional context and in setting specific program goals and objectives.
- Faculty and staff have contributed to development and execution of unit assessment plans, and, working with a grassroots approach, they have fostered a "buy-in" for its success.
- Priorities have been set for implementation of assessment plans, along with a basis for continuous and regular program assessment.

In general, the variety of regular assessment activities includes, but is not limited to, the following activities as illustrated in Table 2.9. Copies of SUU assessment newsletters and an inventory of assessment activity are compiled in Exhibit 2.10.
### Table 2.9
**Samples of Assessment Activities by Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Annual surveys of graduates&lt;br&gt;Regular surveys of withdrawing or non-returning students&lt;br&gt;Annual surveys of first-year and senior student engagement&lt;br&gt;IPEDS reports of institutional characteristics, student completions, finances, and staffing&lt;br&gt;Biennial reports to the Utah Legislature on specific performance indicators&lt;br&gt;Common Data Sets&lt;br&gt;External surveys of key indicators (e.g., <em>U.S. News College and University Rankings</em>)&lt;br&gt;Internal analysis of the strategic plan and assessment of its success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Annual unit assessment plans linking SUU’s mission to goals and learning outcomes&lt;br&gt;Annual assessment reports that extend the plans by documenting assessment activities, their results and the uses of results to effect improvement&lt;br&gt;Accreditation reviews by specialized accrediting agencies&lt;br&gt;The 2000-01 prioritization review and the emerging, regular cycle of academic program reviews&lt;br&gt;Portfolios of student performance, if appropriate to the discipline&lt;br&gt;State-wide assessments in general education core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Student evaluations of courses&lt;br&gt;Direct measures of cognitive assessment&lt;br&gt;Grades, as they indicate actual performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUU’s processes for assessing its educational programs are clearly defined, encompass all of its offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated into the overall planning and evaluation plan. These processes are consistent with the institution’s assessment plan as required by Policy 2.2 - Educational Assessment, pages 36-39. While key constituents are involved in the process, the faculty have a central role in planning and evaluating the educational programs. (2.B.1) Beginning in 1999, after a period of public comment, SUU adopted the ten steps recommended jointly by the National Center of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at Pennsylvania State University and ACT for the creation of an assessment system. See [www.suu.edu/general/ir/](http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/). SUU’s mission statement expresses a commitment to "superior teaching and quality service to students" via the following goals: "to encourage a life-long love of learning, to foster academic excellence, to instill ethics and values and to honor thought in all of its finest forms." The SUU Assessment Plan is embedded in the current Strategic Plan, and it is consistent with the Commission’s policy on educational assessment.

Furthermore, those purposes are reflected in the objectives identified as "assessable educational goals" designed to:

- Develop a systematic process to evaluate learning outcomes and student satisfaction through the use of assessment information.
- Respond to various university stakeholders for data to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence through accountability.
- Develop unit-based definitions and strategies for assessment from a university-wide assessment matrix.
- Evaluate the quality of contribution by each unit.
• Evaluate learning outcomes.
• Evaluate student satisfaction.
• Evaluate post-graduation outcomes.
• Meet accreditation requirements.
• Provide data to campus units for improvement.

In its design and implementation, assessment at SUU is responsive to the institutional context. Broad-based efforts to create an assessment plan and program have been ongoing since the last visit by a NASC evaluation team. In Summer 1999, the Associate Provost was appointed to coordinate and organize campus assessment activities. By Fall 1999, an Assessment Newsletter and Institutional Research and Assessment website (http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/) had been established to act as an information clearinghouse.

In addition, an Assessment Committee was created (and later expanded), consisting of faculty and staff and ensuring "grassroots" application of the institution’s mission statement. From September to December 1999, the Committee on Assessment further developed an assessment outline to guide an implementation process. Following campus comment, the Deans’ Council adopted the outline, matrix, and inventory (see links at http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/). Since Fall Semester 2000, each academic unit has been encouraged to develop in the fall of each year a departmental assessment plan, followed by an assessment report in the spring. Selected indicators and/or measures of goal attainment were included, as were standards and levels of performance for each indicator and/or measures. Throughout the 2000-2001 academic year, departments engaged their plans, interpreted outcomes, and filed reports on assessment results. These documents are posted to the SUU web page.

During the 2001-2002 school year, the Assessment Committee hosted a series of workshops for faculty, department chairs, deans, and non-academic staff. Session leaders, drawn from the faculty and unit administrators, shared strategies for generating useful plans with participants. Designed to disseminate and discuss exemplary assessment plans (for example, those generated by Psychology and Business), the workshops reflected the Assessment Committee’s twin concerns that individual unit plans be connected, on the one hand, with missions and goals, and, on the other, with specific desired outcomes.

Through these and other activities since 1999, SUU has fostered a campus-wide discussion about the "why’s" and "what’s" of assessment. This educational process has led to general acceptance of assessment and its relationship to academic planning and institutional effectiveness. We have seen improved understanding across campus about the techniques, terminology, and significance of assessment. Recent campus discussions have gone beyond early (and simpler) concerns about in-class testing and student evaluations to more sophisticated notions for "closing the loop" on various levels.

A promising step forward came in Fall 2002 with adoption by the University Assessment Committee of Jim Nichols’ five-column model for assessment. Departments were instructed to articulate their assessment plans and reports through a model that called for a mission/goal statement, learning outcomes tied to that mission, activities designed to assess those outcomes, data that would be collected, and an indication of how those results would be used to improve learning. Departments were required to submit their assessment plan in November of each year, using the first three columns of the model. The subsequent assessment report followed up in May of that academic year with completion of the last two columns. Most departments have made earnest efforts to fulfill assessment plans, particularly in the 2002-2003 year.

SUU’s assessment program is a work in progress. Limited resources (of both time and money) have undercut sincere, ongoing, and often Herculean efforts by faculty, staff, and administrators. Some faculty have complained
that assessment activities have meant sacrificing other aspects of their professional development, including scholarly and creative pursuits. In some cases, the recognition of “gaps” has led to the painful admission of insufficient resources to fill or close those gaps. Clearly, SUU’s assessment efforts are evolving, illustrated recently in December 2002 when the Assessment Committee was reconstituted as the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee, using as its springboard for the SUU Strategic Plan 2002-03 to 2006-07.

The Strategic Plan represents a giant step forward in the institution’s drive to tie assessment to mission, goals, and objectives beyond the unit level. Each goal is linked to objectives, assessment indicators, measures of institutional effectiveness, and responsible offices. The Strategic Plan demonstrates progress in connecting assessment to institutional mission. The reconfigured Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee provides new opportunities to refine our institution’s engagement with assessment work.

SUU identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes. (2.B.2) SUU’s curricula are designed so students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education, a major, and in elective courses. The core of general education process begins with essential skills, including written communication, quantitative and scientific reasoning, critical analysis, knowledge of American institutions, and information literacy. The first level of expected learning outcomes begins with general education and extends to degree and certificate programs. SUU’s model is detailed in Table 2.10.

Table 2.10
Model of Institutional Goals for Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Learning Goals</th>
<th>Where Published</th>
<th>General Form of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Goals for Student Learning = General Education Goals</td>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-year advisement materials</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goals = Major Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Catalog by department</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental advisement materials</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
<td>Direct measures and grades,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as they indicate actual performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mission statement and expected learning outcomes for each degree and certificate program is included in the catalog narrative, and assessment of the outcomes is published in annual assessment plans and reports. SUU provides evidence that its assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. (2.B.3) Table 2.11 summarizes by department the various assessment activities engaged at SUU. Table 2.12 provides summary evidence by department of changes recently made as a result of assessment. Departmental notebooks in the exhibit area further
detail evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. **Exhibit 2.11** more precisely connects the goals and objectives of the SUU strategic plan to performance indicators and measures and to assessment evidence. Assessment is still maturing at SUU, but faculty are using assessment tools to effect change.

### Table 2.11

**Departments’ Various Assessment Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Surveys &amp; Interviews</th>
<th>In Class</th>
<th>Course Evaluation</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Fine Arts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.12
### Examples of Uses of Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>Results of field tests and surveys of graduates are reviewed and discussed in fall faculty meetings. Curriculum is assessed through focus groups and adjustments are made. The advisory board provided feedback regarding writing skills. This resulted in efforts to incorporate more writing into courses and to establish pre- and post-testing on writing improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>Results of surveys of graduates distributed to faculty and discussed in faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td>Use student comments to adjust program planning and instruction. Use recommendations from advisory committees to improve program effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Added sophomore portfolio review and art majors seminar to strengthen discipline rigor and exposure to contemporary art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Used field test results in faculty meetings. Modified laboratory exercises to improve student preparation. Used results of professional school admissions tests to improve advanced courses. Used observations of student teachers to improve methods courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Used assessment results to improve writing assignments in Communications Theory courses. Results of surveys of graduates are discussed in faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Finance scores on the ETS Major Field Exam for Business dropped precipitously in 1997-1998 (77th, 47th and 29th percentiles). Investigation found that not all classes of FIN 3250 and 3260 were requiring problem sets. Problem sets were instituted for all sections and scores returned 94th percentile levels. The advisory board provided feedback regarding writing skills. This resulted in efforts to incorporate more writing into courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Employment placement information for each graduate is tracked and the curriculum modified as needed to reflect market and graduate school demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Results of field tests and surveys of graduates are reviewed and discussed in Fall semester faculty meetings. Curriculum is assessed through focus groups and adjustments are made as needed. The advisory board provided feedback regarding writing skills. More writing was integrated into courses. Researching 1997 ETS field exam scores highlighted no requirement that business core courses be completed prior to the capstone course. A correction was made, and a requirement adopted. As a result field exam scores have risen to the top 10% and maintained that level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Although a new program, the faculty are monitoring student assistantships as well as course content, to insure the program is meeting its goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>Course assessment findings prompt revision of learning objectives,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard Two: Educational Program and its Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Course content, and course goals. Through results of transcript analyses and diagnostic testing, the faculty have improved placement of students in general education courses and textbook selection. Placement of graduates and field test results are monitored and reported in faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Improved compliance with NASM standards. Semester jury results in applied music guide changes in teaching methods and assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Survey results of graduates (satisfaction and placement) are discussed among faculty for curriculum and general improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Reaffirmed curriculum relevance and rigor in chemistry and geosciences using field test results and feedback in capstone classes. Used recommendations from the professional advisory board and results of student assessment activities in engineering to update and modify curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Used assessment results to modify learning outcomes and make informed judgments in curriculum and professional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Strengthened content in capstone courses by adding more writing. Used results to restructure degree requirements and expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Integrated assessment into the PEU (Professional Education Unit) such as electronic portfolio, teacher work samples, Praxis exams, and exit interviews to strengthen student learning and bring the PEU into NCATE compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Arts &amp; Dance</td>
<td>With new leadership, the department has established goals and measurable objectives, discussed assessment results in faculty meetings, and modified the entire curriculum to meet NAST standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appraisal

Assessment of programs and student learning outcomes is systematic and probing at SUU. Annual assessment has been institutionalized and most departments have filed assessment plans and evaluation reports. Each year both the sophistication of the plans and the “buy in” continue to improve. Institutional assessments affirm SUU’s strength of faculty, staff and program quality. Documenting specific strengths are exhibit materials from the past years of the College Outcomes Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement. Students’ responses indicate SUU’s high marks for class size, faculty respect of students, quality of instruction, library services, and the quality of their program of study. The systematic, institutional model of academic program review is being implemented with assistance from the Faculty Senate and administration, and each unit will be reviewed on a regular cycle. Colleges/Schools have created advisory boards for advice on updating and changing curriculum. Where appropriate, units have used external testing to measure learning outcomes, and some units use focus groups as a means of assessing and then making changes in their curriculum. Some units use graduation student surveys.

Yet, each unit needs to continue to improve assessment of objectives, and each unit needs to create methods for collecting feedback from students, alumni, and employers and include the method as part of their unit plan. Faculty still rely mainly on lecture as the major mode of delivery of course material. Most units have not engaged assessment overtime nor prepared a way of surveying employers of SUU students.
Some colleges do not have measurable goals and assessment procedures in place. Units should reflect use of alternative delivery modes in assessment plans. Some units still rely on grades as an assessment tool. Individual units with support from the colleges and schools should seek program reviews by outside consultants or comparison of programs with peer institutions.

Undergraduate Program – Standard 2.C

NASC Policy 2.1: Policy on General Education/Related Instruction Requirements

SUU is committed to provide students with a substantial, coherent, and articulated exposure to the broad domains of knowledge. The typical undergraduate program has three elements that reflect the “tripartite structure” advocated by NASC: 1) general education; 2) a major (sometimes composite in design or with a minor); and 3) electives. The following section explores a number of issues related to SUU’s General Education curriculum and student learning and success.

General Education

SUU’s commitment to general education is based on a long-established tradition that general education is fundamental to the development of the individual student and to the needs of society. General education unites the academic program by providing common expectations and establishing the first elements for baccalaureate and academic or transfer associate degree programs.

Through the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC), the faculty has authority to review and make necessary changes in the general education program. This standing committee of the university must comply with policies of the Utah Board of Regents. See the web site at http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/contents. The policies circumscribe specifics for the undergraduate program:

- A baccalaureate program will have a core of no more than 39 semester hours of general education; associate degrees will have at least 18 general education semester hours.
- General education will include breadth instruction in such disciplines as the life and physical sciences, humanities and fine arts, and social science.
- When general education requirements are completed at one USHE institution, they are fully transferable to another USHE institution.
- An American Institutions requirement must be completed.
- A baccalaureate degree requires 120 to 126 semester hours.

A general education subcommittee of the UUCC has direct responsibility for reviewing the general education program. Its recommendations proceed to the UUCC for approval. Under the new curriculum policy, faculty are responsible for the SUU undergraduate program, including general education. Specific definitions of program elements (e.g., major, minor) are adopted within parameters of regental policy. The Faculty Senate, Provost, and Registrar’s Offices are linked to the UUCC by committee representation.

General education requirements, summarized in Table 2.13, can be met in multiple ways:

- Students can complete the requirements at SUU.
- Students can transfer completed general education requirements from other accredited institutions within USHE.
- Students can transfer from other accredited institutions outside of Utah but courses must be evaluated (See 2.C.4 for additional information on process.)
- Students in the Honors Program can partially fulfill requirements by
completing honor sections of general education.

- Students can also transfer individual courses from other accredited institutions to meet individual course requirements within the general education program.
- Students may complete general education requirements through Advanced Placement (AP) courses in high school.
- Students may take a series of tests under the College Level Examination Program (CLEP).
- Concurrent general education enrollment credits may be accepted with approval from the Registrar’s office.

Starting in 2001, the UUCC developed the general education philosophy and the goals in skills and knowledge areas. Suggested competencies and measurements were developed for each goal and circulated among faculty. Each college or school held formal meetings, and the UUCC also examined general education programs at eleven comparable institutions in Utah and outside the state. Faculty were asked to tie each general education course to a skills or knowledge goal, plus all courses were expected to have explanations of learning objectives and outcomes measurement. Faculty were encouraged to incorporate diversity principles, if possible, into their courses. Exhibit 2.12 summarizes changes in the General Education program, and Exhibit 2.13 is the General Education curriculum for 2003-04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Courses</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Fine Arts</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Life Science</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Physical Science</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Humanities</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Social &amp; Behavioral Science</th>
<th>Knowledge Area: Interdisciplinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 1010 (3 credit hours)</td>
<td>Menu of 7 math courses</td>
<td>Menu of 10 courses and labs</td>
<td>Menu of 14 courses and labs</td>
<td>Menu of 26 courses</td>
<td>Menu of 29 courses</td>
<td>Menu of 6 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 2010 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (3 or 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institutions (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literary (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.13
General Education Outline, 2003

Retention

Fall-to-fall retention of freshman students is a challenge for SUU. Retention for several years has been about 58%. After a two-year pilot project with a student success course for new freshmen, SUU decided to add the course as a requirement in general education. In addition, the following actions were taken or will be in place in 2003:

- Academic advisors will be added in each college or school.
- A “Student Success Center” will be created for advising (and coordination with advisors in the colleges), and for providing tutoring and other support services to students.
- A 5th-week progress report for all new freshmen begins Fall 2003.

Institutional research studies have identified why students leave SUU and some of the advisement and structural changes can be traced to that
Based on the findings and a consultant’s report on enrollment management, SUU has taken the following steps:

- Overhauled advising by making it the Provost’s responsibility, redesigning its mechanics, adding staff advisors in the colleges/schools, and creating a Student Success Center.
- Regularly revise and strengthen student orientation with improved design and parental involvement.
- Improved academic support mechanisms for under-prepared students by adding this responsibility to the Student Success Center, consolidating tutoring, and streamlining developmental programs in math and English.
- Created scheduling structures for new freshmen by defining initial and first-year schedules, mandating advising, and changing procedures for declaring majors.
- Provided direction and budget to departments for a student success course (UNIV 1000) by including resources in the budget formula for FY 2003-04.
- Changed the administration and various procedures for awarding scholarships by establishing a faculty committee to advise the scholarship program, review guidelines and awarding practices, and centralize the function in the financial aid office.

Retention is a priority for the entire campus, and SUU is creating a learning and collegiate environment where students will want to stay and succeed.

Admissions

For over a decade, SUU has offered developmental course work to students. About 150 students each year are eligible for subsidized developmental course work through Student Support Services (a component of TRIO programs). The state has required these students to pay the full cost of instruction for the classes. The number of students needing this course work, particularly in mathematics, has increased, providing SUU with a unique admissions challenge.

As a result of the Regents Policy R-312 on institutional missions and roles and the need for more developmental instruction to help students succeed, SUU adopted in 2003 a new, two-tier admissions policy similar to Boise State University that:

- Includes current statutory language for residency.
- Provides a “college” admissions status for students who need special assistance, tutoring, or learning experiences.
- Provides for a “university” admissions status for students meeting high GPA and ACT standards.
- Sets forth a fixed curriculum for “college” admitted students with a support system.

The Faculty Senate and Deans’ Council adopted the policy, as did the Board of Trustees. The new policy has been published in the Catalog for 2003-04.

Student Demographics

While various exhibit materials describe the demographics (characteristics, grade studies, transfer sources, retention and graduation) of SUU students, NASC Policy 2.2 also seeks an analysis of changes. Observations such as the following can be drawn from University data:

- New freshman applications, acceptances and enrollees (Fall Semester) declined between 1999 and 2002, but applications increased for 2003.
- Transfer student applications, acceptances and enrollees (Fall Semester) are declining since 1999.
- The grade point average of new freshmen is stable at about 3.41 over the past five years.
- The ACT composite score for new freshmen is stable at about 21 over the past five years.
• The percentage of students on academic probation has decreased from 8.14% in 1993-94 to 7.5% in 2002-03.
• SUU is enrolling more resident students: 83.1% in 1993, 91.1% in 2002.
• Largest sources of transfer students have been in-state institutions: 327 in 1993 and 433 in 2002.
• Enrollments from out-of-state sources of transfer students have declined: 136 in 1993 and 109 in 2002. For example, BYU-Idaho’s conversion to a four-year institution has led to a drop in transfers, from a high of 39 over the last 10 years to 9 in 2002.

Entry Program Assessment

ACT scores and high school GPA are the general measures used at University entry. SUU has piloted a math placement test, but typically ACT scores direct placement in English and math general education courses. In the past, both the College of Education and the School of Business have adopted entry criteria for advanced standing. Currently, only the School of Business publishes and uses curriculum and GPA criteria for advanced standing in its undergraduate programs.

Mid-Program Assessment

Although not institutionalized, many departments have mid-program assessments. Exhibit materials for the departments provide some examples, and two illustrations may be helpful. The statewide assessment of English composition holds some promise of demonstrating improvement in writing skills as students proceed through general education. The assessment program is discussed more fully below. Departments such as Applied Science have formative assessment activities at mid-semester and mid-program. Because the program was recently introduced, it is too early to draw conclusions.

End-of-Program Assessment

Exhibit and departmental materials document end-of-program assessment in the form of portfolios (e.g., Fine Arts and Education), capstone experiences (e.g., Business) and field tests (e.g., Biology). Because these end-of-program assessments were recently initiated, conclusions about trends, student performance, and reasons for change are premature.

Graduation rates can be one measure, and about 32% of students entering SUU graduate after six years. The rate has hovered in the low 30% range for the past five years. On average in 2002, graduating students had earned 142 credits; in 1999 the average was 147. This desirable decline is a performance indicator for SUU and is reported in biennial assessment reports to the Utah Legislature.

Program Review and Specialized Accreditation

A regular cycle of program reviews is underway with a new policy, criteria, and schedule beginning in 2004. Specialized accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE) was completed in the spring of 2003 with highly favorable recommendations for meeting all six NCATE Unit standards. AACSB candidacy is progressing toward an evaluation visit in 2004. ACBSP reaffirmation occurs in 2003. The Music program has been accredited by NASM, and the Dance and Art programs have been assessed for accreditation. Chemistry is exploring ACS accreditation, and Engineering ABET accreditation.

Alumni Satisfaction and Loyalty

In 2000 the USHE surveyed alumni at all institutions. The results of the survey are available in exhibit materials for Standard 1. The survey, an ACT instrument, provided baseline data for future studies. SUU has not had the resources to continue longitudinal alumni studies at the institutional level, but some colleges (e.g., Business) have made this a regular assessment activity. Findings are included among exhibit materials.
Standard Two: Educational Program and its Effectiveness

SUU has used the ACT survey of withdrawing or non-returning students to determine the reasons why students drop out or otherwise do not complete a program. Findings for multiple years have been reported to the administration and posted to the web site: www.suu.edu/general/ir/reports

Attrition rates are relatively steady at about 42%, hence the need for the retention efforts explained above.

In 1999, the University’s assessment committee decided that withdrawing or non-returning students should be regularly surveyed, and this element became part of the University’s assessment plan. In March 2000, 606 degree-seeking students who enrolled Fall 1999 but not Spring 2000 were surveyed by mail using ACT’s short-form instrument developed for withdrawing or non-returning students. Response rate was 20%.

Student responses indicated that they did not return because they:

- Decided to attend a different college (21.7%).
- Wanted to move to (or were transferred to) a new location (21.7%).
- Marital situations changed educational plans (11.7%).
- Experienced health-related problem (family or personal) (10.8%).
- Desired major not offered by this college (10.8%).
- Accepted a full-time job (10.8%).

(Note: Students could provide multiple responses.)

In summary, students withdrew mainly for personal reasons, and nearly 18% of the students withdrew to go on a church mission. When asked “How satisfied were you with academic advising you received?,” 21% said it was worse than expected but 30% said it was better than expected. Many students were well served but advising services were not consistent across campus.

SUU has taken a number of steps to improve retention. First, a student success course has been added to the general education requirements beginning Fall 2003. Second, SUU instituted a student progress report for the fifth week of the semester to identify high risk freshmen students beginning Fall 2003. Faculty will post a grade of “S” (satisfactory) or “U” (Unsatisfactory). For the purpose of advising, the newly named Student Success Center will contact and work with undeclared majors and the departments would work with the declared majors to assist the students.

Employment and/or Employer Satisfaction Measures

Some individual colleges and schools survey employers as an assessment activity. Strengths and weaknesses are then determined and changes are made as needed. See exhibit materials for unit examples. The University tracks student placement each year through a career services survey. Findings are reported to the Deans’ Council and published in the SUU Fact Book.

Honors Program

Initiated in the spring of 1999, the Honors Program provides enrichment opportunities for academically committed students in an interdisciplinary and collaborative undergraduate experience. To foster a community of learners, the program connects students with some of the best faculty through structured small classes and participation in out-of-class activities. Honors classes engage students in an intense, student-centered, and active learning process. The program provides both a general education and an upper division component. Additionally, students are encouraged to participate in undergraduate research and complete service learning projects. A cadre of Honors students holds offices in the Student Honors Council. The Deans and the Faculty Senate approved an Advisory Honors Council in 2002 and 2003, respectively.

The program is open to both native and transfer students. Admittance to the Honors Program is
a prerequisite for registering for honor courses. Students complete an application and write a 500-word essay on a topic of their choice. Applicants must have a 3.3 GPA or a 24 ACT score. Currently, 118 members can enroll in courses and participate in activities. Students can enroll in honor designated general education courses. They are required to take a critical and creative thinking course and complete an Honors thesis or project. Graduation from the Honors Program requires the completion of 20 credits of HONR or honors-designated courses and students must have a cumulative GPA of 3.5. The program requirements comply with the standards of the National Collegiate Honors Council.

The Honors Student Council has sought and received membership in the National Society of Collegiate Scholars in 2003. The Director of the program nominates and helps students prepare materials for external scholarships such as the Truman and the Goldwater scholarships. See Exhibit 2.14 for the 2002-03 Honors Report.

**Internships and Practica**

SUU education programs are enriched through internships that are encouraged in every department. A new internship policy, adopted in 2003, establishes guidelines for departments and career services to administer internships. Many departments have developed internships and practicum options for students. For example:

- The Psychology Department has developed an extensive practicum program for majors. Learning outcomes are assessed by supervisors, and practicum students keep a professional record and a clinical process journal during their practicum experience.
- Sociology’s field practicum allows students to apply theories and concepts in an applied sociological career field. The objective is for students to see the application of course work and the importance of sociological insights.
- The Social Sciences Department provides internships for students to work with public officials or government agencies. Often students are interns for the state and federal legislators.
- Communication majors most often use the summer months for earning internship credits in broadcasting, advertising, journalism, public relations, and interpersonal communication.
- Management and Marketing, Accounting, and Managerial Economics supervise up to six credits per student for successfully completing an internship.
- The Teacher Education Department partners with area school districts to place selected teaching interns into schools for a full year of teaching in lieu of student teaching. Annually, 15 to 20 senior teacher education candidates are selected who are supervised jointly by a University supervisor and by a mentor teacher in a participating public school classroom. See Exhibit 2.15 for more information about internships, practica, and related programs.

**Undergraduate Research**

During the past three years, many faculty members have embraced undergraduate research, particularly in the Colleges of Science and Humanities and Social Sciences. College of Science faculty realized that for SUU students to be competitive for admission into professional and graduate programs, students needed to be involved in undergraduate research. In addition to aiding student’s applications for advanced study, faculty who seek to be more active in scholarship have promoted undergraduate research projects.

SUU has sponsored an annual faculty-student scholarship day for three years. Students may present posters or deliver a speech to explain their research. A committee reviews the student’s research and provides monetary awards for the best research at a banquet for the participating students and faculty. Additionally, the College of Science hosts a college undergraduate research presentation session each semester.
Students from the Honors Program, Communication, Art, Dance, Psychology, Social Sciences, Agricultural, Business and Science (especially Biology) have faculty guiding undergraduate research projects. SUU has a policy, Policy 6.27, that equates undergraduate research with faculty load. For example, Biology faculty receive one course load reduction for every 11 undergraduate projects they supervise. Selected examples of research projects are documented in Exhibit 2.16.

**Concurrent Enrollment**

About 650 students each year are dual enrolled at SUU and at their high schools. Called “concurrent enrollment” in Utah, this program offers able students the opportunity to take university-level courses while still in high school and at reduced rates. The program is administered through the School of Continuing and Professional Studies and the academic departments are responsible to ensure the academic rigor of the program.

**Service Learning**

Service learning is a curricular-based educational experience in which students participate in and reflect upon organized service activities that meet community needs. These activities are designed to further understanding of course content, encourage a broader appreciation of the discipline, and foster an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

The Service and Learning Center is centrally located in the Sharwan Smith Center. The Faculty Service and Learning Committee serves as an advisory group to the center. Students can receive academic credit for their participation in service learning projects. Recently, about 30 students have participated each semester in projects sponsored directly by the Service and Learning Center. Many more students have participated in service-learning components in a wide range of courses across the curriculum.

This year the Center retained nine student Service Leaders. Each Service Leader serves as part of the Center team and plans and oversees partnerships and events. Recent sample projects have included:

- **Students Service Utah Network (SSUN).** SSUN is a statewide organization that coordinates service activities. SUU had a successful food drive and several student and campus organization hosted “can events” (admission price). They also conducted a trick or treat for food campaign in October 2002. SUU collected 2,000 pounds of food for the HOPE Pantry and Iron County Care and Share, the area food bank for needy residents.

- **Alternative Spring Break Club.** The club has about 50 members who traveled to Mexico in March 2003. They have six faculty advisors representing diverse campus areas such as Sociology, Building Construction, Family and Consumer Science, and Spanish. The club participates in a monthly service activity in the community. They have made quilts for the Children’s Justice Center, made wooden blocks and toys, and hosted a Christmas party for underprivileged children.

- **Iron County Make a Difference Day.** Co-sponsored with the Service and Learning Center and the Iron County Volunteer Center, over 60 students and 100 community members helped build outdoor education and historical centers in two local communities that benefit students in the Iron County School District. USA Weekend magazine, the national sponsor, named the Iron County project as one of 500 National/Local Award winners.

Beyond the Service and Learning Center, over 40 courses at the university have a service learning component. More faculty and students recognize the value of service as a teaching and learning tool. A sample of some of the courses and community partnering are listed below:

- **Accounting:** Volunteer Income Tax Preparation assistance for elderly
and community members on fixed incomes.

- **History:** Written histories of people and places; historical walking tour brochures for Cedar City’s downtown area and cemetery; Veteran’s Day appreciation programs; elementary school Freedom Quilt project; Web sites for communities and historical sites.

- **Physics:** Touring “hands on” science education program for elementary schools.

- **Public Relations:** Public library bond issue; area after-school programs.

- **Sociology:** Family Support Center (crisis and respite nursery); Women’s Crisis Shelter; community mentoring program; youth corrections; local PTA; and Girl Scouts.

Learning and practicing citizenship are life-long activities that extend far beyond the conclusion of formal education. See Exhibit 2.17 for documentation and reports.

**SUU requires of all its degree and pre-baccalaureate programs a component of general education and/or related instruction that is published in its Catalog in clear and complete terms. (2.C.1)** Table 2.14 summarizes the education components of SUU degree programs. Currently, students complete 37 semester hours for the baccalaureate degree and 18 hours for the associate degree distributed in the following fashion.

### Table 2.14
**Components of SUU Degree Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Associates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td>6 semester hours</td>
<td>3 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Literacy</strong></td>
<td>3 semester hours</td>
<td>3 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Literacy</strong></td>
<td>1 semester hour</td>
<td>1 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Literacy</strong></td>
<td>3 semester hours course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Institutions</strong></td>
<td>3 semester hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Areas</strong></td>
<td>24 semester hours (courses representing all 5 knowledge areas)</td>
<td>9 semester hours (in 3 of 5 knowledge areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 36 semester hours</td>
<td>A minimum of 36 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 18 semester hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electives</strong></td>
<td>28 semester hours</td>
<td>15 semester hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>A minimum of 122 semester hours</td>
<td>A minimum of 69 semester hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The general education component of the institution’s degree programs is based on a rationale that is clearly articulated and is published in clear and complete terms in the catalog. It provides the criteria by which the relevance of each course to the general education component is evaluated. (2.C.2) SUU’s UUCC composed and the institution adopted a rationale for general education following the Missouri system of higher education’s framework. The program included: 1) statements of competencies in both skill areas (basic proficiencies integral to higher education) and knowledge areas (general fields of study that may include either single or multiple disciplines); 2) extensions of those competencies in the courses; 3) assessment approaches to document competency and goal achievement. These elements are published in the Catalog with a matrix that identifies the assessment practices for general education. Assessment of general education occurs on several levels: 1) state-wide assessment of core elements such as English, mathematics and American Institutions; 2) institutional assessments through surveys of student engagement and satisfaction; and 3) course assessments of student learning. The University has also acquired the ETS Academic Profile test to measure in 2004 cognitive achievement in general education.

**State-wide Assessments**

As the result of a three-year planning process enacted by the State Writing Taskforce, SUU’s English Department is participating in a system-wide assessment of introductory and intermediate composition classes. During the first week of the Fall 2002 semester, all students in English 1010 classes were asked to compose an essay under guidelines developed by the State Writing Taskforce. The test was repeated in all ENGL 2010 and 2110 classes at the end of Fall Semester. A random sampling of SUU essays was evaluated, along with papers from other participating institutions, in a blind reading by a panel of trained graders during summer 2003. Graders used assessment standards generated by the State Writing Taskforce. Results of these and other assessment activities in the English are included in the departments exhibit materials.

In two other areas, SUU faculty collaborated with colleagues across the state in system-wide and systematic assessment activities. The Department of Mathematics and Computer Science joined in a placement assessment in mathematics, as illustrated in Exhibit 2.18. Besides using ACT scores for placement in mathematics classes, SUU has piloted for two years a math placement test for entering freshmen. Faculty in the Department of Social Sciences participated with other USHE faculty in an assessment of student learning through American Institutions requirement imposed by the Utah Legislature. See Exhibit 2.19.

SUU’s general education program offerings include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, mathematics, and the social sciences. The program may also include courses that focus on the interrelationships between these major fields of study. (2.C.3) Regent’s policy stipulates that general education will include a breadth of disciplines, as well as a core of courses. See www.utahsbr.edu. At present, SUU’s revised general education program has 130 courses, and the UUCC is revising the array of courses for 2004. The UUCC has encouraged departments and colleges to develop and offer interdisciplinary courses.

Specifically, students learn about political institutions and government, particularly in the history of the United States. Students in the Fine Arts can appreciate the creative imagination and how it is informed by social, cultural, linguistic, and historical circumstances. In Humanities courses, students are introduced to the great works of literature, theology, philosophy, music, architecture. Life and Physical Science courses help students to understand the empirical methods of scientific inquiry and how that has shaped human history. Again, see Tables 2.13 and 2.14 for an overview.

SUU’s policies for the transfer and acceptance of credit are clearly articulated. In accepting
transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution ensures that the credits accepted are comparable to its own courses. Where patterns of transfer from other institutions are established, efforts to formulate articulation agreements are demonstrated. (2.C.4) NASC Policy 2.5 Policy on Transfer and Award of Academic Credit. The Registrar’s Office handles all articulation of general education of transfer students. The institutional policy for the transfer and acceptance of credits is clearly stated in Policy 6.47, Transfer Credits and complies with Utah Board of Regents Policy R471 Transfer of Credit. “The university subscribes to 1) statutory mandates regarding transfer credits; 2) statewide policy on transfer and articulation among Utah public college and universities; and 3) articulation agreements between the University and other institutions.” In general, the university accepts credits earned at a fully accredited institution. See http://www.utahsbr.edu/majorsguide/Majorsguide.html.

Graduates of Utah’s accredited community colleges holding the Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Science (AS) will be admitted if they have a 2.00 or higher GPA. Transfer students from Utah institutions who have not completed general education shall have the receiving institutions “accept at full value all general education course work approved by the sending institution.” Following this policy, transfer students will only need to complete work equal to the minimum number of credits and core requirements of the receiving institution. (See Regents Policy R465.e.6, General Education.)

Credit evaluators in the Registrar’s Office ensure that students meet the general education requirements based on articulation agreements within USHE. They can restrict transfer credit for the following reasons:

- Concurrent enrollment if the course work was completed on a high school campus.
- No more than 65 semester credit hours of work completed at a community college can count toward required courses for the bachelor’s degree.
- Credits earned in Armed Forces Training Schools or U.S. Air Force Institution or Defense Activity for Non-traditional Education Support can not exceed 30 credits. Any transferred scores will not count in the transfer GPA.
- Courses below college level (usually numbered below 1000).
- Repeated courses.
- Course work earned at an institution that did not have candidacy with a regional accrediting association when the course work was taken.
- Religious instruction.
- Courses offered for non-credit continuing education units.

USHE now has a program that allows the SUU Registrar to certify completion of general education for SUU students who transfer within the system. In other words, a student could complete general education requirements at SUU and then could transfer to another four-year institution within the Utah system having completed general education (Regents Policy R465, General Education.) Transfer student enrollment procedures are described in the Catalog, and it should be noted that transfer students make-up a significant number of our upper-division students. In 2001, 1,054 transfer students applied, 82.6% were admitted, 58.6% were enrolled.

SUU designs and maintains effective academic advising programs to meet student needs for information and advice, and adequately informs and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. (2.C.5) SUU has adopted a split model of advising to help students regarding education programs, courses of instruction, policies and procedures, career options, and information resources. Students with undeclared majors meet with the staff of the newly named Student Success Center, and students with majors meet with faculty or professional academic advisors. Students majoring in interdisciplinary programs
receive advice from the department where most of the classes will be taken.

Currently, SUU’s Policy 7.1 Academic Advisement details the policy on academic advisement of students. The document, now under revision, places responsibility for seeking academic advisement on the students. Although the policy advises that “students meet with advisors prior to registration to ensure progress toward a degree or certificate,” some students do not seek counsel.

The SUU Catalog and web sources provide students with information about advising and the student’s role in the advisement process. Additionally, each department has a clear listing of the requirements for completing a major and minor printed in the Catalog, including a year-by-year suggested schedule. Pre-requisites for sequenced courses and expected course scheduling are disseminated through the Catalog and the Course Schedule, both of which are available online and updated regularly on the SUU website. The SUU web site also provides information about closed classes. Advisors have access to the Student Information System (SIS) to check student records and class availability. Contact information for academic advisors, including phone number and office location appears on the web and in the printed Course Schedule prior to 2003. Faculty are encouraged to post the syllabi for their courses on the Internet (See SUU Policy 6.36.1, Syllabus Policy).

Because advising is so important to student success and retention, SUU has implemented a number of improvements:

- Beginning July 2003, the functions and offices of the Registrar, Student Development, and Student Success will become responsible to the Provost.
- Student Development/Student Success staff are developing a new working plan that better 1) connects first-year students to faculty and to the institution; 2) provides coherent programming for all students; 3) makes advisement mandatory; 4) enhances student orientation and academic counseling; 5) establishes and defines a Student Success Center for the University; and 6) systematically and regularly trains staff advisors and faculty.

- Added funds for the hiring of four staff members, one in each academic college or school where there was not already an advisor. By Fall 2003 each college or school acquired an advising officer who is also in general contact with the Student Success Center.
- Encouraged Faculty Senate leaders to build advising into faculty expectations as part of the promotion and tenure process. Faculty would be expected to be accessible to students, serve as mentors, and assist students in their exploration of disciplines and professions.

As part of the advising process, students can request a “degree audit” with the Registrar’s office as they approach graduation. The degree audit merges the student’s transcript with general education requirements and major and minor requirements, listing any remaining courses or requirements yet to be completed. This service to students should be enhanced with the migration of the administrative computing system to SCT Banner software and with the additional assignment to the Registrar’s office of a graduation audit function.

**Student Development Center/Student Success Center (SDC/SSC)**

Effective July 1, 2003, the Student Development Center was renamed the Student Success Center reporting to the Provost. The mission of the Center “. . . is to introduce students to the university community and to provide a personalized learning environment for students to explore and clarify academic, career, or life goals and establish plans to achieve them.” In a pilot student satisfaction survey in 2001, student satisfaction with, and the perceived effectiveness of, SDC/SSC advisors was very high – all but one item received scores in the 90% range. This survey has been revised and incorporated into
the SDC/SSC strategic priority objectives. Additional outcome measures are currently being explored.

Advisors and authorized staff members are trained to access SIS information, and all confidential SDC/SSC student records are kept in locked secure storage. All staff members in the Center are aware of institutional policies, along with FERPA regulations, and sign a confidentiality document to that effect. Student databases containing student information are password protected, backed up daily and housed on a secure network accessible only by SDC/SSC employees.

General education advising worksheets and academic planners are distributed to students during advising appointments in the SDC/SSC and the general education information and academic planners are included in the SUU Catalog. In addition, the staff send mailings every semester to the undeclared or “GEED” students to encourage them to meet with advisors for academic planning and to explore options. Currently, SDC/SSC advisors are developing an advising “checklist” to improve the quality and breadth of advising appointments.

The high quality efforts of the SDC/SSC staff are remarkable given their limited resources. For example, in Fall 2001, a total of 1,131 students were advised in a total of 1,389 advising appointments. Divided among four advisors (only one of which has advising as a fulltime responsibility), that is an average of approximately 283 students and 347 appointments per advisor that semester. National advising resources recommend an advisor-to-student ratio of 1:300 for full time advisors, and an even lower ratio for undecided student populations. Because SDC/SSC staff members have other responsibilities, the advisor-to-student ratio in the SDC/SSC is 1:411. This ratio poses a challenge in meeting the needs of all of the students who could utilize our services – over 500 undecided students and potentially 2,000 or more students needing general education advising in an average semester. In Fall 2001, the SDC advisors met with approximately 25% of the declared GEED (undecided) major at SUU – the population that is assigned to the SDC/SSC for advising. The SDC/SSC strategic objective to improve “GEED” student contact include better tracking of outreach activities and offering more group advising sessions.

A review of demographics of students utilizing SDC/SSC advising services in 2001-02 found the following patterns:

- The Center served slightly more than representative segments of the SUU population in all ethnic areas except African-Americans and Pacific Islanders. (Both of these ethnic populations are very small at Southern Utah University (0.53% and 0.43%, respectively), and may be student athletes who have an advisor in athletics.)
- An examination of SDC/SSC advisees by age shows 19-20 year olds as the proportionately highest utilization group, followed by 21-22 year olds, 25-29 year olds, and then 23-24 year olds.
- The 18-and-under age group makes up 20.82% of the SUU student population, yet comprised only 13.38% of the students utilizing SDC/SSC advising services in Fall 2001.
- Of all SDC/SSC advisees in Fall 2001, 35.1% were freshmen, a slightly disproportionate number as 37.3% of the SUU population were freshmen.
- Although freshmen are the largest actual class of SDC/SSC advisees by headcount, sophomores utilized SDC/SSC advising services at the proportionately higher rate than any other class.

In the year to come, tasks for SDC/SSC staff include a more concerted effort to verify major declaration with SDC/SSC advisees and to find more accurate ways of tracking majors and matriculation into academic programs. Furthermore, SDC/SSC staff plans to provide...
some group advising opportunities during peak advising times.

**University Orientation**

The University Orientation program provides academic advisement and social activities while acquainting students with the services, facilities, opportunities, and responsibilities of being a student. This program begins in the summer prior to the student’s first semester on campus, and students are now required to enroll in UNIV 1000 (*Student Success*) during their first semester. Parents are also provided parallel orientations in the summer.

As outlined in SDC’s Strategic Priorities and Objectives, University Orientation is assessed by student and parent evaluations and by regular staff reviews. Although University Orientation is “required,” there are no formal consequences for students who do not participate in the program. Nevertheless, 1,033 students (approximately 95% of the new freshman class) and 478 parents attended University Orientation during the summer of 2001. Of those 1,033 students, 1,024 (99%) were enrolled in classes at the third week of Fall 2001. The fall-to-fall retention rate of students who participate in University Orientation averages 3% higher than the overall SUU freshman retention rate over the last three years. More dramatically, the retention rate of students who participate in University Orientation averaged 14.7% higher over the past three years than the retention rate of students who did not participate in orientation - an indicator that there is long-term value in the University Orientation program.

**Faculty Advising in the Major**

According to SUU’s *Policies and Procedures 7.1*, "Faculty are given academic advisement responsibilities through the Deans and Department Heads according to policies and procedures which the individual college/[school] deans may establish." The College of Education and the Business School each have had professional advisors, as does the Athletic Department, and by Fall 2003, all colleges will have an advisor. All faculty are expected to adhere to relevant policies (including workload) stipulating that they advise and mentor students and maintain a minimum of five reasonable, publicly posted office hours each week. Departments provide information for major and minor students that can include printed brochures, handouts, online information, and verbal advisement. The *Catalog* lists the requirements for graduation for each degree as well as anticipated semester-to-semester and year-to-year schedules. Faculty and staff who use Student Information Systems (SIS) when advising can often provide more accurate information. Primary responsibility for advising students who want to apply to professional schools or graduate schools rests with each individual department.

The decentralized advising process for students with declared majors has created some inconsistencies across campus. For example, the College of Humanities and Social Science, the largest college in both number of students and FTE ratios, did not enjoy a professional advisor until July 2003. Also, departments have a difficult time identifying majors because students can change or declare majors without directly informing a department. It is believed that advising will improve across the board with the hiring and training of an advisor for each of the academic colleges or schools, effective July 2003.

**Disabled Student Services**

Students with disabilities are encouraged to visit with the director of the program. All faculty are required to have a disability statement on each class syllabus advising students of the location of the Disabled Student Services. See course syllabi among the exhibit materials, and Standard 3 describes this program more fully.

**Veterans Services**

SUU participates with veterans and the Department of Veterans Affairs in all educational benefits offered. The veteran advisor is housed in the Registrar’s Office. See
Standard Two: Educational Program and its Effectiveness

Whenever development or remedial work is required for admission to the institution or any of its programs, clear policies govern the procedures that are followed, including such matters as ability to benefit, permissible student load, and granting of credit. When such courses are granted credit, students are informed of the institution’s policy of whether or not the credits apply toward a degree. (2.C.6) SUU policies governing remedial work are explained in the Catalog in the Admissions Policy section. Students who are under-prepared in three areas—English, mathematics, and reading—are required to take developmental courses if evaluating materials show a need. A student deemed deficient is required to pass 0900-level remedial classes. Students are assessed additional fees to pay for the remedial classes. Additionally, 0900 credit does not count towards credit for graduation.

Several areas deserve mention. Student Support Services provides special services to help developmental needy students. Prior to 2003, these services include developmental classes in English (ENGL 0900 and 0990), in math (Math 0900, 0920 and 0990), and a study skills course. Students scoring below 15 on the ACT are advised to take remedial classes in English. If a student’s math score is below 17, the students is advised to take remedial math and required if the ACT is below 15.

In the area of math placement, the attrition rate for general education math classes has been particularly high. During the 2000-2001 school year, an average of 37% of students registered for college algebra (Math 1050) either received a grade of D, failed the course, withdrew from the course, audited the course, or received an unofficial withdrawal from the course. In quantitative reasoning (Math 1030), 28% of the registered students had one of the same outcomes. (Despite a university requirement of minimum ACT scores, students were not always placed in math classes.) As an alternative, the SUU Math Placement Exam now is used to measure mathematical ability. The results of the exam, the student’s math ACT scores, records of their high school math classes, and their attitude about math are all used in a rubric to decide placement. Students are charged a $15 fee to take the test.

As a second example, SUU’s Writing Center helps students with organization and clarity in writing. A professor in the English Department oversees the writing center and provides guidance to writing peer mentors. All students taking the core English literacy classes pay a $5 fee for computer use, paper and access to peer writing counselors. In the past, responsibilities for advising the writing center and the writing across the curriculum program were borne by one faculty member. Now these responsibilities are split and each supervised by a different individual.

The English as a Second Language (ESL) program helps international students learn English. SUU contracts this program with a third-party, and the objective is to help students succeed with English so they can matriculate in post-secondary coursework. In general, students completing the ESL program do not have sufficient command of English to successfully manage courses in the undergraduate program. The imposition of a minimal TOEFL score prior to matriculation into academic courses would be an improvement.

Remedial instruction is provided at additional cost to students at SUU. During Fall 2000, 43 new freshmen enrolled in a remedial class. During Fall 2001, 147 students enrolled. Because students must pay a premium to take remedial instruction, enrollment figures underestimate the need for remediation in math and English. For example, pilot studies at SUU indicate students need far more help with mathematics than remedial enrollments would indicate. SUU is attempting to change that with regental adoption of Regents’ Policy R-301, as discussed in Standard 1. The cost for remedial instruction in tax funds and tuition in FY 2000-2001 was $25,463 with direct costs of $1,147
per FTE. At the time of this self-study, students were not required to complete remedial work except prior to graduation. Under a revised policy for advising, the requirement is expected to change.

**SUU’s faculty is adequate for the educational levels offered, including full-time faculty representing each field in which it offers major work.** (2.C.7) The institution’s faculty is adequate for the educational levels offered for its undergraduate program. The student-to-faculty ratio for Fall 2001 was 21:1. Instruction by full-time faculty at SUU was 76.4% of all instruction, compared to 57.6% of full-time faculty instruction in all USHE institutions. Resumes for all faculty are available among exhibit materials.

One section of the resume template requires each faculty member to list the classes he or she teaches that may be outside of his or her scholastic field of expertise. Supporting materials are required for any instructor who lacks the expected qualifications or credentials. SUU informally has adopted the “master’s degree plus eighteen hours of in-discipline credit” model for determining the minimal qualification of a particular teacher to teach a course in a particular discipline.

The foregoing practice supports the university’s long-established policy of hiring tenure-track faculty who meet minimal degree requirements. For example, all but one full-time faculty member in the College of Humanities and Social Science has a terminal degree. Other colleges/schools require discipline-specific terminal credentialing as a precondition to the awarding of tenure and rank advancement. (See Policy 6.3, Addendum to Academic Rank.)

In 2002-2003, a number of exigencies forced the English Department (previously the Department of Language and Literature) to use a trial internship program for instructors of composition courses. Outstanding senior students were selected to teach supervised sections of ENGL 1010 (Introduction to Composition) with oversight provided by the Director of Composition. Five seniors (three in Fall 2002 and two in Spring 2003) each taught one section of composition. This experiment was prompted by budget cuts, absence of tenured faculty due to sabbatical leaves, and the raising of SUU’s test-out standards for composition in line with other state institutions. After their admission through a rigorous and competitive process, the interns were required to enroll for a one-credit seminar and follow prescribed guidelines. The English Department considered this experiential learning to be an extension of the successful Writing Center tutorial system. The experiment was discontinued in 2003.

In an effort to further establish an institution’s success with respect to student achievement, the Commission on Colleges shall require those institutions that offer pre-baccalaureate vocational programs to track State licensing examination pass rates, as applicable, and job placement rates. (2.C.8) SUU tracks examination pass rates and reports the data to the Regents and Legislatures in biennial assessment reports. Department binders (in the exhibit area) provide information about each unit's goals and assessment. Course syllabi and student evaluations are also compiled in binders.

**Appraisal**

The university has strengthened the general education program by providing goals, competencies, and learning objectives. Policy has been created to measure outputs of general education and make recommendations for improvement. General education has been tied to the goals/mission of the university. Revision of general education is an ongoing process with mechanisms in place for addition or deletion of classes. Equalization of credit hours and contact hours in general education is in place. Most prerequisites for general education courses have been eliminated. General education now includes interdisciplinary courses that cross discipline boundaries. Philosophy courses and a required computer literacy course have been added to general education. A student success course to improve freshmen retention
has been instituted. The general education subcommittee of the UUCC will now require units to assess general education and the material will be carefully reviewed to make appropriate adjustments in the general education program. Representatives from the university continue to participate in the state-wide assessment of core general education requirements.

The UUCC needs to reduce the menu of general education courses and create a better balance between the arts and quantitative requirements. SUU should move to reduce the buffet menu and create courses that are taught only for general education and meet the stated goals and competencies of general education. The UUCC needs to improve student’s oral communication competencies in general education. The University needs to devise more appropriate and comprehensive assessment (beginning, middle, and ending) activities.

From a student perspective, students have been linked in cohort courses in selected general education courses their first year. Yet, students in business and the sciences are required to take preparatory classes before taking major courses. This results in students having few electives and minimal exposure to general education out of their knowledge area. Units offering general education classes have met the established goals and competencies of general education in the core area but do not necessarily reflect the specific needs of various units. A review of general education is an academic agenda item for 2004

Student Development/Student Success were revived in 2003-04 and major observations can be offered. The personnel responsible for SDC/SSC advising and orientation programs care about students and invest substantial time and energy in advising students. Degree audits completed for students in Registrar’s Office have improved the accuracy of advising. The migration to SCT Banner software holds promise for enhancing services to students in advising, degree audit, and web services. The Registrar’s Office, the SDC/SSC, and the First-Year Experience program have been realigned with the Provost’s office to enhance faculty involvement in these critical programs.

Graduate Program - Standard 2.D

Four Master’s degrees are offered at SUU: Master's of Accountancy, Master's of Business Administration, Master's of Education, and Master's of Fine Arts. (The University of Utah offers the MSW degree at SUU but it is not an SUU degree.) SUU does not offer doctoral programs. Master’s degree programs are limited in number and field to ensure focus on the undergraduate mission, and these programs were instituted to meet regional needs. Each master’s program is controlled by the discipline’s college or school. Each graduate program differs in its mission and goals, as well as their admission, graduation and faculty requirements. Exhibit 2.20 is a list of Graduate Faculty.

Under policy currently drafted, SUU will have a Graduate Council, Graduate Handbook, and other materials by Fall 2003. These policy and procedural materials will provide an operating standard for graduate education while allowing for some program flexibility and autonomy.

The largest graduate programs are those designed for practicing teachers and other educational professionals, as seen below in the listing of current admitted graduate students (2002-2003):

- 23 in the M.Acc. program
- 19 in the MBA program
- 229 in the M.Ed. program plus 287 enrolled in courses pending acceptance into program or students with earned Master’s getting endorsement
- 11 in the MFA program

As the number of masters-level programs increases at SUU, appropriate administrative adjustments will be needed to administer the programs.

Assessment of graduate programs is vital to maintain academic rigor and quality. The College of Education in its NCATE materials included a plan for M.Ed. assessment.
Similarly, in reports to AACSB, the School of Business has developed approaches for graduate assessment for the MBA and M.Acc. programs. The programs also have a number of course-embedded assessments, and have completed one cycle of program assessment. For example, Business graduate students scored in the 70th percentile on the ETS field examination at the graduate level. Further, the MBA program was externally evaluated as part of the substantive change request to NASC. (See further discussion in this section and a copy of the report among exhibit materials.) The MFA, under redesign for 2003-04, has portfolio and capstone activities in the existing program, and it is expected to continue graduate assessment as part of the new design.

The level and nature of graduate degree programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. (2.D.1) SUU offers graduate degree programs that are compatible and complementary to its mission, as approved by the Regents. Professional master’s degrees dominate.

The School of Business (SOB) offers two graduate degrees: Master's of Accountancy (M.Acc.), and Master's of Business Administration (MBA). The Department of Accounting and Information Systems offers the M.Acc. degree. The Department of Management and Marketing and the Department of Economics and Finance jointly offer the MBA degree. The mission and goals for the School of Business and each of its departments are described in the “Strategic Plan” for the School of Business. The mission statement for the School is also in the Catalog and posted to the School’s web page at http://www.suu.edu/business/.

In harmony with the mission of the University, the School of Business views teaching and the enhancement of student learning as its primary mission. The mission of the M.Acc. Program is to achieve excellence in accounting education through teaching, research, and service. The program endeavors to provide high quality accounting preparation for professional careers to students, to make relevant intellectual contributions to the field of accounting through the dissemination of research, and to provide service. The mission of the MBA program is to produce capable business leaders who are prepared with the necessary management and research skills to make high-quality business decisions.

The College of Education (COE) offers an M.Ed. degree with emphases and licensure in the following areas: Administrative / Supervisory License, English as a Second Language (ESL), Gifted and Talented, Mathematics, Reading, Special Education, and Technology. The College of Education has been reviewed for initial National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation. Enrollments in graduate program are substantial: in 2002-2003, 229 master’s candidates were enrolled, along with 287 pending acceptance into the program or seeking only administrative endorsement. Graduation rates for the M.Ed. program are notable; 52% of students finish in three semesters, 33% in six semesters, 11% in nine semesters and 4% in 12 semesters. The College of Education has graduated 619 M.Eds. since 1997.

The mission of Graduate Studies in Education is to develop dynamic teachers and educational administrators who pursue truth, excellence, and knowledge through effective practice, collaboration, and scholarship. The graduate program has been especially tailored to meet the needs of in-service teachers and individuals who desire to advance their educational training and expertise. COE programs can be traced to the beginnings of SUU and its original mission as a Branch Normal School as well as to the current mission statement of SUU.

The Master's of Fine Arts (MFA) program in arts administration provides a practical interdisciplinary education. Professional assistantships, individual tutorials, and direct access to master teachers are combined to create a practical learning methodology that is consistent with SUU’s mission of providing
scholarly activities, quality service, and a personalized learning environment.

The MFA program aligns itself well at SUU by utilizing faculty and professional guests who exemplify excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professional contributions to the field of arts administration. It also provides services to both the public and private sectors through professional assistantships with the College of Performing and Visual Arts (PVA) and to affiliates such as the Utah Shakespearean Festival, the American Folk Ballet, and the Braithwaite Fine Arts Gallery. These partnerships, in addition to other local and regional opportunities in the arts, enable graduate students to apply their scholarship first-hand in a professional working environment. The MFA is undergoing a redesign for 2003-04 to accommodate more students and gain greater efficiency.

**SUU’s programs of study at the graduate level are guided by well-defined and appropriate educational objectives and differ from undergraduate programs in requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities.** (2.D.2)

Admission criteria, graduation requirements, and course descriptions for all graduate programs are published in the Catalog and posted to the University’s web pages, and will be included in the new Graduate Handbook.

There are five learning objectives for students in the graduate programs in the School of Business Strategic Plan. The first of these requires that graduates at the masters-level will “have greater depth of development in each objective listed for our Baccalaureate graduates.” The remaining graduate objectives require each masters-level student to:

- Synthesize and extend compartmentalized knowledge.
- Possess high levels of analytical capability to facilitate decision making in the most complex environments.
- Possess the strategic thinking skills necessary to provide vision and mission to their organization.
- Perceive mission-appropriate opportunities within a dynamic environment, and effectively manage the resources of the organization to capture their benefits.

The graduate learning objectives of the School of Business are fully supported by the M.Acc. and MBA curricula and processes.

The M.Acc. degree requires 15 graduate credit hours in accounting and 15 graduate credit hours of MBA courses. There are six M.Acc. courses (excluding credit for graduate readings and internships), and ten MBA courses (excluding the accelerated MBA foundation courses). The MBA degree requires 30 graduate credit hours. In addition, graduate accounting students are encouraged to participate in the Professional Accountancy Club (PAC) and other accounting activities such as Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) and competitions. MBA students are required to work independently to review literature and synthesize information. Students are expected to initiate and complete research or other projects necessary for new ventures. Finally, group work is encouraged through interactive assignments and team projects to complete assigned cases and projects.

The M.Acc. degree exposes students to advanced topics in accounting and business, such as estate and gift taxes, estate planning, taxation for pass through entities, management and cost accounting, accounting theory and practice, business law, quantitative methods, organizational issues, issues in business, managerial economics, marketing management, and strategic analysis. The MBA degree exposes students to advanced topics in management accounting, economics, marketing, management, and finance. A capstone course in strategic analysis is required of all MBA students.

Within the College of Education, the total credits required for the M.Ed. degree is 36 credit hours. The program is aligned with the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS). These standards represent a commitment to maintaining high and rigorous
expectations for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do. Administration/Supervision courses are aligned with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. Master’s of Education candidates seeking state licensure in educational administration must achieve a score of at least 590 on the PRAXIS Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision test. The exam was imposed initially during 2002-03 and results are not yet available. Candidates must also demonstrate professional competency through presenting a portfolio addressing Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and ELCC standards to the Master’s Advisory Committee. Master's candidates must establish a Committee early in their program for the purpose of advising and approval of research, creative project, or NBPTS portfolio.

The educational objective of the MFA in Arts Administration is to develop graduates who can balance administrative structure with artistic process to ensure the artistic integrity and fiscal responsibility of arts organizations. Currently, SUU does not offer undergraduate curriculum in the area of arts administration. Students enrolled in the MFA program are required to possess an advanced level of scholarship and practicum experience in comparison to undergraduates in arts administration programs at peer institutions.

Five learning objectives, as indicators of proficiency, have been established by the faculty members of the MFA program. Students in the MFA program will:

- Successfully apply critical and analytical thinking to practical problems in arts administration.
- Research past and current events to formulate opinions and potential solutions to problems within the field of arts administration.
- Meet with a committee of faculty, staff, and assistantship supervisors to receive feedback on their performance in the program and their ability to evidence that course work is being related to their duties in a professional working environment.
- Present and defend their final rotation internship experience through demonstration of the fulfillment of a substantive work experience as evidenced by a professional capstone portfolio of accomplishments.
- Find jobs relating to their degree and focus of study upon completion of the program.

SUU does not offer doctoral degree programs. (2.D.3.)

**Appraisal**

With student learning as its primary mission, the M.Acc. and MBA programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. The general and specific learning objectives are well-defined in the School’s “Strategic Plan.” The M.Acc. program provides extensive opportunities to develop professional skills through the Professional Accountancy Club, Volunteer Income Tax Assistance, tax competitions, and internships. In 2002, for example, 43 accounting students prepared 311 tax returns and helped another 237 individuals with various tax forms and questions.

Assessment tools indicate that the M.Acc. program is providing an excellent learning experience. In exit interviews, graduating M.Acc. students respond that learning objectives are accomplished. The first-time CPA exam pass-rate is within the range of pass rates at comparable institutions. The graduate tax team placed in the top 20 nationally on the Andersen Tax Challenge in 2001. Nearly all of the M.Acc. students are placed in accounting positions before graduation. Although the CPA exam pass rate is comparable to peer institutions, it could be better. We have modified a graduate accounting seminar to emphasize the CPA exam. Feedback from employers and national surveys indicate the need to emphasize communication skills. The accounting faculty has strengthened its commitment to developing this competency by
adding more oral and written assignments. Pre-test/post-test results indicate significant improvement.

The MBA program is only in its fourth year, and thus assessment data is somewhat limited. ETS MBA Field Exam results show great improvement in achieving knowledge outcomes (70th percentile in 2002; 94th percentile in 2003). Accounting, Finance, and Marketing were also strong with 94th percentile scores and 75th and 88th percentiles, respectively, in Management and Strategic Integration. Although these scores are at or above our 75th percentile goal, these suggest areas that need improvement. The employer satisfaction survey assessed employer expectations and graduate outcomes for ten skill areas. We exceeded employer expectations in the area of computer skills and were very close to meeting expectations in research skills, ability to work in groups, supervisory ability, ability to work alone and problem solving skills. The skills areas in need of greatest improvement are in writing, oral performance and speaking, and listening. Efforts are underway to address these areas.

A survey of MBA graduates found that students were satisfied with class sizes, scheduling and sequencing, and were dissatisfied with placement and networking opportunities. Similar findings have been echoed by student focus groups. In regard to program content, feedback suggests that the emphasis on quantitative analysis and the basic business functional areas need to be strengthened. We will address these concerns in the Fall 2003 curriculum review. Concerns about placement and networking opportunities are being addressed by our National Business Advisory Board and our Alumni Advisory Board. Through an oversight, we were unable to assess coverage of building on the e-business undergraduate objective.

Consistent with the scope of the University’s goals and mission, the M.Ed. program enrolls more than 200 students from urban and rural areas across Utah and the southwest region. In the last six years, more than 600 students have completed degree requirements. Among program strengths is an initiative implemented in Fall 2003 to deliver the M.Ed.’s administrative/ supervisory license entirely online in a distance learning format. During the 2003-04 academic year, it is intended that the bulk of the other M.Ed. courses will have the option of distance learning delivery. To assure program growth, it is important that funding for alternative delivery options (e.g., distance learning and outreach) be continued.

The MFA program has supported SUU’s mission of providing scholarly activities, quality service and a personalized learning environment. It has provided valuable support to the professional components of the University; Utah Shakespearean Festival, Braithwaite Gallery and the American Folk Ballet, as well as the academic units of the College of Performing and Visual Arts. The students have successfully applied classroom knowledge in practical applications and the first graduating class has now entered into the professional arena. Due to economic factors, the MFA program has been asked to reevaluate the delivery of curriculum and number of students admitted to the program. This process is underway and the MFA program will submit a reorganization plan on November 1, 2003, to the administration of the University. This reorganization will reflect a realignment of the program under the Department of Theatre and Dance, an increase from 8 to 13 students enrolled in the program, and expanded interdisciplinary delivery of classes. This restructuring will provide greater financial viability for the program while maintaining the integrity of the MFA degree in the field of arts administration.

Graduate Faculty and Related Resources - Standard 2.E

SUU provides evidence that it makes available for graduate programs the required resources for faculty, facilities, equipment, laboratories, library and information resources wherever the graduate programs are offered and however delivered. (2.E.1) The President and Provost
have supported the School of Business’ continuous improvement processes, especially those related to accreditation by the American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business (AACSB) and ACBSP accreditation. For example, in the School of Business, SUU has been able to attract and hire new faculty at near-market salaries. See Exhibit 2.21, Annual Progress Report to AACSB, December 14, 2001. Beginning in Fall 2003 courses for the MBA degree will be offered in St. George. The M.Ed. is also delivered to Richfield, a program that has funding earmarked to support the program.

The College of Education, School of Business, and/or the University provide resources for scholarly travel, conference fees, and journal subscriptions. For example, in 2001-2002, the scholarly travel budget was approximately $1,000 per faculty member if presenting a conference paper. Professional certification fees for the professionally-qualified faculty were also paid by the School. Teaching and scholarly resources continue to receive funding support. Most classrooms in the Business Building and Old Main have been mediated and are well equipped. (Old Main has since been closed due to structural and safety concerns.) Most graduate faculty and staff members have a personal computer and printer, and each program has at least one mobile system (laptop and projector) available for all faculty use.

Other forms of funding and financial support are available for faculty. For example, in 2002 the School of Business funded a regional survey of about 150 employers of accounting graduates. In addition, course load, course reduction, and course preparation policies are tailored to the research needs of graduate-qualified faculty in the School. The School of Business regularly provides funding for graduate students to work as assistants to the graduate faculty each year. For example, in 2001, four graduate accounting students were funded as assistants. Two served as tutors to undergraduate accounting students in the accounting lab; the remaining two were shared by the accounting faculty. In 2002, five graduate accounting students were funded as assistants.

In terms of library and information resources, the Sherratt Library’s collection of journals and books in the library is extremely limited to support the MBA and the M.Ed. programs. Fortunately, electronic databases have improved access significantly. Because many top academic journals only release abstracts to electronic databases, the library’s efficient interlibrary loan program is also used by faculty for both teaching and scholarly purposes.

Due to the budget situation in 2003, the University furloughed the MFA program for 2003-04 to: 1) redesign the program for a minimum of 13 students; 2) study alternate funding models; and 3) prepare for the 2004-05 academic year should a feasibility study prove favorable. Aside from this latest development, however, SUU supports the MFA program’s need for faculty, facilities, library holdings and information resources by providing ongoing funding for faculty and staff salaries, operational expenses, and student assistantships within prescribed resource limits. In addition, SUU makes available funding to support the professional development of the faculty in attending workshops, lectures, conferences and conventions that keep them abreast of the needs and concerns of the arts arena.

SUU demonstrates a continuing commitment of resources to initiate graduate programs and to ensure that the graduate programs maintain pace with the expansion of knowledge and technology. (2.E.2) SUU is enhancing its graduate programs with financial resources in the latest formula budget, and it is planning for the gradual addition of programs as resources allow. A proposal for a MS degree in Communication has been prepared for the Trustees and Regents next year. Additional approved concentrations in the M.Ed. degree are also being developed in Science Education for the near future.

Institutions offering graduate degrees have appropriate full-time faculty in areas
appropriate to the degree offered and whose main activity lies with the institution. Such faculty are related by training and research to the disciplines in which they teach and supervise research. (2.E.3) Faculty members who teach graduate courses are appropriate, qualified, full-time faculty. See faculty resumes prepared for Standard 4 for examples.

Graduate faculty members in the School of Business must meet AACSB-International “academically qualified” standards in terms of appropriate terminal degree and publishing in peer-reviewed journals and conferences. All eleven faculty have appropriate terminal degrees. Occasionally, “professionally qualified” accounting faculty (M.Acc. with extensive professional experience) are allowed to teach specialized graduate courses based on their unique professional expertise. The School has policies in place defining scholarly activity requirements for graduate faculty members (15 points over a five year period and at least two peer reviewed journal publications (see School of Business Policies and Procedures Section 5, Intellectual Contributions). Only one faculty member has met the scholarly activity requirements and that faculty member has nearly completed a faculty development plan that will achieve the standard. Graduate faculty members conduct research in their specific fields and in nearly all cases the research directly contributes to the classroom teaching environment.

Graduate faculty members in education also have terminal degrees in their respective fields. Further, the College of Education monitors its graduate program and faculty with a Master’s Advisory Committee that addresses issues in regards to program development, thesis/project/portfolio requirements, and graduate committee assignments.

Similarly, graduate faculty members teaching in the MFA program must have a terminal degree in their field of study (preferably in the arts or business) and significant professional achievements as a faculty member and/or professional arts administrator. A Director and Assistant Director, both with terminal degrees and extensive professional experience, were hired in 2001 to build the program.

SUU’s faculty are adequate in number and sufficiently diversified within disciplines so as to provide effective teaching, advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, as well as to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, and development. Small graduate programs ordinarily require the participation of several full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education. (2.E.4) There are twelve faculty members assigned as graduate faculty members, teaching in the MBA and M.Acc. programs (four in accounting, two in economics, one in finance, three in management and one in marketing). According to their strategic plan, faculty members in the School of Business view teaching and the enhancement of student learning as their primary mission. Through research and service activities, faculty members acquire enriching experiences that extend to the classroom and set an example of life-long learning. All faculty in the School of Business are required to develop and maintain a “teaching effectiveness portfolio.” The improvement of teaching is viewed as a continuous process, and individual faculty have the right and responsibility to demonstrate and document their teaching effectiveness. Required items include summaries of student evaluations; a written self-assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities; and a written action plan to address weaknesses, to take advantage of opportunities, and to capitalize on strengths.

Intellectual contributions are measured at two levels for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School of Business. At the school level, the average number of peer-reviewed items per tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to be greater than or equal to two per year, and the average number of peer-reviewed journal articles per faculty per year is expected to be greater than or equal to 0.5 per year. At the individual level, all tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the School of Business are expected to be “active” scholars, defined as
Standard Two: Educational Program and its Effectiveness

making at least one intellectual contribution per year. Clearly, graduate-qualified faculty members in the School of Business conduct research, publish, render professional service in the areas that they teach, and share the results of these experiences in the classroom. For more details, see “Intellectual Contributions” and “Output Analysis” (SUU’s Strategic Plan), along with materials in Standard 4.

Over the preceding five-year period, the 12 Business graduate faculty members have produced the following:

- 17 paper presentations per year
- 11 refereed journal publications per year
- 3 published text books
- 21 memberships in professional organizations per year
- 28 outside consulting projects per year
- 22 service to profession per year
- 6 honors, awards or recognitions

Nearly all of these activities connect directly to the classroom teaching experience.

To help provide time for intellectual contributions and service, the School of Business has set limits for course load and preparations. The normal expected faculty teaching load for academically-qualified faculty teaching in the graduate program is 9 credits per semester. Professionally-qualified faculty teach 12 credits per semester, unless they are teaching in the graduate program, for which they will get a one-course reduction in that same semester. Annual teaching preparations are to be less than or equal to four for academically-qualified faculty or less than or equal to five for professionally-qualified faculty.

Within the College of Education, the graduate faculty is sufficiently diversified within disciplines to provide effective teaching and advising. However, due to teaching load (both undergraduate and graduate courses combined), the Graduate Faculty is challenged to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, development, and scholarly and/or creative activity. The ratio of graduate students to COE Graduate Faculty is 26:1.

Faculty members supporting the M.Ed. program have teaching load ranges between 12 and 15 credit hours per semester. On an average, 40% of the graduate courses are taught as overloads. Still, faculty members have time for scholarly activities. According to the COE Annual Report of Faculty Productivity for 2001-2002, graduate faculty produced the following:

- 12 referred scholarly publications
- 14 referred presentations
- 124 documents, books, creative projects
- 13 research projects
- 49 memberships in professional organizations
- 31 services to profession
- 8 outside consulting
- 7 honors, awards or recognitions

Clearly, faculty work diligently to maintain currency in their fields and have demonstrated their commitment to professional development.

The MFA program is the newest graduate program at SUU. The two full-time faculty members accomplished much in terms of teaching effectiveness and advisement. They were actively involved in committees that address curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, and institutional planning and development. Diversification within disciplines was provided by guest lecturers brought in specifically for the Artistic and Administrative Seminar. Professional expertise is required in certain areas of study such as marketing and fundraising for the nonprofit arts arena. Professional guest artists fulfill this need in the Art Administration program. Partnerships with the College of Performing and Visual Arts, the School of Business, and the Department of Communication provide faculty expertise and support.

In the delivery of off-campus programs, full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education provide physical presence and participation in the planning, delivery, and assessment of the program. (2.E.5) The School of Business is planning to offer courses in St. George in Fall 2004. Off-campus programs in education are
delivered at the University Center, St. George, and Richfield as well as through EdNET. Off-campus courses are determined by graduate student need in the area, and all courses are taught in the evenings. EdNET courses are pre-approved by the Dean of the COE to ensure the standard of instruction and course requirements. The MFA program does not deliver off-campus programs at this time.

**Appraisal**

Business graduate faculty have appropriate terminal degrees and are well published and well connected to their disciplines. Only one professionally qualified faculty member is allowed to teach in the M.Acc. and he has met graduate publishing requirements. All five business disciplines have representation on the graduate faculty. As the MBA and M.Acc. programs grow, we have additional faculty members that meet the graduate faculty requirements. The school has two computer labs and nine fully-mediated classrooms available to support graduate courses, including a graduate seminar classroom with laptop ports. Library support in terms of journals and databases is marginally acceptable. However, faculty and students have excellent support through interlibrary loan. Databases for analyses are adequate. Students taking MBA courses in St. George have access to computer labs at Dixie State College and full access to SUU library databases. The St. George students will be taught by the same mix of graduate faculty as on-campus students.

All faculty (full-time and adjunct) teaching in the M.Ed. program hold requisite degrees and specialized qualifications in their assigned areas of instruction. To maintain ongoing and steady program growth, it is important that appropriate resources be allocated for distance learning initiatives, travel to outreach sites in SUU’s service areas, increased use of technology in the instructional program, professional development for faculty, and hiring of qualified adjuncts in outreach areas.

The MFA program has resources for faculty, facilities, equipment and library resources. The MFA program and the University offer resources to promote faculty development, travel to conferences, and library holdings. The one full-time faculty member is serving as the Interim Division Head of the program as well as the Associate Dean of the College of Performing and Visual Arts. The program has been fortunate in that the position for a new Division Head was retained and will be filled after the completion of the restructuring of the program. Faculty outside the program hold terminal degrees that support the curriculum needs of the MFA students. Future collaboration with other faculty at the University will enhance the breadth of the student educational experience.

**Graduate Records and Academic Credit - Standard 2.F**

Graduate program admission policies and regulations are consistent with and supportive of the character of the graduate programs offered by the institution. These policies and regulations are published and made available to prospective and enrolled students. Graduate program admission policies and regulations reflect SUU’s commitment to quality graduate education. The policies and regulations are published in the Catalog and other materials, and they are made available to prospective and enrolled students. Graduate program admission policies and regulations are consistent throughout the four graduate programs in the areas of credentials, letters of recommendation, graduate exams specific to the graduate program, and other information such as statements of purpose and essays.

For example, to be considered for admission to the School of Business, applicants must have completed an appropriate bachelor’s degree and attain a minimum score of 1150 on the School of Business admissions index (200 x Undergraduate GPA + GMAT Score). Applicants with scores between 1100 and 1150 may be admitted conditionally. Those with scores below 1100 generally are not accepted.
into the programs. A committee comprised of the Dean of the School and Department Chairs (Graduate Admissions Committee for the School) reviews applications for the graduate programs.

Admission to all graduate programs is based on information submitted with the formal application such as undergraduate and graduate transcripts, official reports on nationally recognized tests, and evaluations by professionals in the field or other faculty-controlled evaluation procedures. (2.F.2)

All graduate admissions decisions regarding applicants are based on information provided by the applicant, as noted above and as published in the *Graduate Handbook*. Completed files are reviewed by the Graduate Admissions Committee of the appropriate college or school. Incomplete application packages are filed until the applicant provides the necessary items. If accepted by the Committee, the student is allowed to matriculate.

Required common elements for admission to the graduate program include the following: completed official application for admission; completed Bachelor’s degree from an accredited college or university; submitted official transcripts from a university/college; combined score of 1,000 or above on the verbal and quantitative section of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) or 450 on the GMAT; and letters of recommendation.

Also for the M.Ed. program, applicants must provide a current and valid teaching certificate with at least two years successful teaching experience (documented); handwritten statement addressing reasons for application; and a sample of formal written work. Master’s candidates for the Administrative/Supervisory License Track must complete 450 contact hours (12 credit hours) of Internship. Administrative / Supervisory candidates are required to achieve a score of at least 590 on the PRAXIS Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision test. Moreover, they must demonstrate professional competency through presenting a portfolio addressing ISLLC and ELCC standards to the Master’s Advisory Committee prior to licensure.

Students applying to the MFA program must also provide a completed resume including academic, professional, and volunteer experience; a Statement of Purpose; and have a successful interview with the Program Director.

Faculty teaching in graduate programs are involved in establishing both general admission criteria for graduate study as well as admission criteria to specific graduate programs. (2.F.3) Faculty members teaching in each of the graduate programs are involved in establishing general admission and specific admission criteria, as well as degree requirements. A committee on graduate curriculum has been coordinating, reviewing, and recommending graduate curriculum. A new policy establishing a Graduate Council to oversee all elements of SUU’s graduate program has been adopted for 2003-04. The Council is comprised of faculty.

Graduate requirements for advanced degrees offered by the institution are determined by the faculty teaching in the applicable graduate programs. At minimum, the policies governing these graduation requirements include: specified time period in which the degree must be completed; number of credit hours that must be completed at the degree-granting institution; minimum number of graduate-level credits; minimum of one academic year of fulltime study or its equivalent with a minimum of 24 semester hours; number of graded credit hours; minimum standard of performance or acceptable grade point average; types of qualifying and exit examinations; proficiency requirements; thesis, writing or research requirement. (2.F.4) Minimum graduation requirements are set by faculty and approved by respective deans of the colleges and schools. Consent of the faculty is an integral part of the process of determining minimum graduation.

An example of this process is in the MFA program where faculty members determine the graduation requirements. The MFA program requires that all students enter at the beginning.
of the Fall semester and remain in residence for a minimum of five semesters, and a sixth professional residency semester can be completed on or off campus. Students must successfully present and defend a capstone portfolio to the MFA program faculty members. Students must complete the MFA program within six years of their first semester’s enrollment. A total of 60 credit hours is required for the degree in addition to a minimum of 20 hours per week of work through the professional assistantship. Students must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 for all graduate courses to graduate. All graduate classes in the MFA emphasize practical applications to instructional theory through class discussion and presentations, critical thinking activities, research of current events, formal writing assignments and research papers, and other practical assignments as outlined in course syllabi.

This pattern of faculty setting requirements has been repeated for each graduate program.

Transfer of graduate credit is evaluated by faculty based on policies established by faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education, or by a representative body of such faculty who are responsible for the degree program at the receiving institution. (2.F.5) Graduate students in the M.Acc. and MBA programs may transfer up to 12 credit hours from another institution, provided that the college or university was accredited by either AACSB or ACBSP. Acceptance of such credit is made by the School Graduate Admissions Committee. Transfer of graduate credit for the M.Ed. is evaluated by the Chair of the Teacher Education Department. The MFA program does not accept transfer credit at this time.

Graduate credit may be granted for internships, field experiences, and clinical practices that are an integral part of the graduate degree program. (2.F.6) Both the M.Acc. and MBA programs allow up to 3 credits for internship and related work. A variety of other field experiences are also offered outside of the internship courses, such as embedded course requirements that require interactions with local employers and special projects involving commercial entities.

For the M.Ed. program, more practical, clinical experience is expected of students. Twelve graduate credits is granted for Internship of 450 contact hours (combined: 225 elementary and 225 secondary) hours in the Administrative / Supervisory Track. Internship placement is managed through the Teacher Education Field Experience Office.

Students in the MFA program are required to spend the sixth semester of their program in a professional residency either on or off campus. The professional residency is accompanied by a professional capstone project that is juried by a graduate committee.

SUU is implementing a number of initiatives to support graduate education. A Graduate Curriculum Committee has been established but a Graduate Council with an expanded assignment will soon replace it. A Graduate Handbook was adopted as a common standard for all programs. Finally, policies governing graduate education, admissions, requirements, and programs have been drafted and are in process of campus review. The recent division of the Teacher Education program and the creation of an Office of Graduate Studies within the College will provide more direct supervision of the M.Ed. program.

Appraisal

Prior to 2002-2003, business graduate admissions were overseen by just one person (the associate dean). Now, admissions criteria and processes are overseen by a graduate committee. Students whose School of Business admissions index fall below 1150 are reviewed carefully by the committee to determine admission status. Students who are admitted conditionally or provisionally are notified in writing of any conditions imposed and student records are notated. An application deadline has been established for guaranteed consideration
and for scholarships and assistantships. Otherwise, rolling admission is used for additional applications, subject to capacity. On average, we have 26 applications for the M.Acc. program with an 80 percent acceptance rate. The average GMAT score has grown from 493 in 2001 to 533 for 2002. The average undergraduate GPA was 3.62 in 2002 and 3.36 in 2003, indicating we are adhering to minimum GPA standards. Generally, an average about 28-30 applications for the MBA are submitted each year with a 90 percent acceptance rate. The average GMAT score was 545 in 2001 and 551 in 2002.

Policies and procedures stipulating admission, continuous progress, and degree completion have been clearly defined and articulated to students in the M.Ed. program. Through formation of an M.Ed. Advisory Committee, regular input to promote program improvement has been sought from students, area educators, and program faculty. As a result, program quality and academic rigor have been significantly upgraded.

Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities - Standard 2.G

SUU provides evidence that all off-campus, continuing education (credit and non-credit), and other special programs are compatible with the institution's mission and goals, and are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures. (2.G.1) The School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS) includes distance education (web-based instruction, EdNET, off-site credit, study abroad, and related programs), conference services (support for meetings and events in the Hunter Conference Center and at the Mountain Center), and support functions for the School.

Upon review for this self-study and for other internal purposes, it was determined that the SCPS raised a series of basic questions: What is the mission of SCPS and how does it relate to the SUU mission statement? Is SCPS the best place for summer school administration? Why are independent study courses from the departments administered through SCPS? What role should SCPS play in sponsoring credit, non-credit, certificate, training, and other programs? To what extent can SCPS be self-sufficient? How will academic rigor be maintained? How will unit and program assessment occur?

While noting that the SCPS offered limitless potential to the non-credit programs and courses of SUU, its mission and role statement needed revision to better support SUU’s mission. Also, the SCPS was encouraged to offer study abroad opportunities, and to redefine itself as a more typical continuing education operation, focusing on non-credit programs, distance education, concurrent or dual enrollment, conference services, and workshops. In this review, the SCPS was urged to consider appropriate restructuring and prepare a business plan for its near-term operations. Finally, the SCPS was directed to develop policy regarding distance education.

As a result, a business plan was drafted with a new mission statement, a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis, marketing and financial details, new procedures, and a more definitive role. The University also invited to campus in Spring 2003 an external reviewer and consultant to examine the draft plan and interview the SCPS team and SUU administrators. The consultant’s report validated and strengthened the business plan and provided valuable input to the University administration.

By these actions and accompanying initiatives, SCPS is more compatible with SUU’s mission and goals, as well as the provisions of this standard. See Exhibits 2.22 and 2.23 for more information. The SCPS regularly evaluates all its courses and special learning activities. Exhibit 2.24 includes a summary of SCPS sites and enrollments.

SUU is solely responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. The institution conforms to Policy A-6.
(2.G.2) The SCPS is in alignment with institutional policy regarding academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. As a part of the institution, the SCPS adheres to State Board of Regents Policy Section 5. The business plan calls for greater rigor and accountability in program development and fiscal control.

Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities. (2.G.3) Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of credit-based continuing education and special learning activities. Evidence of this can be found in the new draft policy on distance education, the SCPS business plan, and in SUU Policies and Procedures 6.8.

The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral component of the institution’s organization. (2.G.4) As a part of the institution, the SCPS proves to be an important venue for generating new revenue streams and for enrollment growth. Its health and vitality as an entrepreneurial and academic component to the institution is crucial as SUU asserts itself as a regional university.

Programs and courses offered through electronically-mediated or other distance delivery systems provide ready access to appropriate learning resources and provide sufficient time and opportunities (electronic or others) for students to interact with faculty. (2.G.5) Programs and courses offered through electronically-mediated or other distance delivery systems (e.g., television) provide ready access to appropriate learning resources. Students who enroll in internet courses have full access to the SUU library, the SUU writing center and tutors. This access is clearly defined in the SUU Catalog and in the Policies and Procedures manual generated from the office of Distance Learning. Interaction with faculty is excellent in the area of distance learning.

Course evaluations continue to show that students feel like they are part of a personal learning environment. The English 1010 class, a freshman-level writing course, is geared to be a private workshop with the instructor as well as a forum to encourage the formation of a community of learners. Exhibit 2.25 lists distance education courses for 2002.

All electronically-mediated courses, like WebCT, have the private email and bulletin board discussion functions where students can access the instructor. Some instructors enjoy using the online chat function to enhance student contact. SUU could better utilize online, synchronous student-teacher communication. Many televised courses have parallel websites and Web CT platforms to allow students greater access to instructors and to their classmates. The SCPS business plan revitalizes this area or responsibility.

SUU provides an equitable fee structure and refund policy. (2.G.6) An equitable fee structure and refund policy exists and has been updated in the new business plan. The fee structure is established by the institution and is found in the SUU Catalog and is in line with the Utah State Board of Regents Policy Section 5. All prices are clearly published in catalogs and on the SCPS websites. The refund policy can be found in the SCPS Policies and Procedures Handbook. Full refunds are available within the first month from enrollment date, and although withdrawals are possible after the first month, no refund will be given. There have been extenuating circumstances where this policy has been revised to meet a special need, such as illness, family emergency, or military duty.

The granting of credit for continuing education courses and special learning activities is based upon institutional policy, consistent throughout the institution, and applied wherever located and however delivered. (2.G.7) Provisions for this is established and provided for in SUU Policies and Procedures 6.16.

Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs or courses offered for
academic credit are approved in advance by the appropriate institutional body and monitored through established procedures. (2.G.8) This process is safeguarded by the use of a Curriculum/Course Proposal Form that must be approved at all levels before a course is delivered and before credit is awarded. In the past, we have had departments and groups who have tried to seek credit after a course has been taught. In most instances, these courses are not approved. See Policy 6.8.

Credit for prior experiential learning is offered only at the undergraduate level and in accordance with Policy 2.3 – Credit for Prior Experiential Learning. (2.G.9) The institution provides cooperative education as described in the 2001-2002 SUU Catalog, page 41.

An institution offering an external degree, degree-completion program, or special degree has clearly articulated policies and procedures concerning admission to the program, transfer of prior-earned credit, credit by examination, credit for prior experiential learning, credit by evaluation, and residency requirements. (2.G.10) The SCPS does not offer an external degree or program on its own. It does, however, participate in a degree program offered through the Utah Electronic College established at the State Board of Regents level. The policies and procedures for that program can be found at http://www.utahcj.org.

When credit is measured by outcomes alone or other nontraditional means, student learning and achievement are demonstrated to be at least comparable in breadth, depth, and quality to the results of traditional instructional practices. (2.G.11) The SCPS does not offer credit courses based entirely on outcomes or other nontraditional means. All credit bearing courses require the breadth, depth, and quality of traditional instructional practices.

Travel/study courses meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same institutional control as other courses and programs offered by the sponsoring or participating institution. Credit is not awarded for travel alone. (2.G.12) NASC 2.4 Policy on Study Abroad Programs. SUU just initiated a study abroad program. Its goals and future plans are part of the new SCPS business plan that documents its intentions for academic rigor. The Study Abroad program is designed to comply fully with NASC indicators and policies. See the SCPS business plan in the exhibit materials for more information.

Appraisal

An essential function of SUU, the School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SPCS) has recently been restructured and redesigned for the future. Its operating procedures conform to institutional and NASC standards, and its new leadership, programs, and direction hold great promise for SUU.

Non-Credit Programs and Courses - Standard 2.H

Non-credit programs and courses are administered under appropriate institutional policies, regulations, and procedures. Faculty are involved, as appropriate, in planning and evaluating non-credit programs. (2.H.1) The SCPS offers several non-credit courses which serve the interests and needs of the community. Some examples are classes in Horsemanship, Mountain Biking, and “Spanish for Fun.” These courses are developed “as needed” and will be expanded based on market studies. Where appropriate, these courses intersect with relevant faculty, departments, and colleges. At present no evaluation process exists for these courses, but the business plan sets forth guidelines for an evaluative process for all SCPS offerings.

SUU maintains records for audit purposes which describe the nature, level, and quantity of service provided through non-credit instruction. (2.H.2) The institution maintains records in the SCPS which describes the nature, level, and quantity of service provided through non-credit instruction. This “in-house” procedure is not defined by policy, but it lends itself to easy auditing. The business plan requires a core
systematic and formal monitoring process that is auditable and accountable.

*When offering courses that award CEU, the institution follows national guidelines for awarding and recording such units which call for one CEU being equivalent to 10 hours of instruction and appropriate to the objectives of the course.* (2.H.3) SUU’s SCPS follows national guidelines for awarding and recording CEU’s.

**Appraisal**

Non-credit programs offered through SCPS are marketed, controlled, and reported according to institutional policies and guidelines. Appropriate records are maintained in the SCPS.

**Academic Colleges and Schools**

SUU’s academic programs are organized into six colleges or schools: the College of Education, College of Humanities and Social Science, College of Performing and Visual Arts, College of Science, School of Applied Science and Technology, and School of Business. In addition, the School of Continuing and Professional Studies provides organization for a variety of programs. Each school or college is headed by a dean responsible for all faculty, staff, students, and programs within the unit. This section of Standard 2 briefly describes each major academic unit, and more detailed information is found in relevant materials and binders in the Exhibits area. Specially-prepared binders for each unit include descriptions of programs, degrees, faculty, unit plans, assessment information, and other materials to document our institutional self-study.

**College of Education**

**Mission:** The College views its primary purpose as providing students a personalized learning environment that fosters meaningful experiences involving the mind, the heart, and the hands. It is committed to preparing informed, stimulating, and effective educators for service in Utah schools as well as schools beyond Utah’s borders. It also seeks to prepare physical education professionals who value excellence in all areas of the profession.

**Description:** The Physical Education Department and the Teacher Education Department are housed in the College of Education. The College of Education also provides leadership for the SUU Head Start Program, a federally-funded Head Start and early intervention program serving 435 children and their families in a six-county area of southern Utah. The college offers a Master’s Degree in Education with eight track options; a Bachelor of Arts/Science Degree in Elementary Education with eleven minor options; a Bachelor of Arts/Science degree in Secondary Education with thirty-three major/minor options; a Special education in Mild/Moderate Dual Major; a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education; a Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training; a Physical Education Minor; and a Health Education Minor.

The College of Education generated 10,888 SCH’s in Fall 2001, placing it fourth out of SUU’s five colleges/schools (at that time) in SCH production. In Fall 2002, the COE accounted for 15% of student credit hours produced, ranking third among SUU’s colleges/schools. The college employs 15% of SUU’s faculty while serving 14.3% of the students. The college employs 30 faculty with 40% of the faculty tenured and 64% of the faculty holding the doctorate degree. Faculty teach an average of 10.2 credit hours with an average number of different preparation per headcount faculty of 2.6 per semester. The college has hired 48.5% of its faculty in the past five years (SUU average is 50%) and has 47% female faculty.

The Professional Education Coordinating Council (PECC) serves as the advisory body for SUU's Professional Education Unit (PEU). The PECC offers insight and advice in three crucial areas: (1) selection, evaluation, and assignment of Unit faculty; (2) program approval, assessment, and review; and (3) recruitment,
admissions, and retention of candidates in the various programs which comprise the unit. They also certify that faculty are qualified in accordance with NCATE standards. PECC maintains current information about NCATE and other applicable professional standards and conducts systematic reviews and evaluations of existing professional education programs for the purpose of program improvement.

Goals:
- Achieve and maintain NCATE accreditation. The NCATE Board of Examiners review team conducted the site review in April 2003.
- Achieve and maintain National Athletic Training Accreditation (NATA). The program has met all pre-conditions and has received candidacy status. The site visit will occur in Fall 2003.
- Secure funding for a new Teacher Education building.
- Establish a Center for “Best Practices in Teaching and Learning” with emphasis in math, science, and technology instruction.
- Establish a Professional Development School (PDS) at the Kindergarten through 6th grade level in partnership with Iron County School District.
- Provide on-going support for the SUU Head Start program.
- Obtain a baccalaureate program in exercise science with an emphasis in cardiac rehabilitation.
- Create and maintain electronic portfolios that document student’s progress for all students enrolled in teacher preparation programs.
- Incorporate service learning into the Teacher Education program.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Mission: The College of Humanities and Social Sciences provides students with a variety of learning experiences that foster their development as intelligent and compassionate persons capable of critically discerning issues that affect their personal, professional, and civic lives.

Description: The College houses five departments (that encompass nine disciplines): Communication, English, Foreign Languages and Humanities, Psychology, and Social Sciences. HSS Students can major in 11 different fields and 11 minors. The largest College on campus, HSS enrolled close to 1,500 students during Fall 2001, with a student-to-faculty ratio of 25.32. In Fall 2002, HSS accounted for 30% of SUU’s SCH’s, the most of all schools/colleges.

All departments have ties to their professional organizations and evaluate their programs in accordance with standards set by those organizations. All tenured or tenure track faculty but one in the college have a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. degree, the highest rate of terminal degrees in the university. Twenty-five percent of SUU’s total faculty is housed in HSS. Within the college, 30% of the faculty are women, but only 13% hold rank of assistant, associate, or full professor. Thirty-nine percent of all college faculty are tenured. The average number of credit hours taught per headcount faculty is 12.4 (2001-2002), the highest at the university. The average number of different preparations per headcount faculty is 2.8 per semester.

Goals:
- Achieve Master’s Degree of Communication.
- Develop a minor in philosophy
- Explore feasibility of Master’s Degree of Counseling in Psychology, and interdisciplinary Master’s Degree of Public Policy.
- Ensure all tenure and tenure track faculty have doctorate degrees.
- Support ethnic and gender diversity. Have at least 35 percent of the faculty female and 10 percent ethnic minority.
- Encourage faculty to use the latest technology within their discipline to enhance teaching and scholarship.
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- Improve department tracking record of student placement and achievements.
- Encourage faculty to participate annually in at least one scholarly endeavor.
- Continue to prepare students for graduate and professional schools.
- Prepare students for baccalaureate degree employment opportunities.
- Evaluate service role of college in general education curricula relative to balance of major/minor degree needs.
- Increase student enrollment and number of majors in each academic discipline by 25 percent.
- Explore feasibility of anthropology courses.
- Actively participate in Study Abroad Program.
- Increase internship/experiential learning in all disciplines.

College of Performing and Visual Arts

Mission: The College of Performing and Visual Arts supports a wide array of programs in the arts that are essential and inspiring to the campus, community, region, and nation. A primary goal of the college is to share diverse creative and scholarly works through general education courses, undergraduate major instruction, and numerous performances, recitals, exhibits, and other endeavors.

Description: The College of Performing and Visual Arts (CPVA) is divided into three major functional areas. Undergraduate education is emphasized through the Departments of Art, Music, and Theatre Arts and Dance. Graduate instruction is featured through the MFA program in Arts Administration. The Music Department is accredited through NASM, and other departments are exploring specialized accreditation. Finally, several professional organizations are housed in the college: the Utah Shakespearean Festival, Braithwaite Fine Arts Gallery, and The American Folk Ballet. In 2002-03, CPVA employed 25 faculty and staff, and 35% of the faculty are tenured. Fifty-four percent of the faculty and staff have been on campus for less than five years. CPVA produces 9.0% of SUU’s SCH’s.

Goals:
- Continue to develop professional degree programs in the arts (Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in the departments of Art, Theatre and Dance) and maintain and expand high quality level of arts teacher education
- Obtain funding levels of state-appropriated funds for the arts which are comparable with arts program funding levels in other four-year institutions in Utah. Long-term goal is to reach fiftieth percentile funding over the next ten years in comparison with peer institutions nationally.
- Fully reinstate the revised MFA Arts Administration program, admitting a new class of 13-15 qualified graduate students by Fall 2004.
- National accreditation sought for Art, Dance, and Theatre Departments.
- BFA degrees approved for Art, Dance, and Theatre Departments.
- Appoint the approved CPVA Advisory Board members and work with them on fund raising for college scholarships.
- Develop for Regents’ approval a BIS (Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Study) degree in “Shakespeare Production” working with SUU’s Theatre, and English Departments and the Utah Shakespearean Festival.
- Continue planning for the design and construction of a Performing Arts Center to house the Departments of Art, Dance, Theatre, Music (teaching, performance, exhibit space) and the Braithwaite Fine Arts Gallery.

College of Science

Mission: SUU’s mission and goals that are especially pertinent to the College of Science include optimizing communication, analytical,
creative, and information gathering skills. The purpose of the College is to provide comprehensive programs of classroom and experiential learning that emphasize critical thinking, problem solving, decision making, and communication in science for students from Utah and the southwestern United States.

**Description:** The College of Science is made up of academic programs in Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Mathematics Education, Nursing, and Engineering. These programs are housed in three departments: Biology, Physical Science, and Mathematics and Computer Science. The College also operates or participates in the operation of several special learning environments for students that include a Keck-sponsored undergraduate research laboratory, an astronomical observatory, certified water laboratory, scanning electron microscopy laboratory, Mountain Ranch, and the Cedar Mountain Science Center. In Fall 2002, the College of Science accounted for 21% of the University’s SCH’s, the second highest on campus. The College employs a total of 44 faculty, and 39% are tenured.

**Goals:**

- To provide highly skilled teachers and respected scholars by recruiting Ph.D.-prepared faculty, rewarding good teaching, encouraging faculty to conduct funded research and publish results, and participation in professional organizations.
- To maximize utilization of SUU’s Observatory, Water Lab, GIS Lab, Scanning Electron Microscopy Lab, and the Valley Farm and Mountain Ranch properties, and the Keck Molecular Genetics and Ecology labs by enhancing the physical facilities and encouraging classroom and research utilization of these facilities.

**School of Applied Science and Technology**

**Mission:** The School’s mission is to provide educational opportunities for students whose interests are essentially application oriented. The primary goal of the school is to produce highly skilled technical specialists and occupationally ready graduates in Technology, Information Systems Applications, Family and Consumer Sciences, and Agriculture.

**Description:** The School of Applied Science and Technology is a very new and diverse school established during 2002. The Board of Regents had created the Utah College of Applied Technology with ten campuses, and SUU’s administration believed that a new school would position the University to mesh with the changing technology education within the state. The Dean of the School also serves as the Director of the Applied Technology Program for the campus.

This school is divided into two major departments. The Department of Applied Science includes the divisions of Agriculture, Family and Consumer Sciences, Information Systems Applications, and Geographic Information Systems. The Department of Applied Technology includes programs in Automotive Technology, Cabinetmaking and Millwork, Construction Management, Criminal
Goals:

- Provide hands-on education and real-life experiences in a variety of agricultural, trade, technical, business, service, government and health-related industries.
- Deliver a broad offering of Baccalaureate, Associate of Applied Science degrees, and certificate programs in applied science and technology.
- Maintain interdisciplinary academic partnerships and, where appropriate, coordinate with colleagues and programs across the campus to develop unique offerings to meet specific workforce needs.
- Develop opportunities for high school students to articulate credits with post-secondary programs.
- Create customized training programs to businesses and industries with opportunities to participate in internships and cooperative education.
- Provide upgrading and retraining programs to individuals through a broad offering of accessible services and alternative instructional delivery systems.
- Provide educational opportunities for students to become licensed teachers in areas encompassed by applied science and technology.
- Create an environment to encourage life-long learning;
- Develop each student’s ability to adapt to the fast-paced, rapidly changing technological employment requirements of society and the industries we serve.
- Work closely with the Utah College of Applied Technology to ensure the transferability of competency based credit and degrees.
- Work closely with the Southwest Applied Technology College to share facilities and resources to benefit both institutions and the Southwest Region ATE.

School of Business

Mission: In harmony with the mission of the University, the School of Business views teaching and the enhancement of student learning as its primary mission. Complementary to this mission are obligations to make intellectual contributions to colleagues, the region, and academic disciplines. Excellent undergraduate and graduate teaching is the top priority.

Description: The School of Business is divided into four functional areas: Department of Accounting/Information Systems, Department of Economics/Finance, Department of Management/Marketing, and Department of Military Science. Each program is subject to regular assessment through student evaluations, graduate surveys, employer surveys, and national testing through the ETS Field Exam in Business. Currently, the entire School is undergoing specialized accreditation through AACSB.

Goals. The School of Business has established long-term goals that focus on achieving excellence in teaching and scholarship, among which are the following:

- Achieve and maintain AACSB-International accreditation.
- Properly manage faculty loads and preparations.
- Maintain a process of continuous review of our curricula through input from students, alumni and employers.
- Link program learning objectives to course objectives.
- Provide faculty and students with access to leading pedagogical and business technologies.
- Maintain graduating business student performance on the ETS Major Field Exam in Business at or above the 75th percentile (Undergraduate and MBA).
• Achieve student placement rates at levels equal to other state universities in Utah.

• Achieve a portfolio of scholarship appropriate to our mission of providing primarily undergraduate instruction with a relatively small graduate program with an average journal publication rate of .5 per faculty per year.
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Students
STANDARD THREE: STUDENTS

Purpose and Organization
Standard 3.A

Student Services provides leadership for the co-curricular and extra-curricular education of students that complement academic areas and offer various services for students. The Mission Statement of Student Services ties to the institutional mission in numerous ways.

SUU Student Services personnel support the mission of the institution by:
- Fostering a learning growth environment for students and members of the University community by providing quality services, individual, and institutional support.
- Providing programs and services designed to acknowledge the value of each individual and promote fairness, integrity and professional growth.
- Encouraging students to develop personal skills and abilities to enhance their enjoyment of and success in life, and by providing opportunities for students to broaden their social, cultural, and intellectual perspectives.
- Offering programs that allow each student to receive the best possible education, to be stimulated, to give service to others, and to become responsible, caring members of society, their own families, and individual communities.

Based on the recommendations of a campus committee on organizational structure and effective July 2003, the Student Development Center and the Registrar's Office moved under the direction of the Provost. The transition of the Student Development Center into the Student Success Center (SSC) was the outcome of another campus-wide committee to design better coordination of essential academic-related services and to strengthen academic advising across campus. Programs within the Student Success Center include the previous Student Development Center functions of Testing Services, University Orientation, and a revised model for academic advising including the advisement of undeclared students and students admitted to College tier as well as the addition of tutoring services and the coordination of the Student Success program and course.

SUU's organization of student services is effective in providing adequate services consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. (3.A.1) Student Services departments and divisions within those include:
- Admissions (now part of Enrollment Management)
- Career Services
- Financial Aid (now part of Enrollment Management)
- Housing and Residential Life
- Registrar's Office (now part of the Provost's Office)
- School Relations (now part of Enrollment Management)
- University Life (Student Activities, Student Government, Student Involvement, Service Learning, Campus Recreation, Outdoor Recreation, Wellness Center – including Health Services, Counseling)
- Student Development Center (New Student Orientation; General Education Advisement; Testing) (moved under the Provost in 2003)
- Student Support Center (Multicultural Center, Services for Students with Disabilities, TRIO programs)

Student services personnel take pride in the concept of providing individual service where possible. Student Services employees know each other and network well in student referrals and collaborative efforts. Staff members care about students. During the 2002-03 academic year, the University chose to create an enrollment management division combining the admissions, school relations and financial aid offices.
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Figure 3.1 provides an organizational chart of current Student Services leadership and functions.

![Organizational Chart 2003](chart.png)

Student Services partners with academic programs to support student learning. Offices of Student Services, detailed in Exhibit 3.1, follow a typical national pattern and relate directly with academic units to provide programmatic and student support.

Informal feedback from students, staff and faculty throughout the University and more specific evaluations indicate that Student Services programs are effective and address the learning and development needs of students at the University. For example, Resident Life holds "sounding boards" with student residents, staff and administrators to share planning for Resident Life. Exit surveys are used with each student at the conclusion of their housing agreement. The results of these surveys are used to enhance and improve the services in resident life.

At the conclusion of Welcome Week activities that combine student activities and academic networking opportunities, new students are asked to evaluate the effectiveness of this program in transitioning them to the University. Student feedback is used to plan subsequent programs. Responses from students who take the National Survey of Student Engagement and other assessments are carefully evaluated by Student Services staff. Most of the NSSE responses regarding student involvement, opportunities to be involved in activities, and access to program services are at or above the national and/or peer institution ratings. See assessment information in Standard 3 exhibits.

Within the Student Support Center, the federal programs of Student Support Services, Upward Bound, and Educational Talent Search have annual performance reviews which track grant objectives. These are shared with the U.S. Department of Education and the University, and are used to enhance the services in each program. As another example, the Multicultural Center evaluates each education week co-sponsored between the center and academic departments. These include International Week,
Black History Week, and Native American Week. Students who enroll for credit and general audiences evaluate the programs and comments assist the Center staff in future planning. The Wellness Center and the Student Development Center have students complete satisfaction surveys regarding services. Areas of concern are noted and staff planning and programming work to address those concerns. Seniors evaluate the support they have received from Career Services as they also share information about employment plans or plans for graduate work. This information helps the Center focus career planning and support services.

Staff in student services are committed to students and share positive working relationships within departments and between departments. Departments often co-program (such as Welcome Week) to assure the level of service desired. See program references throughout exhibits for Standard 3.

Student services and programs are staffed by qualified individuals whose academic preparation and/or experience are appropriate to their assignments. Assignments are clearly defined and published. The performance of personnel is regularly evaluated. (3.A.2) Table 3.1 profiles the Student Services staff as of Fall 2002 showing degrees held, years of service, experience in the field, and full- or part-time employment status. Employees are evaluated annually using criteria and instruments provided by Human Resources at the University. Clerical Staff are evaluated in the Spring of each year using a specific form geared to those job descriptions. New staff hires are evaluated informally at three months and formally at six months at the end of the probationary employment period.

Each department (headed by a director or coordinator) meets on a regular basis. In each unit, staff may have specific individual assignments that pertain to the work of the unit, or in some cases, several staff have similar assignments within the unit. Input to plan and accomplish the work of each unit is sought from each staff member. Offices closely coordinate their services, such as Admissions, School Relations, Registrar, and Financial Aid. Entities within University Life (Wellness Center, Student Activities and Student Government, Student Involvement, Entertainment Bureau), meet frequently to plan, design, and coordinate programmatic services. Exhibits for this standard include resumes of Student Services department heads.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Suppt.</th>
<th>Stud.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PhD/EdD</th>
<th>MD/JD/MSW</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>BA/BA</th>
<th>AA/AAS, Certificate</th>
<th>Non-degree/Degree Seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Self-Study**

#### Years of Experience in field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full-Time Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>9/10 months</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part-Time Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>9/10 months</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriate policies and procedures for student development programs and services are established. The objectives of each operating component are compatible and support the goals of student services. (3.A.3) While each unit has guidelines for daily operation, specific policies and procedures relating to students and involving Student Services units are approved by the President’s Council and the Board of Trustees, and are published on the SUU web site.

The Vice President for Student Services' office is designing an annual review of policies and procedures that relate specifically to student services programs and to students. Appropriate staff and students will be involved in the review process. A number of policies that affect students and student services have been in place for many years and need a regular review for contemporary application to students and staff. The Student Handbook, departmental pages on the University web site, and the Catalog share information and policies.

Human, physical, and financial resources for student services and programs are allocated on the basis of identified needs and are adequate to support the services and programs offered. (3.A.4) Student Services operates from the Sharwan Smith Center, a new facility in the center of campus especially designed for its functions and for campus auxiliaries. The Center offers exceptional quality in its physical structure and extraordinary opportunities for Student Services to collaborate in assisting students. Due to the close proximity of key Student Services departments, a majority of student needs can be met in one visit. Individual attention to students is enhanced as staff can personally escort students to other departments within the Center. Informal, anecdotal feedback indicates that this personalized attention is appreciated by students and parents. The facility meets the programming needs of students.

Adequate human and financial resources for student services and programs are met through SUU’s current budget. Areas of need remain, however. Based on national and/or professional guidelines for staffing levels, the Student Services offices that are understaffed include: Admissions and Registrar’s Offices, School Relations, Career Services, Clinical or Psychological Counseling, and the Student Development Office. Both the Admissions and Registrar’s Offices need at least one more professional staff person to appropriately serve students and to support the Banner program for managing student records. At least one additional staff member is needed to assist in school relations efforts, and additional budget resources are essential in following up with student recruitment and enrollment management. In psychological counseling, national standards recommend at least one clinical counselor for
every 1,000 to 1,500 students. Two additional counselors would allow SUU to achieve the appropriate standard. In Career Services, one additional staff member is needed to meet the multi-task demands of the office.

Current travel and operating budgets are tight, and consequently, travel and training opportunities for professional staff are limited. Directors are not always able to accommodate support staff who wish to participate in programs that would enhance their professional connections or provide additional training. However, collaboration and sharing of expertise and budgets across departments allow implementation of the programs most essential to student success and the advancement of SUU’s mission. The camaraderie and support between Student Services personnel are key factors in maintaining excellence in service to students.

The Human Resources area of the University does provide training each semester to help faculty and staff with personal development and to address personal and professional issues. Student Services staff are able to participate in and benefit from these programs.

**Appraisal**

SUU’s student programs and services support the institution’s mission and goals and contribute to the educational development of students. Because SUU is in a rural area, the University must and does provide essential support services to students. Staff also monitor the need to provide student support at satellite sites or through internet services. For example, Career Services works throughout the campus and the community to provide current information for students regarding part-time employment. Staff members work with the local Chamber of Commerce and individual firms to communicate part-time employment opportunities. Career Services also works closely with the academic departments to promote and coordinate internship programs for students. The Student Services Vice President sits on the President’s cabinet and works closely with the Provost and other Vice Presidents to achieve the institutional mission and goals.

Working with the University-wide assessment committee, departments within student services are expanding their assessment work to determine program effectiveness. See assessment data on specific departments in the exhibits for Standard 3.

**General Responsibilities - Standard 3.B**

SUU systematically identifies the characteristics of its student population and students’ learning and special needs. The institution makes provision for meeting those identified needs, emphasizing students' achievement of their educational goals. (3.B.1) Student characteristics and demographics are reviewed each semester using local analysis and ACT profile reports. See **Exhibit 3.2**. While general characteristics of this population remain relatively stable, Student Services departments continue to have concerns about meeting the needs of individual students and social programming. Student Services departments, such as the Wellness Center, Student Activities Office (SUUSA) and the Student Development Center conduct satisfaction surveys to determine if student needs are being met.

The Admissions Office examines academic preparation of students in admissions decisions, including ACT scores, high school grades, and GED test scores. SUU has offered a math placement test during University Orientation over the past two summers as part of a systematic program to place students in appropriate math courses. Some of these may include pre-college developmental courses. The two-tier admission program provides assistance to under-prepared students, as explained further in Standard 2.

Within the Student Services divisions, students needing assistance from the Office of Disability Services self-identify and choose to access that support. All faculty are also required to add an ADA statement to their syllabi each semester to
give notice to students about SUU support programs and accommodations.

*SUU provides opportunities for students to participate in institutional governance. Faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs and services.* (3.B.2) Students are extensively involved in institutional governance, including a voting seat on SUU’s Board of Trustees. Student government – specifically the Student Senate – is comprised of three representatives from each academic college, and the Assembly is composed of representatives from clubs and organizations. Together they work to identify the needs of students, including special "Academic Focus Weeks" for each college/school within the institution.

Table 3.2 lists the many committees on which students serve throughout the institution. Within the student government structure, students comprise elected and appointed positions in the Student Body President’s Cabinet, Student Senate, Student Assembly, Student Court, and Student Activities Board. Committees plan Homecoming, seasonal events, and other activities (see list of potential student clubs/groups in *Student Handbook* and see exhibit materials).

Faculty members serve on most Student Services Committees and help to develop relevant policies and guidelines. A number of faculty members also serve as advisors to various clubs and organizations within the student government structure. Faculty often serve on committees to select new staff hires, particularly for professional staff positions. A committee of faculty is actively guiding the activities of the Service & Learning Center, working closely with student leaders at the Center.

### Table 3.2

**Campus Committees with Student Representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>How Appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Academic Computer Users Committee | Faculty  
Asst. Provost, IT Students                                                 | Six Senators  
VP/Academics       | Election to Student Senate                                                  |
| Acad. Standards and Admissions Committee | Student Services  
Faculty Members  
Students                              | Two Student Senators               | Students selected by  
Student Leaders                  |
| Athletic Council          | Faculty/Staff/  
Administration  
Student Body  
President Officers            | Student Body  
President  
Stud.Body Academic  
Vice President         | Election to Student Body Office                                               |
| Board of Trustees         | Board appointed by Governor  
Pres., Alumni Assn.  
Pres., Student body          | Student Body  
President                | Election to Student Body Office                                               |
| Bookstore Committee       | One faculty member  
From each College and the Library Staff  
Assn. member  
Two students  
Bookstore Staff          | Two students                        | Appointed by  
Student Body President          |
| Campus Planning Committee | VP, Administrative &  
Financial Services  
Deans                            | Student Body  
President                | Election to office                                                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations VP, Student Services SUUSA President</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Appointed by Student Body Pres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security Committee</td>
<td>Student Service Reps. Dir, Campus Safety Risk Mgmt. Dir. Students</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Recommended by Student Body Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Committee</td>
<td>Faculty Staff Students</td>
<td>Two students</td>
<td>Selected by position assignments at the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on ADA/504 Compliance</td>
<td>Staff from Risk and Physical Plant; Student Services</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Elected to Student Senate; one Senator appointed by Academic VP, Student Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocation Committee</td>
<td>Student Services Faculty Students</td>
<td>Six Students: Student Body Academic VP Five Student Senators</td>
<td>Elected to Student Senate; one Senator appointed by Academic VP, Student Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans’ Council</td>
<td>Provost; Associate Provost; Deans; Asst. VP, Student Services SUUSA Academic VP</td>
<td>Academic Vice President, Student Association</td>
<td>Elected to that office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Review Committee</td>
<td>Student/Financial Services Staff Student</td>
<td>One Student</td>
<td>Recommended by Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Committee</td>
<td>Seven faculty mbrs. Two Students</td>
<td>Two Students</td>
<td>Appointed by Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Council of the University Journal</td>
<td>Communication Dept Chair Deans Dir., Public Relations Dir., Student Act. Students</td>
<td>Student Body Pres. Eight additional students</td>
<td>Pres – by election to office; 2 students appt. by student body president; 1 student appt. by University President; 5 Univ senators, 1 from each college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Committee</td>
<td>Student Services Reps Advancement Rep. Acad. VP, SUUSA</td>
<td>Student Body Academic Vice President</td>
<td>Elected to office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Committee</td>
<td>Faculty members - 3 Staff members – 2 Student – 1</td>
<td>1 student</td>
<td>Appointed by University President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Disciplinary Board</td>
<td>SUUSA High Court 3 faculty SUUSA Academic</td>
<td>3 High Court Reps.</td>
<td>Appl. For Court Appt. with Student Body President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Committee</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff/Chief, Campus Safety Students</th>
<th>2 Students</th>
<th>SUUSA VP, by election to office Appointed by Student Body President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Committee</td>
<td>Faculty, staff, and student</td>
<td>SUUSA Activities Vice President</td>
<td>Elected annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies on students' rights and responsibilities, including those related to academic honesty and procedural rights, are clearly stated, well publicized, readily available, and implemented in a fair and consistent manner. (3.B.3)** Policies on Students Responsibilities and Rights, Notification of Rights, Process for Student Complaints, and Drug-Free Act are published annually in the *Student Handbook* and made available to all students. See Exhibit 3.3. New students are given a handbook at the Welcome Assembly prior to the beginning of Fall semester and additional copies are distributed in the Student Center throughout the year. In addition, *Handbooks* are distributed to students during New Student Orientation held prior to the beginning of Spring semester. The right of appeal is clearly identified in the SUU Student Responsibilities and Rights policy. Grade appeals are considered by the College Grade Committee, while parking ticket appeals are handled by the Student Parking Appeals Committee. An appeal of a decision made by the Student Disciplinary Board may be made to the University President, the final appellate authority on campus.

SUU makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students and their property. Information concerning student safety is published and widely distributed. (3.B.4) Students are encouraged to act responsibly in providing protection to themselves and to their personal property. Most campus crimes can be avoided by following simple safety tips, and "Tips on Personal Safety" are shared in the *Student Handbook*. Safety guidelines are shared in University Orientation and in Resident Life programming. Staff members in the University Safety Office are specifically trained in crisis issues related to safety, such as aiding victims of rape or other violent crimes. These individuals work closely with the Wellness Center, the Iron County Advocates Office, and the Canyon Creek Woman's Crisis Center, as well as all law enforcement agencies in the area, to support victims who may need these services.

SUU’s Department of Public Safety (DPS) works closely with departments and organizations such as Resident Living and SUUSA to educate and inform students on the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse. Students are also offered a variety of services including: unlocking vehicles, jumping dead batteries, free fingerprinting services, and assisting with all parking issues and problems. All officers are current with CPR practices and other emergency response situations, and have been certified through the American Heart Association to use AED (Automated External Defibrillator). As detailed in Standard 8, the campus has installed a lighting and emergency call-box system to provide additional protections.

In an effort to provide accurate and timely information concerning all campus crimes, SUU’s DPS disseminates information in a number of ways including: 1) incidents reported twice weekly in the *SUU Journal*; 2) monthly report of incidents to administration personnel; 3) monthly activity submitted to Bureau of Criminal Identification; 4) information submitted to appropriate agencies.

SUU publishes and makes available to both prospective and enrolled students a catalog or bulletin that describes: its mission, admission requirements and procedures, students' rights and responsibilities, academic regulations, degree-completion requirements, credit courses and descriptions, tuition, fees and other charges, refund policy, and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it.
In addition, a student handbook or its equivalent is published and distributed. A student handbook normally will include information on student conduct, a grievance policy, academic honesty, student government, student organizations and services, and athletics. The student handbook may be combined with the institution's catalog. (3.B.5) The University publishes an annual catalog that is also available on the University web site. The Catalog provides information regarding admissions, records, tuition, fees and other charges, refund policy, financial aid, dropping or adding courses, withdrawing from the institution, requirements for graduation and degree completion. The Student Handbook is published separately from the Catalog and is provided to all incoming new students and made available for all students. See again Exhibit 3.2.

SUU periodically and systematically evaluates the appropriateness, adequacy, and utilization of student services and programs and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for change. (3.B.6) Specific reevaluation activities took place in 1999-2000 after work on mission statements for student services departments were developed. The strengthening of the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee with a representative from Student Services will assist departments in designing and implementing specific evaluative instruments and processes. Focus groups as well as written evaluations have been used to capture information useful in developing campus programs.

Within the former Student Development Center, the staff members have developed a first-draft strategic priority objectives document that will be modified within the broader vision of the Student Success Center. The Student Development Center testing services received feedback from the State GED administrator regarding testing practices and standards. ACT testing services also provide feedback on national test administration practices.

Student Services historically has assessed programs on an informal basis to assist with planning programs and services. Student Activities event committees evaluate the success of specific activities or combinations of activities, such as the Homecoming Committee. First-Year Experience students participate in focus groups to evaluate the course and also look at services across the campus. With the University Strategic Plan, Student Services will assess a number of programs and services or will work with other campus entities in completing that assessment. Details about specific Student Services assessment within the University Strategic Plan are noted in Standard 1.

A key assessment tool for Student Services is the ACT College Outcomes Survey. Respondents comprised 65.3% of the senior class. Of the respondents, 81% had at least one hour of transfer credit, and 30.5% had 45 or more hours of transfer credit. Of specific note to Student Services were:
- 40.2% of students did not participate in club or organizational activities each week.
- 56.3% participated from 1 to 11 hours per week in clubs and organizations.
- 40.8 percent of the students participated in no college sponsored events on a weekly basis.
- 52.9% participated from 1 to 11 hours per week in college sponsored events.

Table 3.3 summarizes findings regarding Student Services from the latest ACT College Outcomes Survey.
Table 3.3
College Outcomes Survey Findings, 2001-02

Areas where student satisfaction was above national peer average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College supports both men and women</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for own behavior</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College welcomes feedback from students to improve college</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Services and Programs</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Services</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Safety on Campus</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas where satisfaction was below the national norm include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College equally supportive of all racial/ethnic groups</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively participating in volunteer work to support worthwhile causes</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming an effective member of a multi-cultural society</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus AIDS Education Program</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus atmosphere of ethnic/political/religious understanding</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling Services</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College response to non-traditional students</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other areas where students were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUU</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern for me as an individual</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of academic</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appraisal

Student Services department utilize assessments to fine tune, refocus, or redesign programs to serve students. Student needs are reviewed in all departments. The ACT College Outcomes Survey, the National Student Survey of Student Engagement, and other University-wide assessments are reviewed by Student Services departments for program effectiveness and student satisfaction. Specific evaluations are used to measure satisfaction and effectiveness of specific programs, such as Welcome Week and Native American Week. Exit surveys are used in Resident Life and Career Services, for example, to measure services and student satisfaction. Policies, departmental protocols, and program guidelines are then based upon this process. Policies are published in the Catalog, Student Handbook, departmental publications, and the University web site.

### Academic Credit and Records - Standard 3.C

The Admissions and Registrar’s Offices are located in adjoining space in the Sharvan Smith Center. These two offices have always worked closely together to maintain confidential, accurate records of applying, admitted, and matriculated students. Beginning in July 2003, the Registrar’s Office reports to the Provost rather than to Student Services, and the Admissions Office will function under Enrollment Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>advising</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging on campus</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for victims of crime/harassment</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from harassment on campus</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety or security on campus</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules governing student conduct</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to students with special needs</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student health and wellness services</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College social activities</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for involvement in campus activities</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; intramural programs</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career planning services</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement services</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This college in general</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sense of belonging on campus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services for victims of crime/harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from harassment on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety or security on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules governing student conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student health and wellness services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College social activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for involvement in campus activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; intramural programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career planning services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This college in general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| sense of belonging on campus                  | 62.3          |
| Services for victims of crime/harassment      | 25.1          |
| Freedom from harassment on campus             | 41.9          |
| Personal safety or security on campus         | 63.8          |
| Rules governing student conduct               | 54.2          |
| Response to students with special needs       | 42.6          |
| Student health and wellness services          | 40.9          |
| College social activities                     | 55.9          |
| Opportunities for involvement in campus activities | 62.8          |
| Recreational & intramural programs            | 60.2          |
| Career planning services                      | 50.5          |
| Job placement services                        | 44.8          |
| Financial aid services                        | 66.7          |
| This college in general                       | 81.7          |

And program guidelines are then based upon this process. Policies are published in the Catalog, Student Handbook, departmental publications, and the University web site.
Evaluation of student learning or achievement, and the award of credit, are based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria. Academic records are accurate, secure, and comprehensive. Credit is defined and awarded consonant with the Glossary definition. (3.C.1)

The Registrar’s Office is charged with maintaining student academic credit and records. These records are maintained in an electronic system and official transcript form. Professors in courses offered for credit set the evaluation criteria. Credit is awarded based on amount, course numbers, and descriptions set through the curriculum committees and approved by the academic deans. Most courses are graded with letter grades, but some are offered on a Pass/Fail basis. Student course grades are appropriately recorded by the Registrar’s Office at the end of each grading period. Since 2001, professors have utilized a secure electronic system for recording course grades. All records are maintained in a secure setting and are accurate, comprehensive, and accessible only to the student (or others designated by the student through approved release procedures), and to faculty and appropriate staff at the institution. Standard 2 provides further information on the awarding of credit.

Criteria used for evaluating student performance and achievement including those for theses, dissertations, and portfolios, are appropriate to the degree level, clearly stated and implemented. (3.C.2) Criteria for evaluating student performance and achievement are published in standardized course syllabi made available to students enrolled in and/or inquiring about all courses. Criteria for theses in the master’s programs are set by specific academic departments offering master’s degree programs.

Clear and well-publicized distinctions are made between degree and non-degree credit. Institutional publications and oral representations explicitly indicate if credit will not be recognized toward a degree, or if special conditions exist before such credit will be recognized. Student transcripts clearly note when any credit awarded is non-degree credit. Whenever institutions grant non-degree credit other than the Continuing Education Unit (CEU), some summary evaluation of student performance beyond mere attendance is available. (3.C.3) Most academic programs are comprised of courses required for credit. In a few areas, there are some required courses which do not offer credit (for example, Music 0900, Recital Attendance, is required of music majors/minors and no credit is awarded). A number of courses offered in the Continuing Education and Professional Studies division are taken for pleasure and recreation, and they are marked clearly as non-credit courses in appropriate publications.

Students selecting specific areas of study may take a number of credit courses as electives which are not part of their specific degree program, but the credit may be utilized toward the total number of credits required for graduation and/or the total number of upper division credits carried by the student. Credit is recorded on transcripts in three ways: undergraduate credit, graduate credit, continuing education credit, as detailed below.

Undergraduate credit: An undergraduate transcript shows all undergraduate work in which the student has been enrolled. This transcript may include some credit that will not apply toward completing general education or the major or minor, but does count toward the total credits required for graduation (for example, emergency medical training, sign language, yoga).

Graduate Credit: When a student has been accepted into an approved graduate program (e.g., master’s level work in education, accounting, business administration, or fine arts), this student enrolls in courses appropriate to that graduate study. The graduate credit transcript shows all graduate credit which applies toward the appropriate graduate degree.

Continuing Education Credit: Courses that receive Continuing Education credit are so designated in the Catalog, Bulletin and/or the course schedule. Most of the credit awarded in continuing education is non-degree and can be taken for personal enrichment. If Continuing Education assists in delivering courses for
academic departments, credit is given based upon the academic department. Internship credit – whether graduate or undergraduate – appears on the appropriate transcript.

Transfer credit is accepted from accredited institutions or from other institutions under procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality and relevance to the students’ programs. Implementation of transfer credit policies is consistent with 2.C.4 as well as Policy 2.5 - Transfer and Award of Academic Credit, pages 41-44. The final judgment for determining acceptable credit for transfer is the responsibility of the receiving institution. (3.C.4) Based on guidelines established by the institution and in consultation with specific departments, records of transfer students are evaluated carefully. The course number, course name, and in some cases course descriptions are reviewed to determine if the transfer credit is in harmony with similar credit granted by the institution. Should a course not meet the specific criteria for credit within a major or minor, the course may be accepted as elective credit. Courses considered to be pre-college level are not accepted as transfer credit.

Designated members of the Registrar’s Office staff work closely with the Provost and academic deans in establishing guidelines to assess transfer credit. Matriculated transfer students currently request that their transfer credits be evaluated. The University is in the process of implementing transcript reviews and assessments for all applying transfer students. Questions on the acceptability of transfer credit are resolved between the appropriate Registrar’s Office records manager, and the academic deans, and the Provost. SUU has articulation agreements with all public higher educational institutions in Utah and with BYU-Idaho. SUU is piloting a dual-admissions transfer program with Snow College to be implemented Fall 2003.

SUU makes provision for the security of student records of admission and progress. Student records, including transcripts, are private, accurate, complete, and permanent. They are protected by fire-proof and otherwise safe storage and are backed by duplicate files. Data and records maintained in computing systems have adequate security and provision for recovery in the event of disaster. The information-release policy respects the right of individual privacy and ensures the confidentiality of records and files. (3.C.5) The confidential nature of records, following the FERPA (Family Education Rights and Privacy Act) legislation, is enforced by the Registrar’s Office. SUU complies fully with FERPA. Transcripts are maintained in a private, accurate, complete, and permanent manner. Current records are maintained in an electronic format. Records generated prior to 1985 are maintained digitally and in a hard copy and stored in a “fire proof” vault on campus. A back-up system located away from the campus is being considered as a result of a state-wide initiative by staff in the Registrar’s office and the USHE Commissioner’s office. The electronic/computerized record system is secure and the records are backed up nightly.

Release of information regarding student records is strictly managed. Specific student permission to release records to individuals other than the student is outlined in the Student Handbook. The privacy desired and required by individual students is strictly maintained to assure confidentiality.

**Appraisal**

Student learning and achievement are evaluated in the classroom based on requirements published in course syllabi. Each course follows syllabi guidelines to assure consistency and consistent communication with students. The Catalog notes course numbers, credit granted, and a brief view of course content. Student records are maintained in a confidential, secure manner and appeal policies are in place regarding grades or other decisions affecting their academic credit. Discussions for a state-wide secure backup record system continue among appropriate staff at the Utah System of Higher Education.
Student Services - Standard 3.D

SUU adopts student admission policies consistent with its mission. It specifies qualifications for admission to the institution and its programs, and it adheres to those policies in its admission practices. (3.D.1) The Board of Regents adopted in 2003 a new roles and missions policy (R-312, noted in Standard 1) that requires modification of SUU’s admissions policy. SUU admits graduates from accredited high schools. Freshmen students must meet the Admissions Index that utilizes a combination of ACT scores and high school grade point average. The index was established by the USHE Commissioner’s Office. Students who do not meet the index are referred to the Academic Standards and Admissions Review Committee to be considered for admissions on a case-by-case basis. Those who are admitted after this review are admitted to the college tier. Students who meet the admission index but have a Math or English sub-score indicating a need for developmental course work are also admitted to the college tier. College tier students are assigned advisors in the Student Success Center who can provide academic support and referral to other services.

Non-traditional, re-entry students, transfer, or new freshmen who do not meet the standards established by the index may write a letter of appeal to the Academic Standards and Admissions Committee, comprised of staff, faculty, and students. The letter must show that a student could be successful due to preparation from other life experiences. Admission is then determined on an individual basis. Details on the Academic Standards and Admissions Committee are shared in Exhibit 3.6.

The Admissions Office works closely with students who may have appeal issues. With a rather dramatic change in the Utah residency laws in summer 2002, the office spent considerable time working with non-resident students to answer questions regarding their enrollment and the new residency requirements. The Utah legislature adopted restrictive rules for determining in-state residency. Table 3.4 reflects a three-year admissions history.
## Table 3.4
### ADMISSIONS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation Year (02-03)</th>
<th>1 Year Prior (01-02)</th>
<th>2 Years Prior (00-01)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Time Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Applications</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Applications</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Applications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Applications</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Applications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SUU Fact Books
In keeping with its mission and admission policy, SUU gives attention to the needs and characteristics of its student body with conscious attention to such factors as ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious diversity while demonstrating regard for students’ rights and responsibilities. (3.D.2) In 2001-02, most SUU students were Caucasian, and the majority (56.3%) came from fifteen southern Utah counties, a rural area of the state. Most students were Utah residents (82.5%), with an average age of 23.4 years; 56% were female.

While the diversity of the student body changes slowly, the Multicultural Center works closely with various clubs and specific academic support to assist students with advisement, registration, financial concerns, and sometimes cultural adjustment issues. The University has a small international student population. These individuals, due to more restrictive Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) regulations, are monitored closely. They have long received extensive support from a member of the admissions staff and from staff in the Multicultural Center.

While the majority of the students are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (the predominant religion in the state of Utah), students have access to other religious ministries in the community. Some groups have utilized campus facilities for meeting space, and some offer youth or fellowship programs for college students. A Campus Christian Fellowship Club is available. At the beginning of each Fall semester, the Student Services staff cooperate with religious groups in the community to sponsor a gathering that helps students to become acquainted with religious organizations in the community.

In a variety of ways and through a number of offices, students are assisted in meeting many of their needs through on-campus services. For example,

- Students with appropriate documented disabilities receive accommodations through the Office for Services to Students with Disabilities.

- The Dean of Students Office offers counseling and assistance for students who may be involved in disciplinary issues or in cases of specific difficulty, assisted by the Student Disciplinary Board.

- Student Support Services, a federally-funded program, provides assistance to 150 students who meet the eligibility criteria. These students receive support primarily in developmental English and math, tutoring and academic counseling, and academic needs/preparation assistance to help them sharpen their skills and prepare for college-level courses.

- The Learning Center provides group study, tutoring support, and academic testing for some departments. During 2001-2002, tutoring and group study support were available for twenty-one general subjects, the highest demands in math and chemistry. Over 1,940 students were served in tutorial settings. As of Fall 2003, the Learning Center is part of the Student Success Center.

- The Student Development Center (renamed Student Success Center, July 2003) provides academic advising for undeclared students and for students who are admitted on college tier based on the new admission policy. In addition the Center coordinates University Orientation, Tutoring Services, Testing Services and the Student Success Program.

- Within the University Life area, a variety of activities – student activities, intramurals, outdoor recreation, service learning, entertainment bureau – are open to students from all backgrounds to share and develop talents and friendships.

- The Wellness Center (Drug and Alcohol Prevention programming, University Health Services, and Clinical Counseling) is committed to the total wellness concept. The operation of the Wellness Center is guided by the
principle that the University provides a safe environment to ask health-related questions and to receive qualified information and knowledgeable, confidential answers.

- **Career Services** offers career counseling, student employment, internships, job search preparation and career employment services for all SUU students and alumni. CS works with the SUU Multicultural Center and the Disabled Student Services center to make certain that career and employment concerns of these populations are addressed.

Appropriate policies and procedures guide the placement of students in courses and programs based upon their academic and technical skills. Such placement ensures a reasonable probability of success at a level commensurate with the institution's expectations. Special provisions are made for "ability to benefit"(students (3.D.3) University Orientation and advising staff work closely with the math department faculty to provide accurate course placement. During each summer’s University Orientation, a math placement exam is administered. ACT sub scores and the math test score are then used to recommend a general education mathematics course. Prior to 2003, the recommendations of the Math department were not mandatory and a student could select a more difficult course if his/her ACT score was adequate. Advisors who work with students during University Orientation or in one-on-one advising may also look at ACT scores and high school coursework in recommending courses prior to registration or advisement into particular academic programs.

The Math department implemented a new math placement policy during summer of 2003 requiring a placement test of students within a certain ACT score range and those with ACT scores more than two years old. Students whose ACT math sub score are beyond this range and less than two years old are placed into math courses based on ACT math sub score. A pilot program for students whose English ACT sub score is below 17 has been implemented for Fall 2003. Those students have enrolled in ENGL 1000, a writing lab/supplemental instruction course concurrent with ENGL 1010, Introduction to Composition.

Beginning in Fall 2003, the University has a Student Success Center with mandatory advisement. Until the center is fully operational, placement of students in courses may be self-selected. Some courses require instructor or departmental signatures, often with recommended prerequisites listed in the SUU Catalog. While this process provides guidance and selection for most students, a few students may elect to take courses for which they are not prepared. Most professors work with such students early in the semester to guide them into appropriate alternate courses. In fact, to assist with retention, SUU initiated a 5th-week progress report for new freshmen. Faculty members will review students’ progress as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory,” then share that information with advisors and the Student Success Center. Where assistance is needed, students are contacted.

SUU specifies and publishes requirements for continuation in, or termination from, its educational programs, and it maintains an appeals process. The policy for readmission of students who have been suspended or terminated is clearly defined. (3.D.4) Academic standards are available in the Catalog and on the web, and they are shared verbally by those who work with academic advisement. The University’s new admission’s policy specifies requirements for continuation in, or termination from, educational programs, and delineates an appeals process for students. Readmission is also clearly defined in the policy.

Suspended students may appeal the suspension with the Academic Standards and Admissions Review Committee. Students who left the institution while on probation and students who do not meet the admission index, should they desire admission on a probationary basis, are required to write a letter to the committee. Upon review, the committee makes a decision upon admission or readmission on a case-by-case basis. See details in Exhibit 3.6.
Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) is published and made available to both prospective and enrolled students. (3.D.7)

SUU’s Catalog, web site, and financial aid brochures available to students contain information on the application process and types of financial aid available. The Financial Aid Office maintains a web site that includes a link to each document required to complete the federal financial aid application process. In addition, brochures and web references direct students who want additional information provided by the U.S. Department of Education and the Guarantee Agencies and Lending Institutions. Specific references to the various scholarships, including departmental and specified scholarships, are available in the Catalog and on the web site.

The Financial Aid Office works closely with School Relations and the Admissions staff to coordinate information and assistance for students regarding financial aid. By Fall 2003, the Financial Aid Office will award and track all scholarships for the University, and will function within Enrollment Management.

SUU regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institutional loan default rate. Informational sessions which give attention to loan repayment obligations are conducted for financial aid recipients. (3.D.8)

SUU participates in both the Stafford and Perkins student loan programs. The current Stafford loan default rate is 3.2% and the Perkins loan default rate is 4.6%. Upon graduation, completion of a program, or upon leaving school, students who have participated in the student loan programs are required to complete a loan exit counseling session. Stafford loan borrowers complete loan exit counseling on the internet at www.mapping-your-future.org and Perkins loan borrowers complete loan exit counseling by making an appointment with the SUU Perkins Loan Collection Office. During these sessions students receive information on loan repayment requirements.

SUU provides for the orientation of new students, including special populations, at both
undergraduate and graduate levels. (3.D.9) New Freshmen, both traditional and non-traditional, are oriented during the summer and prior to Spring semester about SUU and its programs. Student Development Center/Student Success Center staff design the day-long program that offers advisement, registration, and an introduction to academic requirements. Various staff and offices in Student Services departments “meet and greet” new students and they encourage everyone to socialize and to get acquainted with others.

Participation in the Orientation Program is a requirement for incoming new students, who are notified through the University Catalog and web site. Orientations for graduate students and programs are provided by those departments offering the specific degrees. University Orientation adheres to and embraces the mission and vision of SUU. Frequent feedback from participants (students, parents, and members of the university community) demonstrates a high degree of satisfaction.

The transfer and/or non-traditional student orientation offered a helpful program, but without extensive participation. Significant revisions were made in Spring 2003 with the implementation of "OSA" – Orientation, Scholarship, and Advising visits to Utah community colleges and in the Wasatch front area. Student Development and School Relations staff worked collaboratively with faculty to provide an "on-site" orientation and advising program for transfer students from SUU feeder schools in addition to the traditional services offered to transfer students. The University may want to examine how to implement a more successful program serving transfer students. Orientation evaluations are available in the SDC exhibits.

A systematic program of academic and other educational program advisement is provided. Advisors help students make appropriate decisions concerning academic choices and career paths. Specific advisor responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students (Standards Two and Four, Sections 2.C.5 and 4.A.2). (3.D.10) A new model for consistent academic advisement throughout the University will be implemented in Fall 2003. Each College will have at least one designated academic advisor who will work closely with advisors currently housed in the Student Development Center/Student Success Center. The restructuring of academic advising starting in Summer 2003 will begin to meet the need for a clear campus-wide advising philosophy and practice. Students, particularly, have requested and supported funding for advisors in each college/school. In addition, the college advisors will provide career counsel, degree tracking for progress toward graduation, and other assistance. Most will teach at least one section of the student success course. Faculty will mentor and provide program choices for students.

The Student Development Center, now Student Success Center (SDC/SSC) provides academic advising for students who have not declared a major and academic advising regarding general education requirements for students who have declared a major. SDC/SSC advisors work with the full range of SUU undergraduate students and their work will be integrated into the University-wide design for advising. Graduation workshops are also provided to assist graduating seniors in negotiating the necessary paperwork for degree completion.

In Fall 2001, a total of 1,131 students were advised in 1,389 advising appointments. The highest utilization of advising services was by students aged 19 to 20, followed by those aged 21 to 22. National advising resources recommend an advisor to student ratio of 1:300 for full-time advisors and even lower for staff with other assignments beyond advising. The ratio in the student development center is closer to 1:411. In Fall 2001, the Center met with about 25% of the students with undecided majors at SUU.

The addition of new college/school advisors and the transition to the Student Success Center for Fall 2003 will help balance some of the advisor loads and will allow Student Success Center advisors to provide more focused advising services to their assigned student population –
college tier students and undeclared students. College/School advisors will link with university tier students in their respective majors. This should allow for a greater range of undeclared and college tier students to be serviced by the Success Center and for a more consistent and systematic advisement process for university tier students.

Career counseling and placement services are consistent with student needs and institutional mission. (3.D.11) The mission of Career Services is to provide opportunities for students and alumni to prepare for entry and lifelong success in the world of work. Career planning is viewed as a development process to be fostered during the college years and over the life span. This mission is closely aligned with the University’s mission to prepare students as informed and responsible citizens. Career Counseling is provided through individual appointments, workshops, career decision classes, a career library and the Choices computerized career planning program.

Job search preparation is utilized to help students present themselves effectively as candidates for employment. Specialized workshops in resume writing, interview skills, internet job search, and state and federal job search are available in the Career Center throughout the year.

Career Services provides student employment, internships and career employment opportunities for students and alumni through two on-campus career fairs, student job expo, and through scheduled on-campus interviews. The Career Services staff develops and maintains relationships with local and regional employers. In addition, it manages a Career Services home page on the web with job listings and links to additional job sites, employer homepages, and other employment resources. Individual and group job coaching is available.

All seniors are encouraged to register with Career Services and post their resume on MonsterTRAK, as well as participate in Job Search Workshops. Credential files are maintained for individuals majoring and/or certifying in education. New electronic trends may change the nature of how such files are managed and created. One of the goals in the strategic planning for the institution is to assess and track University graduates five or ten years after graduation. Career Services will likely play an active role in the design and development of such tracking.

Professional health care, including psychological health and relevant health education, is readily available to residential students and to other students, as appropriate. (3.D.12) The University has long provided some level of clinical services in the Student Health Service. These services are now part of a comprehensive Wellness Center program that includes Health Services, Psychological Counseling, and Alcohol, Drug and Violence Education and Prevention program. The professional staff of the Wellness Center is committed to a multidisciplinary team approach to improve the students’ developmental and physical well-being. Physical, mental and substance abuse education components are housed in the same space and allow the Center to provide multidisciplinary treatment and intervention.

Clinical services to students are available Monday through Friday during the workday. The Center is staffed by a nurse practitioner. One physician provides expanded services on a part-time basis. Nominal fees are assessed for laboratory work. Students requiring laboratory, x-ray, suturing, or casting are referred to local physicians or the emergency room of the local hospital.

Psychological counseling and group work is provided in the Center to help students in their personal, social and academic adjustment. Crisis intervention, outreach services, student and faculty consultation, supervision and training of student interns, as well as psychological and psycho-educational assessments are offered. SUU also offers alcohol and other drug education and counseling to students desiring information or help regarding either their own or someone else’s substance related issues. Surveys are conducted.
periodically to determine the level and type of need students are exhibiting in this area.

Based on nationally recommended guidelines, the psychological counseling segment of the Wellness Center is understaffed. The ratio of trained professionals to students should be 1:1000 to 1:1500. At the present time, students are served by two counselors. Ideally, two additional practitioners should be on staff to provide the level of proactive and support service to the University students.

Student housing, if provided, is designed and operated to enhance the learning environment. It meets recognized standards of health and safety; it is competently staffed. (3.D.13) It is the mission of SUU Housing to provide the highest quality living conditions that are safe, clean, and comfortable, as well as a learning environment that promotes maturity, supports academic success, and enhances personal growth.

With the addition of the Eccles Living Learning Center, the on-campus learning environment will be enhanced with conference rooms, tutoring labs, computer labs, large social areas, and study areas to be used as classrooms for instruction and/or residence hall programs. This wonderful living and learning center was made possible due to a generous donation from the George S. and Dolores Dore Eccles Foundation and is scheduled for completion in March 2004.

To meet recognized standards of health and safety, monthly inspections of student rooms and apartments are made by housing staff. Health and safety issues are dealt with immediately by our maintenance staff. Cleaning issues are the responsibility of students living in the rooms/apartments and, if lacking, we provide educational help and encouragement to keep private and community areas clean and healthy.

The Housing and Residence Hall Department is competently staffed with 5 full time employees holding 2 master’s degrees and 3 associate degrees. They have a total of over 40 years of service to the students of Southern Utah University. In addition, the Housing and Residence Life Department employs many exceptional students who serve as Hall Directors (2), Resident Assistants (15), RHA Presidency (3), RHA Hall Council (15), Computer Lab Assistants (3) and many housekeeping, maintenance, and grounds workers (20+).

Analysis and appraisal are conducted annually using various tools. “Sounding Boards” are informal meetings of residents, staff, and administrators to inform students and to discuss suggestions. These meeting are held once a semester. Exit surveys are used for students at the conclusion of their housing agreement. Written and administered by housing personnel, the surveys have been helpful in recording students’ feelings of their housing experience. Informal personal visits with campus residents gather information to better help the housing fulfill its mission.

These assessment tools have helped the Housing and Residence Life staff to develop valuable resources to benefit students living on campus. Some of the more prominent changes brought about by these tools are: 1) upgrading of bathroom facilities in Juniper Hall to facilitate ADA requirements; 2) more adequate computer labs in both Juniper Hall and Manzanita Court; 3) the building of a social area (The Loft) where students can bring friends or roommates or floormates to a social activity; 4) hot tub; 5) volleyball courts; 6) music practice rooms; 7) BBQ areas; 8) data access in every room of Juniper and Manzanita. Students’ input has helped to bring an additional 300 new beds on line and assist the recruitment and retention of students coming to our beautiful campus.

Appropriate food services are provided for both resident and nonresident students. These services are supervised by professionally trained food service staff and meet recognized nutritional and mandated health and safety standards. (3.D.14) SUU operates a complete food service department that includes a full-service cafeteria, cash operations in a food court in the Sharwan Smith Center, vending machines, concessions in the sports arenas and catering – both on and off campus. Students living in Juniper Hall choose from four food plans. Four meal plans are available for students living in...
Manzanita or off-campus. Food Service provides good and healthy food at reasonable prices.

Food Service employs a chef who is a recent graduate of a culinary school along with other well-trained food service employees. Customers have daily choices of gourmet pasta, vegetarian entrees, salad bar, soups, deli bar and desserts. Gourmet coffee selections and espresso are provided in the food court facilities. Students may dine at several theme dinners throughout the year, including holidays.

Students are encouraged to give suggestions and comments on the “napkin board.” Here they write comments on a napkin and the food service director responds within a 24-hour period. Once each semester the Food Service Director meets with the resident hall students regarding food services.

The catering manager is a former trainer for a large national hotel chain and takes pride in providing a catered event of the highest quality. Students, staff and faculty receive full support in planning events where food and beverages will be served. The University has a policy that events involving food or beverage service held in the Student Center or the Hunter Conference Center will be catered by the University Food Service. The Food Service staff is certified in HASSAP and operates safe-serve facilities.

Co-curricular activities and programs are offered that foster the intellectual and personal development of students consistent with the institution’s mission. The institution adheres to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity for participation. It ensures that appropriate services and facilities are accessible to students in its programs. Co-curricular activities and programs include adaptation for traditionally under-represented students, such as physically disabled, older, evening, part-time, commuter, and, where applicable, those at off-campus sites. (3.D.15) Student Activities (SUUSA), the Entertainment Bureau, Student Activities Board (STAB), Service and Learning Center, Recreation and Intramurals, Outdoor Recreation, and Wellness Center all coordinate programs and services designed to enhance student learning and leadership development.

Recognizing the value of extracurricular life in the growth of the student, the University encourages participation in many and varied opportunities available on campus. Student government leaders and various student committees design and implement programs which help students socialize and enjoy the University. Program offerings support the mission statement by helping students to develop social and leadership skills as well as decision-making techniques.

The Sharwan Smith Center serves as a campus hub for students, faculty, and staff. Housing most of the student services departments, including student government and activities, the post office, cafeteria, bookstore, and food courts, the building is the “campus living room.” The facility is used for workshops, conventions, club activities, meetings, movies, academically related events and social activities.

Large numbers of students enjoy campus recreation and intramurals. Taking advantage of a spacious new Physical Education building, these programs serve a variety of interests during fall and spring semesters. Growing student interest in outdoor recreation programming has been met by adding part-time and student staff to provide specific program support in outdoor recreation connected to SUU’s exquisite natural setting.

Student involvement is now under a specific director, and involvement programming reaches out to students living both on and off campus and draws them into student activities, athletics, and other events. The Entertainment Bureau works with groups that represent the student body and promote campus recruitment and retention. The Bureau offers an annual talent show, works with the Miss SUU Scholarship pageant and the annual Thunderbird Awards, sponsored by SUUSA.

The Service and Learning Center works closely with departments in Student Services and academic departments to enhance the
University’s learning environment. The impetus behind this campus center is to provide centralized and current communication about existing service opportunities and to help facilitate service learning across the curriculum. Major interest has been shown in the Alternative Spring Break program where students visit Mexico and provide service to communities, schools, and children.

Convocation, a weekly lecture series, offers thirty annual lectures and performances and is designed to promote additional learning and community awareness among students and the University community. Students, faculty and staff serve on the Convocation planning committee. This group selects appropriate topics and presenters to create programming that stimulates intellectual inquiry and dialogue about current topics of critical concern to students. Students may enroll for course credit and evaluate each speaker in the series. (Starting in Fall 2003, Convocation will be overseen by the Tanner Center.)

The co-curricular program includes policies and procedures that determine the relationship of the institution with its student activities; identifying the needs, evaluating the effectiveness, and providing appropriate governance of the program are joint responsibilities of students and the institution. (3.D.16) The student constitution (which deals with student government and the assembly) provides guidelines for the operation of student government. Other policies and procedures also govern student activities. Student activity programs are evaluated informally by the planning committee after each event. Attendance and representation from different clubs and organizations is monitored at various events. Elected student leaders respond to a year-end written survey of their experience. In August 2001, a broad-based survey of the Southern Utah University Student Association’s leadership and programs was completed and published. Focus groups have been utilized to garner information in guiding the operation of the University. There is a need for more formalized assessment of some services through satisfaction surveys, focus groups, and other student evaluations. Recent improvements have been made and are documented in exhibit materials for Standard 3.

SUU provides adequate opportunities and facilities for student recreational and athletic needs apart from intercollegiate athletics. (3.D.17) The campus offers intramural and open recreation programming in association with Student Activities. With the addition of the new physical education building, expanded offerings in fitness, team and individual sports became possible. With the University's location in one of the most scenic areas of Utah and the western United States, an outdoor recreation program is being developed in partnership with campus recreation and the student activities office. Many students are attracted to SUU by its physical environment that includes proximity to National Parks and areas for skiing, rock climbing, hiking, and other endeavors.

If the institution operates a bookstore, it supports the educational program and contributes to the intellectual climate of the campus community. Students, faculty, and staff have the opportunity to participate in the development and monitoring of bookstore policies and procedures. (3.D.18) The University Bookstore is the official source for all required books and supplies. The store is centrally located in the Sharwan Smith Center and works closely with faculty in making available books and other supplies. The Bookstore has been commended for its buy-back program and for high utilization of used books that helps students with tight budgets. The Bookstore has an advisory committee comprised of faculty, staff, and students. The Bookstore provides clothing and a variety of other commercial items of interest to students and the campus in general. The Bookstore handles sales associated with concerts and other events where books, compact disks, clothing or other materials are to be sold.

When student media exist, the institution provides for a clearly defined and published policy of the institution's relationship to student publications and other media. (3.D.19) The University Journal student newspaper serves the
campus. Published in full-size form on Monday and Thursday during the academic year, the Journal is primarily student managed and operated. With ties to the Communication Department from which it is advised, it is also assisted by a Steering Council comprised of faculty, staff, and students.

Campus television and radio stations are associated with the Department of Communication. Students have opportunities to produce, direct, and anchor or perform with these media. Newscasts and other specific programs are produced by University students. The policies and guidelines for these productions follow those of the academic department. In order to properly define the University’s relationship with student media, the University Publications Council maintains a general policy for each student publication. This assures that such publications are conducted primarily as organs of student news and opinion and that they seek fairness and accuracy at all times. The Steering Committee of the University Journal works exclusively with the student newspaper on campus. Television and radio stations operated by students are overseen by the faculty of the SUU Communication Department, and guidelines regarding students’ on-the-air representation of the University are included in course syllabi.

Appraisal

The University recruits and admits students who are qualified to complete programs of study. SUU is challenged to support the capable but under-prepared student who may wish to study at the institution. The University has now implemented a two-tier admission system. Students needing developmental support will work closely with academic advisors, tutorial programs, and will be involved in the student success course. The Student Success Center is designed to assist the student with a supportive learning environment in the academic setting while the Student Service departments design programs that foster learning in the non-academic setting. For example, Resident Life programming supports student residents in the halls; Disabled Student Services work closely with students who need appropriate accommodations; and the Multicultural Center supports a variety of clubs and provides counseling support to help students adjust to University life. Student Activities and Student Involvement encourage students to participate in outdoor and other recreation, service learning, student activities and government. All Student Services areas design programs that assist students in balancing their lives. Students are assisted in managing their time to allow for adequate emphasis on academic performance, as well as time for social and recreational activities and possible employment.

Exhibit 3.4 reflects Student Services areas reporting of internal and external assessments conducted yearly or periodically. Exhibit 3.5 extracts Student Services items from the SUU Strategic Plan.

For the self-study, each unit within Student Services prepared notebooks of exhibit materials. The notebooks are in the exhibit area:

Exhibit 3.6: Admissions
Exhibit 3.7: Financial Aid
Exhibit 3.8: Student Activities
Exhibit 3.9: Student Development Center
Exhibit 3.10: Wellness Center
Exhibit 3.11: Student Support Center
Exhibit 3.12: Career Services
Exhibit 3.13: Student Services Administration
Exhibit 3.14: Housing and Residence Life
Exhibit 3.15: Registrar
Exhibit 3.16: School Relations

Intercollegiate Athletics - Standard 3.E

The SUU Thunderbirds compete at NCAA Division I level in baseball, men’s golf, men’s and women’s basketball, cross country, indoor and outdoor track and field, women’s gymnastics, soccer, softball and tennis. Football competes at NCAA Division I-AA.

In 1988, SUU made the transition to Division I in every sport but football which remained DII.
until 1993 when it advanced to DI-AA. All programs, with the exception of football and women’s gymnastics, joined the Mid-Continent Conference in 1997 where they have experienced several notable successes. In 1997 the NCAA issued full certification to SUU on the operating principles of the Athletic Department. Currently, SUU is in the second cycle of the NCAA certification process with a 2004 recertification decision due.

SUU athletes have also prospered in the classroom. The gymnastics team has been named Academic National Champions six of the last ten years and has never placed lower than third. Softball received the same honor in 1997 and 1998, as did men’s cross country in 1997, to make three Academic National Champions in the same year.

**Institutional control is exercised through the governing board's annual review of its comprehensive statement of philosophy, goals, and objectives for intercollegiate athletics. The program is evaluated regularly and systematically to ensure that it is an integral part of the education of athletes and is in keeping with the educational mission of the institution. (3.E.1)** The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics operates within the institution's mission statement and NCAA rules and regulations. Student-athletes at SUU are required to progress toward completion of the degree of their choice while concurrently developing athletic abilities in an environment consistent with high standards of academic scholarship, sportsmanship, leadership, and institutional loyalty. The intercollegiate athlete representing SUU is thus a bona fide student and an amateur competitor. Administrators and trustees review the program annually to insure that it is an integral part of the education of athletes and is complementary to the mission of SUU. As stated in the SUU Athletic Mission Statement, the athletic program adheres to the policies and procedures of the NCAA and the rules of any conference, league or association of which it is a member.

The objectives of the Intercollegiate Athletic Program include but are not limited to the following:

- To encourage scholarship, sportsmanship, fair play, and a sense of responsibility among all student-athletes, students, faculty, and staff members at Southern Utah University.
- To assist University men and women whose athletic abilities and personal conduct reflect credit upon the institution and who, as bona fide students, will be able to make normal progress in their degree programs with appropriate academic counseling, advisement, and support.
- To field disciplined and competitive teams and athletes recruited, coached, and supported by a competent staff dedicated to the observation of the spirit as well as the letter of all the applicable rules and regulations.
- To schedule appropriate competition for the athletes and teams.
- To develop an Athletic Department recognized for its leadership as an ethical, non-discriminatory, and well-managed department devoid of any appearance or fact of impropriety and characterized by the overall excellence of its programs.
- To provide superior training and medical support for all intercollegiate athletes.
- To maintain an intercollegiate athletic program befitting a major state university while concurrently meeting the athletic needs of a diverse student and faculty community.
- To strive for the improvement of the system of intercollegiate athletics by cooperation with other institutions.

**The goals and objectives of the intercollegiate athletic program, as well as institutional expectations of staff members, are provided in writing to candidates for athletic staff positions. Policies and rules concerning intercollegiate athletics are reviewed, at least annually, by athletics administrators and all head and**
assistant coaches. The duties and authority of the director of athletics, faculty committee on athletics, and others involved in athletics policy-making and program management are stated explicitly in writing. (3.E.2) Athletic policy with goals, objectives, and institutional oversight is outlined in the Athletic Policy manual. A copy of the manual is made available to all athletic staff. The Director of Athletics has operational responsibility for the athletic program and reports to the Vice President for Administrative & Financial Services. Administrative oversight of the Athletic Department is delegated by the President to this Vice President. On issues of fund raising, the Director of Athletics coordinates promotion, receipting, and recognition with the University’s development office. In recent years, a student-athlete advisory committee has been organized to address issues of student-athlete welfare and to serve as a communications conduit for students in the Athletic Department.

Trustees monitor institutional compliance with rules relating to athletics. The board also advises the President on issues related to athletics. The President is responsible for institutional compliance with programmatic requirements of the state higher education system, institutional, conference, and NCAA rules relating to athletics. The Athletic Council at SUU is an advisory committee on eligibility and scheduling issues to the Director of Athletics and to the President. Its primary role is to review eligibility policy and financial aid appeals.

Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards and degree requirements, and financial aid awards for student athletics are vested in the same institutional agencies that handle these matters for all students. (3.E.3) Students, both athlete and non-athlete, desiring to attend SUU are required to meet published admissions criteria. Exceptions to the admissions requirements are considered if it can be shown that the student is capable of succeeding at SUU or if that prospective student has special talents or diversity which will enhance the institution’s life and character.

Similarly, degree requirements, financial aid awards and other support for student athletes are the same as for other students. For example, in the case of a student-athlete who has been denied admission, a letter from the coach and athletic director or associate athletic director is required. The Athletics Department’s recommendations are taken into consideration with the same merit as other third party recommendations. The appeal is presented to the Admissions office and then taken to the Academic Standards and Admissions Review Committee for consideration. The Athletics Department does not have representation on the Academic Standards and Admissions Review Committee. See Exhibit 3.17.

Athletic budget development is systematic; funds raised for and expended on athletics by alumni, foundations, and other groups shall be subject to the approval of the administration and be accounted for through the institution’s generally accepted practices of documentation and audit. (3.E.4) Fund raising is coordinated with the SUU development office. Final budget and fiscal control and responsibility are vested in the President as approved by the Trustees. The Director of Athletics, with the assistance of the Associate Director of Athletics, is responsible for formulating overall budget requests for submission to the administration. Such requests specifically designate those funds allocated to revenue and non-revenue producing sports. Upon final approval of the budget, each coach or program is given a copy of their finalized budget. See Exhibit 3.17.

As stated in the Athletic Policy, the Athletic Department will be subject to an annual compliance audit to be performed by the Controller’s office. Compliance with all rules and regulations governing finances and the actions of the Athletic Department will be reviewed and a report submitted to the President and NCAA.

All fundraising efforts are coordinated by the Marketing and Promotions Director and Athletic Director. In addition, these efforts are coordinated with the SUU Development Office. All monies are deposited into institutional
accounts administered by the Athletic Director
and are audited annually by the University and
outside auditors.

SUU demonstrates its commitment to fair and
equitable treatment of both male and female
athletes in providing opportunities for
participation, financial aid, student-support
services, equipment, and access to facilities.
(3.E.5) SUU is in compliance with Title IX. A
women’s sport team was added in Fall 2001, and
the addition of women’s soccer increased
participation of female students from 68 in
plan was adopted which placed two male
(Football and Basketball) and two female
(Basketball and Gymnastics) as priority sports
receiving sport media guides and posters. All
other sports are combined in a Fall or Spring
media guide and poster. Squad size limits have
been placed on the men’s teams to help manage
proportionality.

Females constitute 38.7% of those competing in
intercollegiate athletics. They receive 43% of
the available athletics financial aid. Operating
budgets for women’s sports increased an
Women’s coaches salaries have increased
between 18% and 76% during the same time
frame. Equitable starting salaries for both men’s
and women’s sport programs have occurred the
past three years with new hires.

In addition, the mode of transportation for all
men’s and women’s sports is equitable for bus,
van and air travel. A locker room for women’s
teams has been provided in the renovated
Multipurpose Center for Softball, Soccer, Tennis
and Cross Country/Track teams, and the
Women’s Basketball locker room has been
renovated with new lockers and carpet.

SUU publishes its policy concerning the
scheduling of intercollegiate practices and
competition for both men and women that avoids
conflicts with the instructional calendar,
particularly during end-of-term examinations.
(3.E.6) Head coaches of each sport work with
the athletic administration to prepare a tentative
schedule. In constructing schedules, the
objective is to provide the best competition
possible within the framework of the respective
budget and consistent with the objectives of each
sport program and applicable NCAA and
Conference regulations. Practice times are
coordinated through the athletic administration.

Completed schedules must be submitted to the
Athletic Director as early as possible but no later
than June 1 for the subsequent academic year.
Upon approval of tentative intercollegiate home
contests, competition dates are to be posted in
the Harris Center office. After proposed
schedules have been found to fit within budget
by the Athletic Director, they will be considered
for final institutional approval, and contracts will
be signed by the Athletic Director (or Associate
Director as applicable). Each coach will be
notified when the schedule has received final
approval and should not be announced in any
manner until final approval has been received
from the Athletic Director.

The factors to be considered in constructing
schedules are:

- Balance between the number of home
  and away contests.
- Proper spacing of home and away
  contests.
- Scheduling during academic semesters
  or other times when students are on
  campus. No competitions may be
  scheduled during the final examination
  period.
- Academic demands upon the student-
  athletes.
- Income and expense involved in each
  contest, i.e., travel expenses and
  guarantees.
- Possibility of arranging for trips
  involving more than one contest,
  resulting in a savings of time and
  money.
- Time and space demands upon home
  facilities.
- Dates for Conference and NCAA
  championship tournaments and meets.
Exit interviews with student-athletes include questions regarding the value of the students’ athletic experiences, the extent of the athletics time demands countered by the student athletes, proposed changes in intercollegiate athletics, and concerns related to the administration of the student-athlete’s specific sports. See Exhibit 3.17.

**Appraisal**

The Athletic Department attracts quality student-athletes to the University. The Athletic Department graduation rate is higher than the general student body. However, it is challenged by the student-athletes serving church-related missions for two years, thus graduating outside of the six-year window used for computation of the graduation rate. The Operating Principles of the NCAA are being met by the department. There remains a need for additional scholarships to meet the NCAA allowable numbers.

Student programs and services at SUU support the University’s mission by contributing to the co-curricular experience of students, complementing academic areas, and giving voice to student concerns of institutional governance. Units in Student Services have been developed to support the overall mission of Student Services and address the needs of SUU’s student population.

Recent initiatives of the University have been initiated to meet critical areas for students. Recruitment and retention of students has been foremost among these initiatives. A centralized approach to enrollment management was implemented in July 2003, providing unitary direction to admissions, financial aid, and school relations. Student advising was restructured for improved retention with fill-time staff advisors in each college/school, a Student Success Center, “mandatory” advisement, and a student success course in general education. These changes hold great promise for the institution.

Continuing programs have also guided the work of Student Services. Promoting an appreciation for diversity through cultural weeks, enhancing the wellness of the student populations, creating staff development opportunities, and advancing service learning through voluntary participation—all are continuing.

Like other elements of SUU, Student Services is thinly funded for its comprehensive and complex role. A number of future initiatives will need attention as the division aspires to greater success: 1) a more academically aligned resident life program; 2) systematic assessment of student services and programs; and 3) adjustment to changes in enrollment management, advising, and records under new organizational structures and institutional goals.
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SUU’s Outstanding Scholar for 2003, Dr. David Christensen leads an accounting and information systems department of national caliber. "Our graduates score in the 80th percentile on national field exams, and accounting firms always want more of our graduates," Christensen said. He teaches accounting with practical application and the latest in business scholarship.

Recognized for his ability to teach small business development, marketing, and international business, Professor Derek Snow offers practical application of business principles. He's a specialist in developing business loan packages and in launching small businesses. He was recognized in 2003 as SUU’s Outstanding Educator.
STANDARD FOUR: FACULTY

In Fall 2001, SUU employed 220 regular faculty and a total of 898 academic, student support, administrative staff, and students. SUU faculty provide academic quality through their primary role as teachers, and are known and respected for their rapport with students. Through the dedication and diligence of faculty, SUU offers applied technology, baccalaureate, and graduate programs of uncommon distinction. Faculty with professorial rank teach undergraduate courses at all levels, advise students, provide leadership to the University, and engage in scholarly and creative activities. SUU has gathered a diverse group of faculty from 73 academic institutions, public and private, foreign and domestic. About 70% hold a doctorate, first professional, or other terminal degree.

While this section of the self-study report examines faculty roles, loads, duties, rewards, involvement, and related issues, it also demonstrates the strong commitment of the faculty to the welfare and future of the University. Faculty strive for “shared governance” in wrestling with resource, curriculum, and other operational decisions that have, in the past, been left to others. At times, faculty members have expressed candid commentaries on SUU that reflect their perceptions and hopes. Collectively, the faculty remain committed to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development - Standard 4.A

The selection, development, and retention of a competent faculty is of paramount importance to the institution. The faculty's central responsibility is for educational programs and their quality. The faculty are adequate in number and qualifications to meet their obligations toward achievement of the institution's mission and goals.

SUU employs professionally qualified faculty with primary commitment to the institution and representative of each field or program in which it offers major work. (4.A.1) A goal of SUU is “to foster superior teaching, scholarly/creative endeavors, and public service.” To achieve this goal, the university hires professionally qualified faculty who have a primary commitment to the University and its mission and goals, and who are representative of each field or discipline in which SUU is programmatically involved. Each faculty member has access to SUU policies; each has a contractual appointment outlining employment status and duties. Policies and procedures are in place or are evolving to insure equitable treatment, fair compensation, and opportunities for professional development. Table 4.1 provides the institutional profile of faculty. Additional detailed information and statistics about SUU’s faculty are provided in Exhibit i.1, recent Fact Books of the University; Exhibit 4.1, Minority and Gender Composition of SUU Faculty/Staff; and Exhibit 4.2, Number and Source of Highest Degrees of Full-time, Tenure and Tenure-track Faculty.

As a result of the self-study process, the need became clear for greater uniformity across campus of faculty members with terminal degrees. Some colleges/schools have an uncommonly high percentage of faculty terminally qualified; others do not. The Provost has introduced a Faculty Education Enhancement (FEE) program effective Fall 2003 whereby eligible faculty will receive institutional, college and departmental assistance to complete minimal qualifications. It is an objective of SUU to strengthen the academic credentials and qualifications of faculty.

Several SUU policies are relevant to selecting, hiring, retaining, and promoting professionally qualified faculty:

- 6.0 Definition of Faculty
- 6.1 Leave, Rank & Tenure (under revision)
- 6.2 Academic Position Descriptions (under revision)
- 6.3 Academic Rank (under revision)
- 6.4 Adjunct Faculty
Standard Four: Faculty Self-Study

- 6.6 Academic Freedom
- 6.8 Curriculum Development & Revision
- 6.9 Supplemental & Overload Compensation & Consultation
- 6.10 Faculty Senate Constitution
- 6.14 Leave, Rank & Tenure procedures
- 6.15 Leaves of Absence
- 6.22 Faculty Due Process
- 6.24 Faculty Appointments
- 6.27 Faculty Workload
- 6.33 Annual Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
- 6.34 Three-year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
- 6.35 Faculty Preparations
- 6.36 Course Syllabus
- 6.38 Faculty Hiring (under revision)

Copies of all University policies are available on the SUU web site, http://www.suu.edu/pub/policies/, and in the Exhibits area. Under revised Policy 6.3, a doctorate is the terminal degree in all disciplines except in the Department of Art and the Department of Theatre Arts/Dance, where a Master's of Fine Arts degree is recognized as the terminal degree. Faculty vitae, available in the exhibit area, detail the credentials of the faculty.

Helen Chuang earned her Ph.D. in 1999 from SUNY at Buffalo. Her research explores ornithology, molecular evolution and biotechnology. In 2002 she was recognized as Outstanding Scholar for her ability to balance her high quality teaching, scholarship and service roles. She teaches undergraduate courses in general biology, genetics, evolution, vertebrate physiology, biotechnology and sociobiology.
### STANDARD FOUR—FACULTY TABLE 4.1. INSTITUTIONAL FACULTY PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Previous Fall Term Credit Hour Load</th>
<th>Standard Four: Faculty</th>
<th>Self-Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Terminal Degrees</td>
<td>Salary, 9 Months</td>
<td>Years of Experience at Institution</td>
<td>Total Years of Teaching Experience *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45,417</td>
<td>90,687</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32,885</td>
<td>49,995</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>48,286</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof in Residence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist in Residence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>33,650</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,967</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teaching experience not at SUU.*
Faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance. (4.A.2)

As at most universities in the nation, SUU faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance. SUU has a maturing and developing system for faculty participation and shared governance. The Faculty Senate is the faculty governing body at SUU; it meets monthly during the academic year to make recommendations to the administration. The Faculty Senate web site includes the senate constitution, meeting agendas and minutes, and a list of officers and members. See http://www.suu.edu/ad/senate/. Through the Senate, its committees, surveys, and ad hoc committees of the University, faculty contribute to SUU governance. Exhibit 4.3 is a current list of faculty committee membership.

Faculty members provide significant input for any changes to existing academic policy. Under revised curriculum policies, academic planning and curriculum development begins at the department level with proposals submitted by individual professors and program units. Department chairs and program coordinators generally lead discussions in departmental meetings regarding academic policy and course development. Departments establish academic degree requirements for their respective programs. This includes establishing core requirements, elective courses, and prerequisites for upper division courses.

Faculty members are also expected to be involved in academic advisement. SUU provides for two types of advisement: First, the Student Success Center provides general advisement for students without a declared major in general education courses. Second, for students with declared majors, beginning July 2003, a professional staff advisor is available in each school or college. Some departments also designate one or more faculty members to supplement staff resources.

In the 2001-02 academic year, faculty and the Faculty Senate:

- Adopted policies regarding course syllabi, grading, faculty preparations, academic development and grant resources, and transfer credits.
- Revised the University’s curriculum processes, its definitions, committees, and procedures.
- Initiated revision of the Senate’s constitution and bylaws.
- Streamlined and consolidated its committees for better operating efficiency.
- Created a special task force to update leave, rank and tenure policies.
- Conducted a survey of faculty attitudes and perceptions.

The President of the Faculty Senate attends meetings of the Deans’ Council that convenes regularly to act on academic issues. The Faculty Senate President-elect attends Board of Trustees meetings, and the Senate’s Executive Committee meets regularly with the Provost.

Despite these policies and procedures, recent surveys of SUU faculty suggest concerns about limited input in institutional governance at the college and university levels. The situation is improving, according to survey data. According to the 2000-01 faculty satisfaction survey, faculty held a high level of satisfaction regarding faculty governance at the department level (mean Likert score of 3.57 out of 5). However, this statistic falls to 2.78 at the college level and to 2.24 at the university level. All of these statistics showed improvement over the previous survey, and the college and university changes were statistically significant.

Faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty, allowing sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal. (4.A.3) Regents’ and institutional policy govern faculty workloads at SUU. Recognizing SUU’s role and mission, the Regents established 24 credit hour equivalents each year or 12 credits each semester. Further, recognizing the diverse mix of teaching assignments, the Regents allow faculty contact hours in credit-bearing teaching activities to
average 13 contact hours per week. An annual report of workload, Exhibit 4.4, is submitted each fall to the Board of Regents. Figure 4.1 summarizes the trend in average credit hours taught per headcount faculty.

**Figure 4.1**

![Graph showing average credit hours taught per headcount faculty from 1994-95 to 2002-03.](image)

Source: SUU Fact Books

**Faculty Workloads**

In SUU’s Strategic Plan performance indicator 2.3.2, workload is addressed: “Faculty workload will meet the Regent’s standard of average weekly teaching contact hours.” The Board of Regents allows this workload to be adjusted for various reasons, including the teaching of large sections, labs and studio hours; supervising theses and internships; performing administrative and other activities; and teaching graduate-level courses. Department chairs have some discretion for these adjustments. The most recent data (Fall 2002) indicates SUU is within the contact hour standard.

Surveys of faculty satisfaction indicate that SUU faculty are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their teaching loads under current research expectations with Likert-scale responses near 3 on a scale of 5 (see 2001 Faculty Satisfaction Survey, p. 15, summarized below). The faculty satisfaction survey also queried respondents as to teaching load “if expectations of scholarly activity were to increase” (see Item 3). Because of specialized accreditations (e.g., ABET, AACSB) and expansion of graduate programs, these scholarly expectations have increased in recent years. Data on faculty contact hours per FTE faculty are available only for the last three years. These statistics are as follows: 2000-01, 12.4 contact hours per FTE faculty; 2001-02, 12.8; and 2002-03, 12.8. These data show no increase in Fall 2002.

At the request of students and in an effort to improve space utilization rates, the University has made the distribution of instruction throughout the day and week a priority. Further, to preserve an institutional strength, faculty and
student interaction, SUU has kept most class section enrollments below 30 (80% in Fall 2002).

**Professional Development Opportunities**

Faculty and staff professional development is a priority of the institution. The University has substantially increased the amount of travel funds in the last five years, and another increase is planned for 2003-04. At the present time, three sources of funds encourage and promote faculty research through travel and the presentation of research findings: University Faculty Development Grants, college faculty development, and department travel budgets.

University Faculty Development Grants are awarded on a competitive grant basis through the University Faculty Development Committee. Also, each college receives an allotment of Faculty Development money, which is administered through the Dean of that college. Additionally, each department is allotted a line item travel budget. Although in the past college and department funding amounts were allotted on an historic basis, current department and college funds are allotted on the number of faculty. Criteria used for distribution of funds vary among colleges and departments, but many have been administered on a first-come, first-served basis. See College and Department accreditation documents for specific procedures.

The 2001 faculty survey showed a slight increase over the 2000 survey in faculty satisfaction with both the availability of financial resources and release time for conference attendance. Likert scaled questions (range 1 to 5) increased from 2.31 to 2.46 regarding “financial resources for conference attendance” and increased from 3.35 to 3.48 regarding “release time for conference attendance.” Neither of these changes was statistically significant. SUU has seen some reduction in travel funds for the 2002-2003 school year as a result of state budget deficits. Beginning in 2003-04, additional funding, a streamlined application process, and greater emphasis on faculty development are priorities.

Sabbatical leave is granted to faculty for the purpose of scholarly or creative activity, writing, advanced study or related professional activity. A committee of the Faculty Senate reviews, evaluates, and ranks sabbatical requests each year, and depending on available funding, one-year or one-semester sabbatical leaves may be recommended by the President and approved by the Board of Trustees. Since 1996-97, 54 members of the faculty have applied for sabbatical leave and 50 (92.6%) received approval.

Faculty salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain a competent faculty and are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available, and equitably administered. (4.A.4) Faculty compensation is a continuing challenge for SUU. Goal 2 of SUU’s Strategic Plan includes the objective: “hire, reward, and retain qualified faculty.” As an assessment measure for this objective, the plan addresses the “number of faculty whose total compensation package is less than 90 percent of peer average.” Current data indicate all faculty ranks combined are 89.5% of the average of peer group institutions; 54 faculty are below 90% of market. Improving salaries and salary equity have been a long-standing budget priority of the administration as it annually requests support from the Utah legislature.

Until the two most recent fiscal years, SUU made some progress regarding faculty salaries as summarized by comparative data in Table 4.2. Of special note was a “catch-up” provision from the State Legislature in the 2001-02 school year. The lack of state funding for salary increases in FY 2002-03 and FY 2003-04 may work against recent trends in faculty satisfaction surveys.
Table 4.2
Faculty Salary Increases, 1992 to 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>National Annual Increase (%)</th>
<th>SUU Annual Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This salary issue has several dimensions:

- Studies of salary comparability to peer institutions indicate that SUU faculty salaries are below average.
- There are issues of salary equity among departments.
- Competitive hiring of new faculty requires offers that are market driven; this has created salary compression.
- According to faculty surveys, the issue of compensation for overload classes or summer teaching is a larger concern than base salaries.

Each of these issues will be analyzed here.

**Below-Average Salaries**

SUU’s Human Resources Office does annual compensation studies, and the most recent study (2000-01 year) showed that overall SUU salaries (mean $42,743) were 84% of peer institutions using CUPA data (mean $50,980). (Note: These data control for field, degree and rank.) However, there is considerable evidence that the institution is making progress in bringing salaries in line with peer institutions:

First, SUU received an overall increase of 7.5 percent for the 2001-02 school year to raise the mean salary to $45,399. Although CUPA data were not available at the time of this writing, if one assumes that CUPA data shows an increase of salaries by 3.5 percent, then the SUU “salary gap” would have closed from 84 percent to 86.0 percent of CUPA. (Note: The 3.5 percent statistic is the average salary increase at comprehensive institutions nationally in 2001-02.)

Second, faculty satisfaction survey data indicate that faculty members were more satisfied with their 2000-01 salaries than in past years. These survey results, moreover, were acquired prior to the large overall salary increases of 2001-02. Further, base salary did not show up as one of the five areas of greatest faculty dissatisfaction (although faculty were most dissatisfied with overload compensation). Exhibit 4.5 includes all relevant salary and compensation studies, the surveys of faculty satisfaction cited here, as well as the latest AAUP annual report on compensation.

Third, SUU fares better in total compensation (salary and benefits) than in narrow salary comparisons. Unfortunately, there is no systematic way to compare total compensation to peer institutions while controlling for rank and experience. According to the 2000-01 faculty survey, the SUU benefit package (where benefits are on average 40% of salary) provides a high level of satisfaction. The benefit package (medical, dental, disability, maternity/paternity leave for staff, and retirement) received mean

One thing in particular that sets Professor Richard Tebbs apart, students say, is how approachable and friendly he is; they feel completely comfortable with him. That says a lot about a mathematics professor. His well-designed courses and humorous delivery enliven his classes. He was department chair for 10 years, and he is considered a dynamic teacher and role model. In 2002, he was recognized by his peers as Outstanding Educator.
Likert scale ratings of from 3.7 to 4.3 (scale of 1 to 5). The survey found that SUU retirement benefits are the area of highest satisfaction for faculty.

The AAUP annual report contains data on “total compensation” which includes benefits. For comprehensive institutions in the Intermountain West, AAUP estimates total mean 2001-02 compensation as $68,255 (AAUP Report, Table 7); for SUU this statistic is $63,500 (Appendix 1). The “compensation gap” (93 percent) is therefore much narrower than the “salary gap” (estimated 86 percent). (Note: The AAUP data also have straight salary data. For Mountain West comprehensive institutions, the average 2001-02 salary (all ranks) was $54,318 (table 6); the comparable statistic for SUU is $45,800.)

An important measure for judging satisfaction with salary levels is turnover and retention. Indeed, this indicator has prompted the administration to invest some of the anticipated tuition revenue for 2003 in salary and compensation funding to promote faculty and staff retention. Despite the improvement of salaries and a strong benefits package, the available turnover and retention data suggest that SUU faculty are under-compensated. Almost every department response to the accreditation templates indicated that low salaries had limited hiring and retention. Turnover data are consistent with this template evidence. The 2000-01 Faculty Survey included an analysis of the turnover rate at SUU. Figure 4.2 depicts a six-year turnover rate at SUU.

![Six-Year Faculty Turnover Trend](image)

As the figure indicates, the annual turnover rate at SUU increased threefold in the last six years. The table below breaks these turnover data into retirement, end-of-contract, and resignations (from 2000-01 Faculty Survey). These data indicate that resignations (as a percent of total faculty on contract) have increased from 1.9 percent in 1998-99 to 8.7 percent in 2000-01. It is not known for certain that inadequate salaries have driven these resignations, but the data are
consistent with that interpretation (especially when combined with anecdotal evidence from the templates). Retention rates vary within units of the institution. For example, in the areas of biology, family/consumer sciences, languages, and physical education, over half of the full-time faculty have at least 10 years of service to the University.

Table 4.3
Faculty Turnover, 1995-96 to 2000-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty on Contract</th>
<th>Retirement</th>
<th>End-of-Contract</th>
<th>Resignation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equity Among Departments

A second issue related to salaries is how equitably they are administered; i.e., are some departments/disciplines “overcompensated” relative to others? This issue has been raised in the Faculty Senate and also in the annual faculty satisfaction surveys. Table 4.4 summarizes comparative salary data by academic department. These data are for the 2000-01 school year.

Table 4.4
SUU Salary Equity Analysis, 2000-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mean Salaries</th>
<th>Department Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>SUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>66,461</td>
<td>55,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Sci.</td>
<td>57,982</td>
<td>45,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>53,839</td>
<td>45,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>51,165</td>
<td>44,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
<td>43,806</td>
<td>43,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>56,211</td>
<td>43,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>49,819</td>
<td>42,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ed/Computer Info Sys.</td>
<td>47,737</td>
<td>41,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>60,038</td>
<td>41,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>49,043</td>
<td>40,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Science</td>
<td>48,481</td>
<td>39,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>44,338</td>
<td>39,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>45,241</td>
<td>38,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>39,673</td>
<td>38,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td>48,751</td>
<td>38,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SUU Office of Human Resources
The departments are ranked in Table 4.4 by both mean salary and percent of market. Data indicate that there is very little correlation between rankings. For example, the top three departments in absolute salary (Business, Math/CS, Biology) are in the bottom third of all SUU departments when ranked by percent of market (CUPA). The SUU Art department is ranked next to last in terms of absolute salary, but is ranked second in percent of market average salary. One definition of equity would be that all departments attain the same percent of CUPA (for example, the School of Business has a goal of 90 percent of CUPA for new hires). There are clearly some departments that are lagging in compensation. Three departments are slightly below 80 percent of market (Psychology, Language and Literature, and Math & Computer Science). Most SUU departments are between 80 and 90 percent of market. One difficulty with bringing departmental salaries more in “equity” (as defined above) is that some departments must pay market (or near market) salaries to hire new faculty. Mean departmental salaries are influenced by these new hires; hence, growing departments should experience more closure in the CUPA salary gap.

**Salary Compression**

Salary compression occurs when new faculty salaries exceed those of existing faculty who have similar or even superior credentials. Compression tends to increase inequity, resulting in low faculty morale and perceived unfairness. The University has experienced rapid growth in enrollment and faculty during the 1990s. Consistent with the institution’s movement from college to university status, many programs are hiring terminally degreed faculty in a national job market. Accreditation of individual departments (e.g., AACSB, ABET) have also driven the required credentials (and therefore salaries) of new hires.

There is evidence of salary compression at SUU. Specifically, salary compression was identified as an issue on accreditation templates of five SUU departments (Communication, Music, Physical Science, Psychology, and Social Sciences). The Engineering and Physics unit in the Physical Science department recently adjusted faculty salaries to mitigate compression. Institutionally, the Provost is setting aside funding to address compression and developed a plan to increase funding for rank advancements.

**Overload/Summer Teaching Compensation**

According to recent faculty surveys, overload compensation has been the number one area of faculty dissatisfaction at SUU. Until the summer of 2003, overload compensation for teaching a three credit hour class was $2,100. Unlike most universities, SUU paid retirement benefits of $304.50 on top of overload contracts. To raise overload compensation, to improve faculty morale and satisfaction, and to expand summer school course offerings, a new model took effect in Summer 2003. The plan set a salary floor at $2,200 and a ceiling at $3,500, and in between, salary is based on 6.25% of the 9-month salary base for a three-credit hour course. As expected, the enhanced overload compensation model has been well received by faculty and will expand the number of course offerings for students. Further, during the academic year, funding for adjuncts and overload compensation will be built into departmental budgets through use of the revised budget formula.

SUU provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations, and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 - Faculty Evaluation, page 66. (4.A.5) Several SUU policies explicitly address faculty evaluation and several provide user templates for preparing tenure and rank advancement portfolios:

- 6.1 Leave, Rank & Tenure
- 6.3 Academic Rank
- 6.14 Leave, Rank & Tenure Procedures
- 6.33 Annual Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
• 6.34 Three-year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
• 8.3.1 Faculty Appraisal & Evaluation

Evaluation of teaching by students provides feedback for faculty members to improve. Table 4.5 provides a six-semester summary of course and instructor evaluations, with focus on two summative questions.

Figure 4.3

Course and Instructor Evaluations
Percent of Students who Agree or Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Overall Instructor Effectiveness</th>
<th>Course Usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Course Evaluation Summaries

Standard 1 discussed these evaluations as part of the University’s assessment process and Exhibit 4.6 collects current evaluations by department and college. Some departments supplement student evaluation with peer teaching evaluations, periodic reviews of faculty performance, or department chair reviews. Department templates, completed for the self-study and available among exhibit materials, describe departmental practices. Some departments also provide for post-tenure reviews of faculty (e.g., English).

For the past three to five years, the Faculty Senate and various subcommittees have been researching, revising, and updating policies applicable to regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance. The revisions were intended to draw upon additional resources, including evaluations other than from students, measures to ensure teaching effectiveness, and post-tenure review. The evaluation of faculty performance remains an item for further discussion and action.

Promotion and tenure guidelines and criteria are in the process of thorough revision, primarily to align them with the revised role and mission of the University, expanded meanings of scholarly and creative activity, and present evaluation and review practices. While policies are under revision, the preparation, submission, and evaluation criteria of faculty dossiers for promotion and tenure follow present policy. Departmental, College, and University committee recommendations are forwarded to the Provost and President. Policy 6.1, available in the exhibit room, delineates current practice.

SUU defines an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. Institutional personnel policies and procedures are published and made available to faculty.

(4.A.6) Recruitment of quality faculty is critical
to fulfilling the University’s mission of superior teaching and quality service to students. Faculty hiring is increasing in importance at SUU for at least two major reasons: 1) the University is hiring more terminally-qualified faculty in a national labor market, and 2) the University is committed to increase diversity of its faculty and staff.

For the past several years, the University has not had a consistent and uniform hiring policy. There are policies providing guidelines for hiring (*Exhibit 4.7*, Policies 5.21, 5.14 and 5.3, Affirmative Action), yet the departmental templates indicate considerable differences in the hiring procedures across campus. Working together, the administration and the Faculty Senate are in the process of establishing a rigorous and well-defined hiring process that will be applied consistently across departments. Policies have also been drafted to stipulate the content and length of faculty contacts, and the duties and evaluation mechanisms for faculty holding administrative positions. Under current and revised policy, however, faculty hire faculty at SUU.

Currently, the general practice is that the hiring process for full-time faculty begins at the department level. A recruitment authorization form signed by the department chair, dean, and provost engages the Human Resources office in the search process. Given approval for hiring, faculty hires follow the following steps:

- A search committee of at least three members is formed through appointment by the department chair. Usually, four to five faculty members serve to offer a better balance of tenure/non-tenure, gender, discipline and other considerations. Policy requires at least one female to be on the committee. The University Affirmative Action Plan (among the policies noted above) requires the Director of Affirmative Action to monitor all search committees for gender representation.
- The search committee works with the department chair to develop a hiring timetable and position description.
- The search committee meets with the director of human resources for suggestions on the position description and proper search policies and procedures.
- The position is advertised through the University web site and publications such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, professional journals, and newspapers. Policy requires the Director of Affirmative Action to receive and distribute position announcements through appropriate venues.
- When the position closes, the search committee screens candidates by reviewing applications and performing phone interviews. Finalists (usually three) are selected for formal on-campus interviews, and their references and credentials are carefully checked. Given the University’s mission of quality teaching, most finalists are required to teach a class during their visit, and some units require a faculty seminar by candidates.
- The search committee ranks candidates, often with input from the faculty. After a candidate is selected for hire, the Human Resources Office is notified in writing. After the University President

---

*After applying 20 years of experience and teaching in applied economic research and policy at such places as the National Academy of Sciences and Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Joe Baker joined SUU as associate professor of economics and finance to teach undergraduate and graduate courses in finance and quantitative analysis. He was named SUU’s Outstanding Educator in 2001.*
signs the Notice of Appointment, the successful candidate is notified by the hiring department, usually the Chair.

All faculty appointments become official upon approval of the Board of Trustees. Institutional personnel policies and procedures are available through the faculty and staff webpage. In addition, new faculty members are given a print copy during their orientation, and this general procedure is likely to appear in revised hiring and contract policies.

The institution fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty. (See Eligibility Requirement 13, page 6, and Policy A-8 - Principles and Practices Regarding Institutional Mission and Goals, Policies and Administration, page 118). (4.A.7) SUU fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty, as declared in Policy 6.6. The University’s policy regarding academic freedom of campus speakers is set forth in Policy 5.1 (Exhibit 4.8). Data from the SUU faculty survey indicate satisfaction with the level of academic freedom at SUU (mean Likert scale of 3.42 out of 5; see below). This statistic changed little from last year, according to the 2000-2001 Faculty Survey. Standard 9 further discusses academic freedom.

Part-time and adjunct faculty are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignment and/or other prescribed duties and responsibilities in accord with the mission and goals of the institution. (4.A.8) Part-time and adjunct faculty are defined as “faculty” in SUU Policy 6.0, “Definition of Faculty.” As such, all policies and procedures that apply to “faculty” also apply to part-time and adjunct faculty, save the exceptions outlined under Policy 6.4 “Adjunct Faculty.” During the 2001-2002 school year, SUU supplemented full-time faculty with 98 part-time instructors (31 percent of head-count faculty). This figure has increased substantially from an estimated 31 part-time/adjunct faculty in 1992-93. Based upon the 10-year summary table (Exhibit i.1), part-time/adjunct faculty have increased from 18% of FTE faculty in 1992 to 34% in 2002. Despite this growth, there are no assessment indicators related to part-time/adjunct faculty in the current Strategic Plan. Some part-time instructors have been employed on more or less a continuous basis for several years. Table 4.5 lists the number of part-time/adjunct faculty by department, and Exhibit 4.9 provides a detailed roster of adjuncts and copies of relevant policies. The dearth of qualified instructors precludes some departments from seeking and hiring part-time faculty, even if a teaching need is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5. SUU Adjunct Faculty, 2001-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education &amp; Computer Info Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Consumer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Computer Sci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assure that part-time faculty are qualified, SUU adopted and implemented Policy 6.4. Resumes and transcripts of part-time and adjunct faculty are part of the data review and collection process, the same as for full-time faculty. Detailed information on credentials is provided in exhibit materials and departmental templates.

Part-time and adjunct faculty make outstanding contributions to the institution. In particular, the Utah Shakespearean Festival provides a unique opportunity for the Theatre Arts and Dance Department to employ distinguished adjuncts and part-time faculty. Part-time and adjunct faculty are also subject to student course evaluations, providing a helpful tool in determining their effectiveness as teachers.

*Employment practices for part-time and adjunct faculty include dissemination of information regarding the institution, the work assignment, rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment. (4.A.9)*

Recruitment for adjunct and part-time faculty are described in Policy 5.21, “Procedures for Hiring New Personnel.” If the position is for half-time or greater, then hiring procedures follow those for full-time tenure track positions. Positions of less than half-time do not require advertisement or fringe benefits. Adjunct and part-time faculty have access to university web pages; these pages contain all SUU policies regarding the university and employee rights and responsibilities. Work assignments and conditions of employment are established through contracts with individual departments; part-time/adjunct faculty are given a written agreement detailing these items. Consistent with its mission of teaching excellence, SUU policy requires that each part-time/adjunct faculty’s appointment end automatically each June 30 and may be reappointed after appropriate review. Part-time/adjunct faculty are subject to student and merit evaluations the same as full-time faculty.

SUU demonstrates that it periodically assesses institutional policies concerning the use of part-time and adjunct faculty in light of the mission and goals of the institution. (4.A.10) Policies for using part-time and adjunct faculty are part of the current review of academic policies.

**Appraisal**

SUU’s faculty include many outstanding educators, teachers, advisors, scholars, and administrators. The University has mechanisms for inclusion of faculty in planning and governance, in developing curriculum, and in shaping unit directions. The Faculty Senate is representative of the faculty with a well-defined system of operations.

Foremost among SUU’s challenges is faculty and staff compensation. Faculty salaries remain the priority challenge for the administration. Faculty have also identified the need for new facilities, equipment, larger operating budgets, support staff, and workload balance. These concerns are expressed in departmental templates prepared for this self-study. There is also a need, recognized by the leadership of the Faculty Senate, to dovetail and streamline the leave, rank and tenure processes with faculty evaluation and development.

A number of initiatives are underway to address challenges posed in the Standard:

- From student tuition revenue in 2003, increased investment in faculty retention, compensation, and professional development has been a commitment of the administration.
- A streamlined and enhanced faculty development program will be available to faculty.
- Deans and department chairs have been given data and a challenge regarding 1) class sizes and breakeven points; 2) workload study results; and 3) cost analyses and student-to-faculty ratios to manage academic scheduling and
faculty assignments. The objective is to meet regental workload standards and allow time for scholarship and service.

- A new financial model for summer school has been introduced and a summer scheduling grid developed to aid faculty and students.
- A comprehensive financial model for academic operations will be introduced beginning in fiscal year 2003-04, expanding operating budgets and equalizing allocations within specific resources.
- Faculty appointment and hiring policies have been revised for greater clarity and uniformity.
- A Faculty Education Enhancement (FEE) program was introduced in Fall 2003 to provide financial assistance to faculty needing to meet minimum credentialing standards.

Of great significance is the reaffirmation of faculty participation in planning, curriculum development and review, advising and general governance through a number of processes and mechanisms:

- Revised, faculty-driven curriculum committee system.
- New graduate curriculum and programs committee.
- Faculty service on key planning and governance committees examining institutional effectiveness and assessment.
- New academic program review policy and processes.
- Revision of the leave, rank, tenure and faculty evaluation policies and processes.
- Faculty oversight and involvement in advising, first-year experience, and student success.

Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation - Standard 4.B

Scholarship, including research and artistic creation, is inherent in the work of faculty and students. Scholarship is the systematic study of a chosen subject characterized by a high level of expertise, originality, critical analysis, significance, and demonstrability. Faculty contribute to the validity and vitality of their teaching through acquiring and sustaining expertise in their chosen discipline. Faculty scholarship -- which may entail creation, application, synthesis, or transmission of knowledge -- is central to effective instruction in all postsecondary educational institutions. Moreover, faculty endeavors provide students with opportunities to observe and develop an understanding of scholarly, academic, and artistic activities.

James Bowns, a distinguished professor in Biology, received the Outstanding Scholar Award in 2001. Known as a leading national authority on land-use management, he has published nearly 100 articles, and served on more than 30 public advisory boards in an effort to promote balanced environmental policies. He is professor of forestry and range management, and has held joint appointments at SUU and at Utah State University.

Research is scholarly activity directed toward constructing and/or revising theories, and creating and/or applying knowledge. Artistic creation is scholarly activity in the visual, performing, and literary arts that expresses original ideas, interpretations, imagination, thoughts, or feelings. Faculty and students at SUU pursue a multitude of research and artistic endeavors that fulfill the institution's mission.

Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty are engaged in scholarship, research,
and artistic creation. (4.B.1) Consistent with its role and mission, and with its strategic plan, faculty are engaged in scholarship, research, and artistic creation. Indeed, SUU has seen an increased emphasis on scholarship and creative endeavors since 1992.

Assessment indicators for this objective include:
- In discipline-appropriate ways, scholarly/creative activity will be measured on a campus-wide portfolio basis where faculty will on average produce at least one scholarly/creative, externally reviewed work each year.
- Departmental LRT and assessment plans/reports will address the objective in discipline-appropriate ways that demonstrate steady improvement.
- Objective 2.4 of the Strategic Plan states: “The University will recognize and reward outstanding student and faculty scholarship and creative activities.”

In measuring and assessing such activities, several indicators are helpful. These include the number and percentage of faculty recognized and rewarded for outstanding scholarship and creative activities each year; the percentage of faculty in externally fundable areas who generate grant funding; and the amount of external funding per faculty FTE. Data in departmental binders (among exhibit materials) indicate that active research and creative endeavors are evident in all university departments.

SUU’s policies and procedures, including ethical considerations, concerning scholarship, research, and artistic creation, are clearly communicated. (4.B.2) By policy SUU encourages, recognizes, and rewards scholarly excellence through rank advancement and tenure. Policies for rank advancement and tenure (Exhibit 4.10) specify that faculty establish and meet goals in areas of professional activity: teaching, scholarship, and public service. This is further developed in the University Strategic Plan Objective 2.3: “To integrate in mutually supportive ways appropriate to each discipline scholarship/creative work with instructional activities.” These policies and procedures are communicated to new faculty as part of the new faculty orientation workshop, and are available to all faculty members through the university web site.

Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty have a substantive role in the development and administration of research policies and practices. (4.B.3) The Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, approved by the Board of Trustees, declare that the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process. Furthermore, the faculty has responsibility for providing input and consultation about preparation of the University budget relative to expenditure of funds allocated for instructional and research areas. See Exhibit 4.11.

With the exception of the Scholarly Achievement Committee, however, there currently are no Faculty Senate committees that oversee issues related to research policies. The Faculty Senate Scholarly Achievement committee has some de facto effect on campus research policy by awarding and rewarding scholarship/creative activities (Exhibit 4.12). In addition, faculty have input on research practices through the Institutional Review Board and Animal Care Committees. While there is no formal all-encompassing University Research Policy, the product of research, i.e., intellectual property, is defined in Policy 5.52. Faculty, staff, and students may have personal rights in intellectual works they create while employed by or attending the University. Such creations are encouraged in the best interest of the creator, the University, the public, and the research sponsor, if any. As a condition of employment or enrollment, faculty, staff, and students are bound by this policy unless “... they have received substantial support in research, writing, or development of works as defined in Presumptive Ownership.”
Consistent with its mission and goals, the institution provides appropriate financial, physical, administrative, and information resources for scholarship, research, and artistic creation. (4.B.4) As noted above in the discussion on professional development, SUU provides, within its mission and goals, appropriate resources for scholarship, research and artistic creation. Further, scholarship is supported both internally and externally. The Center for Faculty Excellence (CFE) includes a full-time director of the Academic Grants Office (AGO) reporting to the Provost, and the AGO represents a more aggressive approach to securing funding and support for scholarly work as per recommendations in the 1998 Northwest Accreditation Report. The AGO subscribes to “Grant Advisor Plus” and “SPIN” electronic databases that provide a wealth of information about potential grant opportunities.

The director of the AGO is responsible to:

- Communicate with faculty and staff through email alerts based on a database of research interests.
- Provide assistance with proposal development and budget preparation.
- Document cost-sharing and compiling time and effort reports.
- Provide monthly spreadsheets to faculty to explain financial activity in grant accounts.
- Assist faculty members with reports to funding agencies.
- Serve as the authorized signature on NSF electronic and Fastlane proposals.
- Assist the Chair of the Institutional Review Board on the issues related to the protection of human subjects.
- Offer workshops for faculty and staff on such topics as proposal writing, electronic submissions and management of grant projects, and relevant policies of the university, Utah Board of Regents and federal agencies.

External funding agencies for SUU projects have included the National Science Foundation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Geological Survey, the W.M. Keck Foundation, Utah State Office of Education and Board of Regents, Utah Arts Council, Utah Humanities Council, and Utah Historical Society.

Both the number of proposals and the total dollar amounts requested have steadily increased in recent years. For example, in fiscal year 1999 faculty in the College of Science received seven grant awards for $30,256, and in fiscal year 2001, the College of Science faculty received $164,654 in thirteen awards. During the 2000 school year, the College of Science faculty received a $250,000 award for equipment from the W.M. Keck Foundation. Exhibit 4.13 details external awards.

Each year the Center for Faculty Excellence provides internal funding for faculty projects. In the past nine years, nearly $300,000 has been awarded to faculty through a competitive grants process. Members of the faculty have been awarded funds for technology, lab equipment, research projects, grant writing, and professional travel. While not every proposal was funded, the competition for internal funding is not as stiff as the competition for federal funding. Exhibit 4.14 details faculty development grants by college since 1993.
Additional resources have been added to encourage faculty development and scholarship. With University funding, faculty development conferences have brought to campus experts in the scholarship of teaching. An ongoing program of visiting scholars has been supported by the George S. and Dolores Dore’ Eccles Foundation. Drawing on a rotating grant of $8,333 per college every three years, scholars are invited to campus for three or more days of intensive interactions with faculty, students, and the public. See Exhibit 4.15, Annual Reports, 1997-2001, George S. and Delores Dore’ Eccles Foundation Visiting Scholar Program. In 2002-2003, a newly-established Provost Fund provided more than $40,000 in faculty development funds, with a larger amount anticipated for 2003-04.

Nonetheless, as Faculty Satisfaction Survey data indicate, most faculty and administrators recognize that current resources only begin to support a level of scholarship desired by faculty and appropriate to the institution's mission. Faculty surveys indicate low levels of satisfaction with the availability of financial resources for research, although satisfaction is improving. The 2001 survey mean Likert (range 1-5) for “financial resources to conduct research” was 2.10, up a statistically significant amount from a mean of 1.81 in the 2000 faculty survey. The statistic for “release time to conduct research” grew from 1.98 in the 2000 faculty survey to 2.20 in 2001. This change was not statistically significant.

The competition for funding and for other sources of support for scholarly activities is increasing on campus. The faculty continue to grow in number, and newly-hired faculty have terminal degrees and research and creative agendas that call for institutional support. Yet, the amount available per faculty member to support research and travel is both minimal and uncertain from year to year. In addition, no program currently exists for publication page charges. Current funding is derived from budget line items and indirect costs, and is less than optimal. If scholarly activity is to become a more fundamental part of the enterprise, resources will be needed to encourage and reward it.

The nature of the institution's research mission and goals and its commitment to faculty scholarship, research, and artistic creation are reflected in the assignment of faculty responsibilities, the expectation and reward of faculty performance, and opportunities for faculty renewal through sabbatical leaves or other similar programs. (4.B.5) To the extent possible, the university’s commitment to faculty scholarship, research, and artistic creation is reflected in the assignment of faculty responsibilities, the expectation and reward of faculty performance, and opportunities for faculty renewal through sabbatical leaves or other similar programs. The Utah State Board of Regents established a faculty workload policy to “allow faculty to produce research, or works for scholarship or artistic merit and to prepare for classes” (Utah State Board of Regents Policy R-485). Regents allow this workload to be adjusted for various reasons.

Some departments reduce the teaching load for faculty who are engaged actively in research projects, and some incorporate a specific level of scholarship activity as part of the annual credit hour assignment. In addition, release time is
also available in some departments for grant writing and can be funded through faculty development grants. Currently, these negotiations happen on a case-by-case basis. SUU faculty remain concerned about teaching loads if expectations of scholarly activity were to increase. However, survey results also indicate a high level of satisfaction (Likert mean of 3.19 out of 5) with teaching loads with no change in scholarly expectations.

Departments vary in their recognition and award mechanisms for scholarship. Priorities are communicated to faculty in department and college/school policy manuals. Each year, students and faculty of the university are encouraged to submit names of faculty with outstanding performance in research and creative activities. Students recognize faculty through the Thunderbird Professor of the Year award (Exhibit 4.16), recognizing the professor who has contributed to academic excellence through the knowledge of his/her area of expertise, exceptional teaching ability, and dedication to the education of his/her students.

Through several standing Faculty Senate committees, faculty recognize excellence through monetary and recognition awards. These include awards for Scholarly Achievement, Outstanding Scholar, Outstanding Professor, Distinguished Professor, and Distinguished Faculty Honor Lecture awards. The Scholarly Achievement and Outstanding Scholar are awards that have been established in the last five years. The Faculty Senate’s Scholarly Achievement Committee asks for submissions from faculty that provide evidence of superior achievement during the calendar year. See Exhibit 4.17.

The Outstanding and Distinguished Professor awards are based, in part, on extraordinary teaching, and include scholarly achievement. One Outstanding and up to three Distinguished Professor awards are given each year. Outstanding Scholarship Achievement is defined by the committee as work that has been peer-reviewed within a discipline and judged superior. The number of faculty scholars recognized has tripled in the last three years (9 in 1998 to 26 in 2001). The number of recognized Outstanding Scholars increased from one in 2001 to two in 2002.

All submitted scholarly work is displayed in library display cases and placed in bound formats in the library’s Special Collections, and publicized as outstanding academic and professional achievements of faculty. See Exhibit 4.18. In addition each year, one faculty member is recognized as a Distinguished Faculty Lecturer for her/his scholarship (by application) and receives the Grace A. Tanner Award and an honorarium of $1,500. The Distinguished Faculty Lecturer presents at the University’s Convocation series, with a distributed lecture publication and an honor reception. See Exhibit 4.19. Results from the latest faculty survey indicate a slight increase in
satisfaction for “recognition for scholarly activity at the college level or higher” from a mean (scale 1-5) of 2.71 in 2000 to 2.94 in 2001. This change was not statistically significant.

SUU’s professional leave program operates under guidelines that are described in University policies. Applications are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Scholarly and professional activities accomplished during the leave must be documented at the conclusion of the sabbatical. In general, leave applications are considered only after six years of service. The 2001 faculty survey indicated a mean Likert scale (range 1-5) satisfaction value of 3.14 for “opportunities for professional development.” This was up a statistically insignificant amount from the 2000 survey mean value of 3.04.

Sponsored research and programs funded by grants, contracts, and gifts are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. (4.B.6) Research and programs funded are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. Scholarship and creative endeavors reflect the University’s primary role and declared mission. Much of the research is applied or pedagogical in nature; also there is a strong component of undergraduate research involvement. Virtually all departments have indicated integration of faculty research and creative endeavors into classroom instruction. Although questions and indicators of adequate time and resource availability to do scholarly and creative activities are addressed in the Strategic Plan, they were identified as three of the five lowest areas of satisfaction in the 2000-2001 faculty survey.

Objective 2.4 of the Strategic Plan states that SUU will recognize and reward outstanding faculty (and student) scholarship and creative activities. Indicators include the number and percentage of faculty recognized and rewarded, the percentage of faculty who generated grant funding, and the amount of external funding per faculty FTE. Table 4.6 summarizes the number and amount of external grants awarded to faculty since 1996. It should be noted that some faculty are responsible for more than one grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Grants Funded</th>
<th># Faculty</th>
<th>Grand Total $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>312,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,981,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3,719,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,338,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,216,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>803,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>590,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUU Grants Office

Faculty are accorded academic freedom to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. (4.B.7) Faculty members are accorded academic freedom to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. Standard 9 also addresses this issue. As stated in University policy, SUU is operated for the common good of the greater community that it serves. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. A faculty member is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. Research for pecuniary return should be conditional upon disclosure to and the consent of the officials of the institution. Although faculty response to the question of academic freedom in the 2000-2001 Faculty Satisfaction Survey showed a high degree of satisfaction (3.42 out of 5), written comments from a few faculty caused academic freedom to be identified as an area of concern due to growing differences in faculty opinion.

Appraisal

The term scholarship is interpreted to be inclusive of the variations in the work of faculty across all disciplines, including scientific research, invention, and creative activities, and is currently being formally articulated by the Faculty Senate.
A core of dedicated faculty committed to scholarship and its integration into the curriculum and into student lives is one of SUU’s greatest strengths. Students love the faculty and the mentoring they receive. One excellent example of this commitment is that of the College of Science, whose faculty have a strong undergraduate research program. In the last three years, more than 20 students have participated in off-campus internships at universities and Department of Energy facilities, such as Lawrence Berkeley Labs and Pacific Northwest Labs. At least 50 biology, chemistry, and geology students have collaborated with faculty in independent undergraduate studies in southwestern Utah, and all biology majors participate in undergraduate research projects as part of their core and elective courses (see department accreditation templates and binders). The results of this scholarship have been disseminated in the Annual Biology Student Research symposium for the past five years, and the University Faculty and Student Scholarship Day for the past three years (also in Exhibit 4.19 and Exhibit 4.20, Faculty Development Conferences).

Faculty scholarship is disseminated in a number of ways. Recently, faculty have published in such journals as Archives and Museum Informatics, Utah Historical Quarterly, Journal of Educational Psychology, American Biology Teacher, Herpetological Review, Western North American Naturalist, Great Basin Naturalist, Journal of Mass Media Ethics, Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, Tailwind, Petroglyph, Dialog, Romance Notes, Libro Segundo, Caliope: The Journal of the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry, Selectra, Carolina Quarterly, Southwest Scholar. Books by faculty have been published by the University of Utah Press, the University of Nebraska Press, and other academic publishers. See exhibit materials for a more detailed listing of faculty scholarship.

Faculty have earned considerable recognition during the past three years. Artists have held exhibitions and performances at such institutions and galleries as Utah Pastel Society, Eccles Community Art Center, Art Complex Museum, Duxbury, MA; Folk Art Center, Asheville, NC; Denver International Airport, Ohio Craft Museum, Miller Gallery, Cincinnati, Ohio; New Orleans Art Association, LA; Period Gallery, Omaha, NE; Bradley University Print & Drawing Exhibition, Peoria, IL; Delta National Small Prints Exhibition, Jonesboro, AR; Gallery Eleven-Seven, Long Beach, CA; Springville Art Museum, UT; Rio Grande Depot, Salt Lake City, UT; Capitol Theatre, Salt Lake City, UT; Cultural Olympiad. Dance, Music and Theatre faculty have performed or participated with the American Folk Ballet, Carnegie Hall, Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble, Utah Shakespearean Festival, and the Kennedy Center American College Theater Festival, Region VII. (See exhibit materials for this Standard and departmental notebooks for examples.)


Internationally, faculty have presented papers, performed, or published in Australia, Canada, France, Greece, Mexico, and Russia. See exhibit materials for a more detailed listing.

As a result of the self-study process, the University has revised a number of key policies designed to insure equal and fair practices in selecting, hiring, evaluating, recognizing, advancing, compensating, and encouraging faculty. Procedures and policies are in place to
insure development of scholarly and creative endeavors, academic freedom, professional development, and a continued commitment to scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the mission of SUU. Faculty development funding is expanding. Faculty are competitive and successful in sponsored research and external grants writing, and there is potential for greater involvement. These ongoing endeavors reflect the centrality and commitment of faculty to SUU. Challenges remain, to be sure, but faculty continue to demonstrate high levels of engagement in their teaching, scholarly, and service activities.
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STANDARD 5

Library and Information Resources
STANDARD FIVE: LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

The Sherratt Library, Instructional Media Center (IMC), and Information Technology (IT) are integral to fulfilling the institutional mission. Exhibit 5.1 documents the library’s and IMC’s relationship to the SUU mission statement and how effectively they perform their roles. In addition, the Association of Colleges and Research Libraries (ACRL) recommends that a university library evaluate their performance “within the framework of the university’s mission and goals.” The mission statements for each function are summarized below, and documented further in Exhibit 5.2.

Library Mission Statement

The mission of the Gerald R. Sherratt library is to ensure access to global information within a personalized learning environment by collecting, organizing, preserving, disseminating and creating information for the university community. The role of the library is to actively stimulate the optimal use of information resources in support of the university curriculum, students and faculty research, and public service. Unique to our mission is 1) the support of superior teaching through instructional media services, and 2) the preservation of and access to our cultural heritage.

Instructional Media Center Mission Statement

The mission of the IMC is to support the educational media needs of the entire campus. The IMC distributes, installs, and maintains classroom equipment; provides production services; serves as the campus resource for the purchasing and installation of classroom equipment; serves as the campus resource for joint purchasing of paper and other media equipment and material; and provides a site for faculty and students to produce learning materials.

Information Technology Mission Statement

The mission of IT is to provide professional, service oriented technological support to the university community by:

- Maintaining a technological environment that encourages lifelong learning by faculty and students, academic excellence, scholarly/creative endeavors, quality service to students, and superior teaching.
- Planning and implementing proven technologies to enhance the functionality and capabilities of information technology on campus.
- Providing assistance and training to users of information technology systems.

Purpose and Scope – Standard 5.A

SUU’s information resources and services include sufficient holdings, equipment, and personnel in all of its libraries, instructional media and production centers, computer centers, networks, telecommunication facilities, and other repositories of information to accomplish the institution’s mission and goals. (5.A.1) The Gerald R. Sherratt Library opened in March 1996 at a construction cost of $10.4 million. This 80,500 square foot facility is linked via the internet to national and international collections and provides rich materials, information, and services. Together, faculty, library personnel, and students use the library for a variety of educational endeavors.

The new facility tripled library space on campus from assignable square footage of 22,543 in the old building to 61,691 in the Sherratt Library. Moreover, the number of reading stations in the library jumped from 350 to 1,200, and the number of student computer stations climbed from eight to nearly one hundred. The library has 10,557 full text journal titles in electronic, print or microform formats. Annually, the online databases receive over 240,000 hits and electronic reserve has over 12,000 patron uses. More than 32,000 patrons (duplicated) visit the
library each month. Increases in the base acquisitions budget and new endowments have enabled the number of print volumes to reach 236,688, a ratio of 39 books per student.

The Sherratt Library and Instructional Media Center employ 22 FTE staff and faculty. Exhibit 5.3 details the uses of the library, and Exhibit 5.4 summarizes the scope of the collection, budget and staffing compared to peer institution averages and provide trend information of resource sufficiency according the ACRL criteria.

An important function, the Instructional Media Center has changed to better serve the campus within diminishing resources. In July 2003, the IMC began operations in the Library, with its printing services directed from the Electronic Learning Center and its production lab downsized. The IMC will maintain public copiers located in the Sherratt Library and the ELC.

Information Technology (IT) serves the entire campus and comprises four areas: Administrative Systems, Networking Services, Network Infrastructure, and Web Services. To fulfill these aims, a number of skilled employees work in each area:

- **Administrative Systems** employs 5 FTE staff and is responsible for installation, support, and maintenance of accurate, reliable, secure systems for the management of university records, including student, financial, human resource, alumni development, and loan information.

- **Networking Services** employees 4 FTE staff and supports 30 file servers. It also supports faculty, staff, and student computers with a student ratio of 1 computer for every 10 students.

- **Network infrastructure** employs 2 FTE staff and consists of a fiber optic backbone connecting each building to one of two central hubs. These links to the buildings are, for the most part, gigabit Ethernet. Campus-wide there are 4,378 ports available on 207 network devices. The campus computers are connected to the internet and provide e-mail services.

- **Web Services** employs 2 FTE staff and provides a professional, secure, and consistent visual appearance to campus web pages. Web Services supports the campus in two main areas, the managing of the hardware and software that provides web functionality, and in design and content expertise provided to individual campus units.

The following table provides evidence of effectiveness in providing library and information services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NASC 1993</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commendations for service and use of technology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT College Outcomes Survey, 2002</td>
<td>79.5% responded “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with library services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus survey of library services, 2002</td>
<td>73% responded “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with library reference &amp; circulation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus survey of 1,517 students, 2002</td>
<td>86% responded “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with campus computing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the 1993 self-study report, the Sherratt Library continues to use innovative technologies. In 1999 an electronic reserve program was implemented and now receives over 12,000 hits annually. The number of online databases has increased dramatically to over 144. In 2000, the web-based LM 1010 Information Literacy course became a general education requirement, and over 1,400 students completed the course in 2001-02. See Standard 2 for more details.
National awards and recognition have followed these innovative practices. In August 1999, the library was named by the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) as one of nine colleges and universities in the nation for the Innovative Use of Information Technology by Colleges for our online photos and manuscripts collection. In 2002, the Sherratt Library received a substantial “leadership” grant of nearly $150,000 from the Institute for Museum and Library Services for Voices of the Colorado Plateau, an online multimedia museum collection featuring digitized oral history recordings and historic photographs. In 2002, the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) named the Sherratt Library as one of the state’s four regional digitization centers, whose major goal is to establish a statewide web-accessible digital collection.

Acclaim for the Sherratt Library’s design has come from many quarters, including selection for the Collegiate Citation in the Educational Interiors Showcase from the journal, American Schools and University. The library facility has been highlighted in visual and textual displays in Design Cost Data: The Cost Estimating Magazine for Design and Construction (Jan/Feb 1998); Choice: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries (November 1999); and Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings, by Leighton and Weber (American Library Association, 2000).

SUU has worked diligently to address recommendations from the 1993 NASC site visit. One major concern then centered on increasing the library’s budget. In 1996, the state allocated $160,000 for new acquisitions budgets, and the library received the first of six payments of the Huntsman Endowment (now totaling $500,000). In 1999 the library received a $15,000 grant from the UALC for the purchase of education and psychology materials, along with $12,500 for the purchase of non-print materials that could be loaned to other Utah academic libraries. Ongoing collection funding for new graduate programs ($12,450 for MFA and $7,500 for MBA) was obtained from a legislative appropriation. The 2001 legislature allotted UALC ongoing funding to address high costs of serials, of which SUU received $6,486. Each year the UALC spends almost $1,600,000 for database purchases, and SUU’s portion of that amount is $105,000.

Funding support for faculty scholarly endeavors was another primary concern voiced in 1993. The library’s collection development priorities are 1) materials that support existing programs and curricula; 2) general works of universal importance; 3) materials supporting the research of faculty; and 4) collections to anticipate future curriculum needs. Faculty can now expect timely delivery of research materials in two to seven days through interlibrary loan, and usually less than two days through the Utah Article Delivery (UTAD) service. Costs for the service are borne by UALC, and in 2000-01 the interlibrary service was used 2,497 times.

In 1993 the staff totaled 13.8, and in 2002 it had climbed to 18. The faculty has grown from 6 to 8, the professional staff from 5.5 to 6.2, and the classified staff from 2 to 4.5. Still, comparisons show that the master’s-degreed staff is 27% below that of library peers, and 46% below institutional peers. To help compensate for staffing issues, the Sherratt Library continues its effective use of student workers, a practice that was commended in 1993. Since 1993, the library student workers FTE has increased from 4.0 to 6.5, mainly by obtaining non-university sources for funding student wages.

From 1900 to 2000, the number of volumes has increased from 174,617 to 222,678, and the number of volumes purchased each year has tripled from approximately 5,000 to 15,000 volumes. Electronic and online access to serials has increased dramatically. Currently, faculty, staff, and students can access 10,557 electronic serial titles and 1,109 paper serials, a huge jump when compared to the 692 paper serials accessible in 1993.

The SUU book collection is a vital part of the library. Various collections in the library house the books used by the faculty and students. They include a main, juvenile, curriculum,
reference and special collections. An analysis of these book collections provides some interesting insight into the curriculum support provided by the library. Broad subject categories shows that the business and social sciences comprise approximately 11% of the book collections, 17% of the books are in education, 20% are found in the language and literature section, and 12% of the books are dedicated to science subjects. Microforms provide additional book resources to students and faculty. The library supports education curriculum with an ERIC document collection of 467,875 titles.

SUU’s core collection and related information resources are sufficient to support the curriculum. (5.A.2) In the past three years, the library book collection has grown 12.8%, from 209,759 in 1999 to 236,688 in 2002. This increase continues the steady 36% increase that the collection has made during the past ten years. While peer comparisons show that the library collection lags behind other institutions by 63%, studies of small libraries in an ACRL comparison show that SUU is 10% above the average in volumes in the library (see Tables 5.2 and 5.3 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries Reporting</th>
<th>Volumes in Library</th>
<th>Volumes Added (Gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>835,383</td>
<td>21,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>201,430</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU</td>
<td>222,697</td>
<td>15,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from average</td>
<td>21,267</td>
<td>9,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3  
Peer Institution Collection Comparisons (2001)  
(Uses 1999 American Library Directory entries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Volumes per Student</th>
<th>Serials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>540,974</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>3,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Dominguez Hill</td>
<td>435,627</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarion University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>384,957</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Univ/Purdue Univ at Fort Wayne</td>
<td>333,323</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>724,473</td>
<td>60.37</td>
<td>2,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>867,344</td>
<td>63.31</td>
<td>3,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Whitewater</td>
<td>386,575</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td>493,044</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>742,287</td>
<td>57.99</td>
<td>3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>570,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,693</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>209,759</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>7,275*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Average</td>
<td>(361,101.40)</td>
<td>(21.90)</td>
<td>4,582.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-63.26%</td>
<td>-38.61%</td>
<td>170.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Electronic access

The library continues to strive to raise the collection to the average of peer institutions, and has made significant progress by allocating scarce resources to increasing electronic resources. The 144 electronic databases cover subjects from general interest to science, education, social sciences, literature, and business, and represent a 38% increase during the past ten years.

Faculty and student assessments of the library provide valuable data on how the collection meets the curriculum needs of the campus community. First, academic templates were sent to all campus departments, of which twenty provided responses about the library collection. Second, faculty surveys were sent to 235 faculty members, with 90 responses. Third, a student survey was conducted using a random sample of 465 students in a student population of 6,095. The results are summarized below:

- Academic templates showed that thirteen departments (of twenty respondents) believed that the book and journal collection was not adequate for student and faculty research needs. Despite online access to electronic databases, some departments remain dissatisfied, notably those of Biology and Communication.
- During Spring Semester 2002, 90 faculty members completed a survey with 51 questions related to library and media services. Among faculty respondents, satisfaction with library resources on site (65%) was lower than satisfaction with availability of interlibrary loan resources (81%). The high use (68%) of interlibrary loan confirms that faculty find material elsewhere because it is not available in the Sherratt Library collection. More than 25% of the faculty stated that they had never used services that included electronic reserve and off-campus
access to library catalogs, suggesting a need for better training.

- Students were surveyed at random in the Spring Semester 2002, with a total of 464 responses. Nearly one-half (46%) of the students reported that they used the library 1-4 hours per week, but some 17% of responding students had never used online journal indexes and 20% had not used the online catalog or electronic reserve. Half of the students had not used interlibrary loan or UTAD, the online article delivery system.

Information resources and services are determined by the nature of the institution’s educational programs and the locations where programs are offered. (5.A.3) The Sherratt Library is located in the center of campus, is easily visible from all campus areas, and is open 92 hours per week. Traditional library materials such as books, serials, and media items are available for checkout. Special Collections provides resources related to the university and southern Utah. From the library, students can access all electronic resources, as well as access their student computer accounts which allow them to type papers, use their email accounts, and access other campus software programs. See Exhibit 5.1 for more details about library hours, services, and facilities.

Students are no longer restricted by time or space in doing their research at the library. They have access to 27 campus computer labs, some of which are available 24 hours a day. Students can access all campus related software, including library electronic resources, through these labs. In addition, students are able to access library resources from anywhere in the world through the internet. Through this access, the library supports the ACRL Guidelines for Distance Learning Library Services.

Some university departments maintain additional or specialized resources that benefit students in their specific areas. For example, programs in music, education, geology, and art provide rooms with materials relevant to their curricula. These materials are not cataloged in the library online catalog and are accessible to students in the department during limited hours. Career Services also provides materials and information resources to help students plan their careers, search for jobs, and find employers, none of which are indexed in the library online catalog.

**Appraisal**

Evolving from and implementing its mission, SUU’s information and library resources support student learning and faculty scholarship. Although the library collection could be more extensive, SUU applies its resources wisely and with focus on the mission of the institution. Information technology resources are a particular strength to SUU.

**Information Resources and Services - Standard 5.B**

Equipment and materials are selected, acquired, organized, and maintained to support the education program. (5.B.1) Generally, information resources and services at SUU are sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currency to support the institution’s curricular offerings.

**Equipment**

Networking services employs a variety of operating systems: Windows 2000, Window NT, Windows 2000 Server, MAC OS 9, Novell Netware, and RedHat Linux. In 1993 there were 304 computers in academic labs, with a student to computer ratio of 1 to 13; presently that ratio is 1 to 10, considerably higher than peer institutions. Students and faculty have developed a multi-year equipment purchase and replacement plan for systematic replacement of equipment to support the educational program. See Exhibit 5.5.

The skilled staff of Networking Services provides a wide array of services to support education programs. They do the following and more:
Design, install, and maintain instructional classrooms and labs.
Install, configure and maintain file servers to authenticate faculty, staff, and students to campus-wide network.
Secure shared storage to allow departments to collaborate on files.
Maintain campus software site licensing, an IBM/Tivoli backup system, and a network monitoring system.

Across campus, there are 4,368 ports available on 207 network devices. The campus computers have a high speed T3 connection to the internet. In the near future, an Internet 2 connection will be provided for student and faculty use. Campus email needs are provided by Central Novell GroupWise that is used by about 7,000 users who can access their e-mail, calendar, and task lists from anywhere in the world via the internet.

At present, 90 research computers are available for library patrons, 12 more than three years ago, and all have been upgraded to Windows XP and to 100 Mb connections. Further, upgraded wiring on the library’s second level now enables internet access to those students using their own laptops and wireless access is available on the third level. Some machines have DVD drives to enable access to an expanding collection of government documents and other materials. Services have been consolidated on fewer servers, and the library is participating in the newly installed campus wide SAN (storage area network).

All library staff computers have been replaced during the last three years; printers and scanners have been added to support new applications and services. A new self-check machine enables a faster circulation turnaround at busy times of the day. The library and IMC have a 5-year equipment replacement plan that guides new purchases.

The rental equipment and lab production equipment in the IMC is continually upgraded to meet faculty, staff and students needs. The IMC and the Sherratt Library have worked to provide the most up-to-date formats for media materials.

Since rental equipment is purchased solely with the rental money collected, some faculty and student needs are not met. Service and repair of existing equipment takes priority over new equipment purchases.

The Faculty IDEA Lab, funded as part of faculty development, is equipped with up-to-date software and equipment to help faculty generate products to enhance their teaching. SUU’s Art Department faculty, for example, created a customized slide library to accompany lectures, rather than purchasing one from a commercial vendor.

**Materials**

All faculty members are encouraged to suggest materials in their subject specialties to enhance their curriculum. Acquisition budgets are allotted annually to academic colleges and departments, to library subject specialists, and to the serials and databases department. The budgets are based on a funding formula determined by the number of faculty, student majors, degrees awarded, general education courses supported, service courses offered, and library materials circulated. Serials and databases may also be purchased from the departmental budgets.

All books are cataloged in the Library of Congress System. The Sherratt Library is a selective government depository for state and federal government documents, and these items are cataloged and shelved in the main collection. An electronic book collection of approximately 6,000 titles is available online. The collection, purchased from netLibrary, can be browsed, read, printed, or downloaded. A reference collection of 12,014 titles is available for in-house use only.

Other materials include:
- The reserve collection provides equal access to all students of needed class materials. In 2001-02, paper reserves had 7,396 checkouts and the electronic reserves were accessed 12,802 times.
• An in-house serial collection of 1,109 titles includes magazines, newspapers and journals available in print and microfiche formats. Over 10,557 serial titles are available full-text electronically through databases purchased by the library or UALC.

• The media collection of over 19,000 titles contains video tapes, computer programs, books on tape, transparencies, posters, CDs, recordings, pictures, charts, maps and kits and the equipment to use these materials.

• The curriculum collection contains 9,548 current public school materials while the juvenile collection includes 9,312 children’s literature titles. The items in both of these collections are cataloged in the Dewey Decimal System.

Special Collections is the center for SUU’s archives and many other collections that are historical, valuable, or in need of special handling. Oral histories, photographs, negatives, artifacts, and videos are available for use. Several collections are special: the Seymour Collection provides valuable materials in opera, drama, literature, and languages; and the Palmer Collection includes many historical photographs and materials about the Paiutes and southern Utah history.

Since 1998, the library has created computer searchable finding aids using recognized standard to provide Internet access to historical material housed in special collections and archives. In 2001, a second digitization technology, using high resolution scanning and CONTENTdm software, constructed a large collection of digitized images for web distribution. Voices of the Colorado Plateau, a sophisticated online multimedia museum exhibit of digitized oral history recordings and historic photographs, was developed by library staff and is housed on its own server purchased with a substantial IMLS grant.

Library and information resources and services contribute to developing the ability of students, faculty, and staff to use the resources independently and effectively. (5.B.2) Students have access to these resources at any time during the day or night. They can research at their convenience through services offered in the library, campus computer labs, and off-campus computer access. Lab assistants are available during open lab hours to provide help to students.

Two services provide patrons with needed reference help. The first is the traditional reference desk service that is staffed fifty hours a week. The second service is an online chat reference service called 24/7 that has been implemented by UALC this year. Students can access the service from the library home page, on and off campus.

Traditional reference service has increased 6% during each of the past three years at SUU (Table 5.5). However, in comparing our reference transactions to ACRL figures, SUU answers fewer reference questions by 12% (Table 5.6). The 2002 SUU student survey of library use indicates that only 69% of the campus students used the library and 15% of those students had never used the Reference Desk services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,938</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,212</strong></td>
<td><strong>+16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5
ACRL Reference Transactions (2000)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,701,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU</td>
<td>7,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(1092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*420 institutions

LM 1010 (Information Literacy) became a general education requirement in 2001 and provides students with the opportunity to learn how to do research. This “stand alone” course has generated debate among members of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee that needs to be resolved. In addition to the LM 1010 class, the library promotes effective utilization of its resources by offering orientation and information literacy instruction for students and faculty. In 2001-2002, 145 sessions with a total of 3,217 students were taught by library faculty.

Faculty and students have various opportunities to make efficient and independent use of library and information resources. Faculty, for example, may request bibliographies of library resources related to their subject area or specific course. Faculty may also request student assistant help in producing teaching projects through the faculty development services. All library patrons can check out books, serials, audio visual, and microform materials with staff assistance or through an automated self-checkout station.

Another service available to the campus community is a UALC program of reciprocal borrowing. This service allows a student, staff, or faculty member to go to another academic institution in Utah, show their current SUU identification, and check out materials from the library. The person may then bring the material to Cedar City, use it, and bring it to our library for free return to the loaning library.

Web services collect detailed server statistics that show traffic trends such as the number of page views per month, and the most popular pages. See web site at http://www.suu.edu/ad/webdev/stats/. This information is used to plan future server needs, address usability, and track marketing campaigns. Students can also use web services to publish homepages and to fulfill academic requirements, such as the NCATE portfolios. Web services works closely with faculty, staff, and a student web advisory committee to ensure that the visual elements of the main university web site complement other university efforts. 

Exhibit 5.6 describes student satisfaction with computing services, computer labs, software support, lab assistance, and technology access. Survey results are used to improve computing use and effectiveness.

Policies, regulations, and procedures for systematic development and management of information resources, in all formats, are documented, updated, and made available to the institution’s constituents. (5.B.3) Exhibit 5.2, as noted above, summarizes the policies for IT, library and IMC. All university policy is periodically reviewed and updated, and posted to the University’s web page. New faculty members receive a Faculty Guide to Library Services as part of their orientation. Library liaisons answer questions for faculty about library policies and procedures. Circulation and reference explain policies to patrons as needed.

Changes to the library and IMC policies begin with the administrator responsible for the policy.
being changed. Once the policy has been revised, it is sent to the campus library committee, comprised of eight faculty and two students. The committee charge and organization is outlined in SUU Policies and Procedures 13.13 (http://www.suu.edu/pub/policies/).

Opportunities are provided for faculty, staff, and students to participate in the planning and development of the library and information resources and services. (5.B.4) Committees and other informal methods allow all interested individuals the opportunity to shape library and computing services. One example of cooperation and active participation is found in material selection. Faculty, students, staff, and community members may request the library purchase items by using an online form found on the library website. The IMC receives requests for new equipment and services from faculty, staff, and students. The campus community is notified of changes and new items through the work of the library liaison and a quarterly newsletter sent to all faculty. The Academic Computer Users Committee (ACUC) was established to exchange computing information among instructional users for the optimum application of computer and other technologies in support of the curriculum of the University. A website describes their responsibilities: http://www.suu.edu/ad/acuc/

SUU’s computing and communications services are used to extend the boundaries in obtaining information and data from other sources, including regional, national, and international networks. (5.B.5) The campus has full internet services that allow access to information from all over the world. The library web pages provide access to resources in databases and other sources available on the Internet, including government documents, state websites, and basic reference resources. UALC’s Academic Pioneer and Utah Public Pioneer provide electronic products to the citizens of Utah. The library actively participates in these cooperative programs to extend the information resources to the campus community.

**Appraisal**

Significant progress in information technology has been made during the past ten years. Campus information systems and networks are an exceptional resource for the University. Library and information resource users are not limited to a certain time and place to do their research, but can find information and ask questions at any time through online services. Information resources and services are carefully planned and evaluated, and the library and IT staffs constantly monitor and keep pace with new formats, services, and technology. Important services such as interlibrary loan and UTAD overcome budget constraints and supplement collections. The library’s alliance with other higher education institutions helps SUU to update resources while avoiding unnecessary duplication of resources. IT effectively utilizes limited funding by “cascading” computer upgrades in student computer labs in the library and throughout campus. (New computers are first located in areas of greatest need, and the used computers replace older equipment elsewhere on campus.) The University recognizes the need to support information resources, illustrated during the past two years when the acquisition budgets remained stable and software maintenance needs were funded during statewide budget cuts.

The role of the library liaison should be enhanced through activities such as faculty open houses, enhanced database training, and communication about new materials in their field. Such a change might assist with collection development. The library’s paper-based book and serials collections are not growing fast enough to satisfy student or faculty research needs. Finally, the constant changes in computer technology and limited budgets prevent the IT department from effectively anticipating and implementing new technologies when desired.
Facilities and Access – Standard 5.C

Library and information resources are readily accessible to all students and faculty. These resources and services are sufficient in quality, level, breadth, quantity, and currency to meet the requirements of the educational program. (5.C.1) Exhibit 5.7 inventories all computing labs and their layouts. Over 115 software applications are supported on campus. As another measure of meeting educational needs, the campus has 70 mediated classrooms, of which 24 were upgraded during the summer of 2002.

Students have extended access to the library’s electronic resources including online databases and reference service. These proprietary materials are not free through the Web, but are made possible through a statewide academic consortium. As an example, the SUU debate team can access campus information resources while they travel to competitions. Administrative systems support the university’s data warehouse. Over the next five years, administrative systems will migrate to SCT’s Banner series of Oracle database applications. Again, the computing recycle plan, noted above, is a direct effort to maintain quality with up-to-date equipment.

In cases of cooperative arrangements with other library and information resources, formal documented agreements are established. These cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources complement rather than substitute for the institution’s own adequate and accessible core collection and services. (5.C.2) Many of the library’s electronic databases are purchased as part of the UALC projects. Exhibit 5.8 summarizes current agreements. Contracts for the databases are available on the UALC website (http://www.ualc.net/coldevC.html). Membership in UALC also permits reciprocal borrowing privileges and items returned to SUU will be forwarded to the lending institution.

The library selects 19.91% of the materials available through the Government Printing Office (GPO). In addition, the library is a State Data Center affiliate and SUU is provided with census materials and other state statistics. In return, the Sherratt Library provides reference service to the community.

Special Collections has two agreements. One is with the Dixie National Forest as custodian of their papers and photographs. The other is a designation as the Regional Archives for the Utah State Historical Society. SUU has a formal agreement to produce microfilm of local government records through the Millennial Project.

SUU has recently been appointed as one of four state institutions that will provide digitization services to local groups. Projects include photograph and document scanning, loading images on the internet with appropriate cataloging, and storage of the images created.

The IT department receives Internet service through the Utah Education (UEN) backbone located at SUU. From there, campus service connects to the Eccles Broadcast Center (EBC) in Salt Lake City, a connection is shared with two colleges and approximately 80 public schools. Qwest and Sprint provide the connections leaving Utah.

Appraisal

Facilities and access of the library and information technology are excellent for students, faculty, and staff. The library building is a superb complement to the campus, and information technology labs are regularly improved with current equipment. Mediated classrooms need more systematic funding to maintain and replace equipment, but the number of mediated rooms and their use in the curriculum favors faculty and students.
Personnel and Management – Standard 5.D

SUU employs a sufficient number of library and information resources staff to provide assistance to users of the library and to students at other learning resources sites. (5.D.1) The IT department, directed by the Assistant Provost for IT, oversees 6 staff positions and 2 student assistants in administrative systems. Exhibit 5.9 provides detailed organizational charts.

Student assistants have filled important staffing functions on campus, applying classroom lesson and skills while gaining valuable work experience. These positions are ideally suited for students pursuing a degree in computer science, information systems, or related subjects. Networking services employs 22 students to monitor and maintain the open computer labs. Web services currently employs part-time four students who perform duties including updating content to web design and one-on-one training.

The number of library personnel has increased dramatically during the past ten years. The library now employs 18.48 staff members, compared with 10.16 in 1990-1991. See Table 5.6 and Table 5.7. The library has 7.78 (FTE) faculty librarians. Each librarian is assigned an administrative function and a teaching load. Peer institution comparisons show that the SUU library is understaffed by 46% (7 FTE). See Table 5.8. ACRL 2000 data comparisons show that out of 474 reporting libraries, the average number of professional staff was 7, SUU has 8 professional staff. The library has received additional student funding as the result of grants written to IMLS, Utah State Library Division, and UALC library consortium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.6*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Decreases due to the transfer of EdNET services to another department

Table 5.7
ACRL Staff Comparisons (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Profes.</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dif.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Dominguez Hill</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarion University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Univ/Purdue Univ at Fort Wayne</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Whitewater</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from Average</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library and information resources staff include qualified professional and technical support staff, with required specific competencies, whose responsibilities are clearly defined. (5.D.2) The faculty, staff, and students hired to work for the library, IMC, and IT areas are highly qualified and bring excellent skills to the library. The IT department hires qualified staff who have at least a bachelor’s degree. Half of the staff members have master’s degrees in accounting, business, and education. Many have pursued certificates related to network administration or software applications. Exhibit 5.10 includes current vitae of the staff.

The library employs nine librarians whose terminal degrees range from an M.L.S. degree to a Ph.D. degree in Education Administration. The library employs 6.2 (FTE) professional staff and 4.5 classified staff. Among these employees there are eight bachelor’s degrees, and two M.A. degrees. Each was hired for his/her skills and the work ethic he/she brought to the job. The IMC staff includes 1.8 (FTE) professional staff and 1.91 classified staff. Two employees in the IMC have bachelor’s degrees.

SUU provides opportunities for professional growth for library and information resources professional staff. (5.D.3) In 2001-2002, every library faculty member attended at least one national conference, with some travel funding from grants, endowments, and self-generating funds. All staff members are provided the opportunity to attend to Utah Library Association and other local conferences or training.

Several faculty and staff are members of UALC committee that meet once or twice a semester and provide excellent opportunities for learning and networking with other librarians. The latest example of the impact of UALC participation is in the Mountain West Digital Library project (www.lib.utah.edu/digital/mwdl).

In addition to off-campus training, the faculty and staff are provided opportunities to participate in national programs through closed...
The library has purchased teleconferences on customer service, copyright, reference services, and library services. These electronic forums allow for information exchanges and professional growth despite limited budgets and other travel constraints.

Library and information resources and services are organized to support the accomplishment of institutional mission and goals. Organizational arrangements recognize the need for service linkage among complementary resource bases (e.g., libraries, computing facilities, instructional media and telecommunication centers). (5.D.4) Library faculty and staff and the IMC staff report to the Dean of Library Services. The Dean sits on the Dean’s Council and reports to the Provost. Under the direction of the Dean, administrative meetings are held, campus committees review library issues, and policy changes are made. Through the IT department, a unit of the Provost’s Office, faculty and students benefit from the coordinated services by receiving access to software such as WebCT for syllabus and online testing services, and web pages for class related materials.

The institution consults library and information resources staff in curriculum development. (5.D.5) A library representative sits on the University Curriculum Committee. All departments reported on the academic templates that they require students to do library research. Some used bibliographic instruction to help their students complete these research projects. Some faculty use the reserve system to provide information and materials for their classes and curricular development. IT staff are consulted on software applications and hardware purchases.

SUU provides sufficient financial support for library and information resources and services, and for their maintenance and security. (5.D.6) Since 1996, when the Sherratt Library was completed, the total library budget has increased 53% percent, from $936,689 to $1,429,622. The acquisitions budget has made a dramatic increase of 139%, from $227,553 to $544,094. Specific examples of the improved acquisitions budget is seen in ongoing funding for two new graduate programs ($12,450 for MFA and $7,500 for MBA). Some support is less direct, such as Academic Computing’s contribution of 48 computers for patron use in the library, with an expected replacement cycle of three to four years. In 2001-02, the academic departments spent $49,886 (66%) of the total allotment ($75,426) for discipline-specific book acquisitions. Only three out of twenty-two departments spent their entire allotments during the past year.

UALC funding supports many resources and services for the Sherratt library. Annually, UALC spends $1.6 million on electronic resources of which SUU’s portion is $105,664. The 2001 legislature allotted UALC ongoing funding to address serial inflation, of which SUU received $6,486. In 2002 SUU received $194,000 in funding from the Utah Library Consortium.

In 1996, the library received the first of six payments from the Jon and Karen Huntsman Endowment (now totaling $500,000), whose annual interest is spent on library acquisitions. Over the last ten years the library has received $175,000 for acquisitions from the Marriner S. Eccles Foundation. The Seymour Endowment provides $7,000 annually to support Special Collections services and resources.

Since 1998, the library has received grants totaling $220,770 from external sources. The funding agencies, amounts and activities are listed below in Table 5.9. External grants and consortium funding have been vital in supporting SUU’s library.
Table 5.9:
External Grants to Sherratt Library, 1998-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Agencies</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Amount Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)</td>
<td>EAD-based machine-readable finding aids for Special Collections</td>
<td>$7,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)</td>
<td>Computer and software to serve visually impaired patrons</td>
<td>$2,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Historical Society</td>
<td>Digital library of rare photos from the William R. Palmer Collection</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)</td>
<td>Create a digital library of rare photos from the Special Collections and improve data base and search engine</td>
<td>$6,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Technology Initiative</td>
<td>Develop an online Media Certification program</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Museum and Library Services, National Leadership Grant</td>
<td>Collaborative project creating Web-based multimedia museum, <em>Voices of the Colorado Plateau</em></td>
<td>$146,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Technology Initiative</td>
<td>Complete online Library Media Minor and Licensure program for the Utah Electronic College</td>
<td>$7,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State Historical Society</td>
<td>Organize Southern Utah regional archives</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both institutional and USHE funds support IT operations. The Banner migration will cost SUU nearly $1.3 million over five years, and funding will be adequate for the software and training of users.

**Appraisal**

Maintaining adequate staffing is a challenge, often addressed with faculty and staff development and additional hourly wage for student and part-time employees. SUU does not have the staffing that peer averages suggest it should have, but staff are experienced, dedicated, and provided with opportunities for professional development. More contract staff employees would allow for increased hours in specific library areas and improved services in information technology (such as help desk, lab support and program development). More IT staff are gaining professional certificates and training. Top leadership in the library should be MLS qualified.

**Planning and Evaluation – Standard 5.E**

*SUU has a planning process that involves users, library and information resource staff, faculty, and administrators. (5.E.1)* The library faculty meet at least monthly to evaluate resources and services and make plans to meet unit goals. Academic departments are involved in the library planning and evaluating process through representation on the Library Committee and through their library liaisons.

Departments plan and prepare for their curriculum needs by a regular review of holdings, and some departments complete a formal review of accreditation process. *Books for College Libraries* and *Best Books for University Libraries* are used in building and evaluating the collection. In addition, *Choice* recommendations for all libraries are placed as a priority for purchase. The Blackwell approval plan is reviewed at least annually and adjusted to
meet curriculum changes and refine the profile of books received.

Students participate in the library planning process by serving on committees, including the Library Committee, and by submitting suggestions for purchases through the library website (available at http://libforms.li.suu.edu/forms/request.htm). In 1998, the student government, under the direction of the Psychology Department, conducted a survey of 300 students to determine library hour needs. In addition to the survey, students actively lobbied the legislature for increased funding for academic libraries. The latest project that has directly benefited students is the drive-up book drop funded by the student government.

IT staff meet weekly to plan and evaluate services to the campus community. The ACUC and Deans’ Council are involved regularly in review of services and planning for the future.

In its planning, SUU recognizes the need for management and technical linkages among information resource bases (e.g., libraries, instructional computing, media production and distribution centers, and telecommunications networks). (5.E.2) Organizational linkages and planning committees, described above, create functional and service connections for faculty and students.

SUU regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, and utilization of its library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, and at all locations where courses, programs, or degrees are offered. The institution uses the results of the evaluations to improve the effectiveness of these resources. (5.E.3) As noted above, through surveys, campus input, annual reports, and other accountability mechanisms, both information technology and the library have and use a number of assessment tools. Exhibit 5.11 provides extensive evidence on facilities, services and resources. Furthermore, each year ACRL collects information from institutions so that libraries can compare themselves to their peers. The data is web-accessible and allows comparisons of SUU to other institutions granting master’s and professional degrees. Additionally, each year, SUU’s Office of Institutional Research compiles statistics from the American Library Directory comparing SUU to its peers.

Every five years, two library surveys are distributed: one to all faculty members and another to a random sample of students. The results are tabulated and have proven indispensable for library evaluation and planning. Cooperative UALC projects are also carefully evaluated. Use statistics on electronic resources, UTAD, Chat Reference, and other services are tabulated, thus providing details about consortium and individual members’ costs. Most of these services help distance learners as well as the campus community. Moreover, Information Technology conducts an annual survey of user satisfaction to guide planning and policy decisions.

Appraisal

Systematic mechanisms are in place to evaluate information technology and library services. Findings are used to plan and to provide improvements to services. The self-study process discovered that library liaisons could be better used, and communication can be improved between departments and the library. Generally, however, library services are excellent and timely, and information technology is a University strength for all users.
Resources and Reference

Tables
5.1 Selected Survey Responses on Library and Computing Services
5.2 ACRL Library Comparisons, 2000
5.3 Peer Institution Collection Comparisons, 2001-02
5.4 Reference Desk Statistics
5.5 ACRL Reference Transactions, 2000
5.6 Library and Instructional Media Personnel, Faculty, Staff and Students (FTE)
5.7 ACRL Staff Comparisons, 2000
5.8 Peer Institution Library Personnel Comparisons, 2001-02
5.9 External Grants to the Sherratt Library, 1998 - 2002

Exhibits
5.1 Library Annual Reports, Guide, and Newsletters
5.2 Library Department Policies
5.3 Library Use Statistics
5.4 Collection Statistics and Catalogs
5.5 Multi-year Replacement Plan for Computing
5.6 Student Satisfaction Survey Results with Computing Services
5.7 Inventory of Computing Labs, Use Statistics, and Service Plans
5.8 Agreements with Other Libraries
5.9 Organizational Charts for Library and Information Technology
5.10 Vitae for Professional Library Staff
5.11 Assessment Documentation of Facilities, Services, and Resources
STANDARD 6

Governance and Administration
STANDARD SIX: GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

The institution's system of governance facilitates the successful accomplishment of its mission and goals. SUU operates under and is a part of the multi-campus system of the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). USHE has developed policies and procedures that direct member institutions, define roles and missions, and form the foundation for institutional plans, goals, staffing, programs, and accountability.

Governance System - Standard 6.A

The Board of Regents (“Regents” hereafter) is the governing board ultimately responsible for the quality and integrity of USHE and its member institutions. Each institution in the system also has a Board of Trustees (“Trustees” hereafter) with specific statutory and delegated responsibilities. Both boards include representation of the public interest and oversight. Laws and policies governing the boards provide for continuity and change of board leadership and membership. SUU’s president is not a voting member of either board, but attends ex officio, and sets the agenda for the Trustees of SUU.

Regents

The system of governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in a constitution, charter, bylaws, or equivalent policy document. (6.A.1) SUU is one of the ten institutions comprising the USHE. Utah law (Utah Code, Title 53B, Chapter 01, Governance, Powers, Rights, and Responsibilities of the Utah State System of Higher Education) empowers USHE and its governing board, the Regents. The Regents’ role in governance is stated in the same title of Utah code. The Governor appoints members of the Regents who in turn appoint a Commissioner of Higher Education who serves at its pleasure as chief executive officer.

In a multi-unit governance system (state or district), the division of authority and responsibility between the central system office and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered. (6.A.4) The Commissioner of Higher Education executes, administers, and implements Regents’ policies and is responsible to the Regents. The Commissioner is the supervisory link between the Regents and the governance and administrative units of the individual campuses, although presidents of the campuses are hired by and responsible to the Regents. Regents’ policies, accessible at http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/contents, detail Board policy regarding operations of the Regents, Boards of Trustees, and institutional governance. Relevant statutes, delegations of authority, areas of responsibility, and operating guidelines are also provided at the web site. Documents governing the system clearly describe structural relationships, authority, and responsibilities.

Trustees

The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth by the governance system's official documents. (6.A.2) At the campus level, some statutory powers and many delegated responsibilities are vested in the Trustees. The Trustees generally serve as an advisory and oversight Board to the president of each USHE campus. Eight trustee seats are gubernatorial appointments, with two seats filled by ex officio individuals, the SUUSA president, and the alumni president. Because the Board of Regents and Board of Trustees structure is unique to Utah, Table 6.1 was developed to compare and contrast the two boards. Exhibit 6.1 offers policy extracts describing the authority of the two boards.
Table 6.1
Role Assignments of the Utah State Board of Regents and Boards of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Regents</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Boards of Trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in statute with accountability to the legislature</td>
<td>Line of Authority</td>
<td>Established in statute with accountability to the Board of Regents and Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Board of Regents with 18 members, including representative from public education</td>
<td>Number/ Membership</td>
<td>Nine individual boards of trustees with 10 members each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System governance and administration, construction and bond approvals, budget development, institutional missions and roles, delegation of certain authorities to trustees.</td>
<td>Statutory Duties</td>
<td>Communications, planning, advancement (fundraising and community relations), and honorary degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board hires and fires presidents with consultation from Trustees</td>
<td>Relationship to President</td>
<td>Advisory to presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature and Governor</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Monitors and reports to the Regents on specific matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops system-wide proposals, sets tuition and general fees, approves work programs, and collects &amp; analyzes data</td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>Advises presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves and implements strategic plans for the system, approves campus (physical) master plans and capital budgetary needs, approves new academic programs, ensures system articulation of courses and programs</td>
<td>Master Planning</td>
<td>Recommends plans, capital projects, budgetary needs, and new programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from Regents’ Policy R-220

The chief executive officer is the President of SUU. The President is appointed by the Regents and is directly responsible and accountable to the Regents according to USHE policies. The President, in turn, hires and supervises the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and other executive staff members.

The executive staff assisting the President includes the Provost, three Vice-Presidents, serving respectively the areas of Administrative and Financial Services, Advancement and Regional Services, and Student Services. Further, the President oversees the office of Legal Counsel and of University Relations (see Figure 6.1, Organizational Charts - President’s Council). Each year complete organizational
charts of SUU are published in the *Fact Book*. See exhibit materials for documentation of recent years. Governance roles, as described and set forth in policy, are understood and fulfilled with accountability to the Regents and Utah Legislature.

Figure 6.1

![President's Council Organizational Chart](image)

The system of governance makes provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest. (6.A.3) The Utah system of governance makes provisions for consideration of faculty, student, and staff views. Faculty leaders attend Trustees meetings and Deans’ Council meetings; the president of the Southern Utah University Student Association (SUUSA) sits as a voting member on the Trustees, and the SUUSA academic vice president sits on the Deans’ Council. A student leader in the state, as appointed by the Governor, is a member of the Regents. On a voluntary basis, faculty leaders from all USHE campuses meet periodically on issues of mutual concern and provide input to the Commissioner’s office. Locally, faculty, student, and staff constituencies at SUU are individually represented by separate deliberative bodies, including the Faculty Senate, the SUU Student Association, and the SUU Staff Association. These aspects of local faculty and student governance are described in greater detail below in Standards 6D and 6E.

Ongoing efforts by the administration include both formal and informal interactions that encourage input and communication from faculty, students, and staff. Formal efforts include special and standing committees, issues task forces (e.g., retention and recruitment), Faculty Senate meetings, and curriculum committees (undergraduate and graduate). Informal efforts include the President’s and/or Provost’s meetings with faculty, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings with the Provost, and Provost’s visits to departments and colleges/schools.
Appraisal

SUU is included under the governance umbrella of the Utah System of Higher Education. Both the Utah State Board of Regents and the SUU Board of Trustees are knowledgeable about higher education in general and about SUU in particular.

Governing Board - Standard 6.B

The board includes adequate representation of the public interest and/or the diverse elements of the institution's constituencies and does not include a predominant representation by employees of the institution. The president may be an ex officio member of the board, but not its chair. Policies are in place that provide for continuity and change of board membership.

(6.B.1) The Utah State Board of Regents consists of eighteen (18) residents of the state, fifteen of whom are appointed by the governor with the consent of the Senate. The governor also appoints a student from an institution of higher education to serve on the board. Two members of the State Board of Education, appointed by the chair of the State Board of Education, serve as non-voting members of the board. The members of the board represent the diverse geographical regions of the state and a balance of political party affiliation.

Five members of the board, other than the student member and the State Board of Education members, are appointed during each odd-numbered year to six-year terms that commence on July 1 of the year of appointment. The student member is appointed for a one-year term and may be reappointed for one additional term. The student member has full voting rights and may vote on selection of a board chair or vice chair, but may not serve in either office. Board members hold office until their successors have been appointed and qualified. Each member of the board takes the official oath of office before beginning the duties of office.

The President’s office maintains a web site that lists the membership of both governing boards, their terms of office, and geographic area:

http://www.suu.edu/general/orgadmin.html

Utah State Board of Regents (contact information available at http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/r1.htm) Terms expire in the years listed.

The board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the board acts in place of the board except by formal delegation of authority. (6.B.2) All matters requiring Regents’ determination are addressed in a properly convened meeting of the board or its executive committee. Regents may also meet, in full or executive session, at the request of its chair, its executive officer, or five members of the board. A quorum of the voting members of the board is required to conduct its business and consists of nine members.

The board has subcommittees to conduct business, receive reports and recommendations, and examine specific issues, but action is taken as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the boards acts in place of the board except by formal delegation authority which is reported and recorded at the next meeting.

The duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board are clearly defined in a published policy document. (6.B.3) Each board has its own public operating policies and bylaws providing for board and member duties, responsibilities and ethical conduct. Regents, the Commissioner, and the presidents develop system-wide policy, with actual implementation at the campus level taking place through broadly based institutional policies and procedures. Trustees bylaws develop institutional policy and procedures with annual accountability to the Regents. See http://www.suu.edu/pub/policies/pp40.html.

Consistent with established board policy, the board selects, appoints, and regularly evaluates the chief executive officer. (6.B.4) Regents select, appoint, and regularly evaluate the chief executive officer or campus president. Procedures for hiring and evaluating are well defined in Board policy. The selection process
includes representation from the Trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community. For example, during 1997 when a new president was selected, a search committee comprised of Trustees, faculty, staff, students, community members, and Regents developed selection criteria, conducted a review of applicants and interviews, and submitted to the full Board of Regents names of finalists.

The Regents review the performance of presidents as stipulated in policy. The review includes an examination of the institution’s academic program, finances, community relationships, and progress toward achieving specific goals. Both governing boards regularly review and approve the mission statement, major academic programs, degrees, financial reports and audits, and campus master plans (facilities) of the institution. Regents regularly evaluate the president with input from selected faculty and staff. This evaluation, by Regents’ policy, has not been shared with the campus community. See http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/r220.htm 4.6.2.1, 4.6.2.2 and 4.6.2.3; and also see http://www.le.state.ut.us/~code/TITLE53B/htm/53B02003.htm.

The board regularly reviews and approves the institution’s mission. It approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas. It approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs. (6.B.5) Except as institutional roles are specifically assigned by the Legislature, the Board of Regents may establish and define the roles of various institutions of higher education under its control and management and shall prescribe the general course of study to be offered at each institution.

Regents establish procedures and policies for considering proposals for substantial alterations in the scope of existing institutional operations. “Substantial alteration” includes the establishment of a college, professional school, division, institute, department, or a new program of instruction, research or public service, or a new degree, diploma, or certificate. The board conducts periodic reviews of all programs of instruction, research and public service, including those funded by gifts, grants, and contracts, and may require the modification or termination of any program.

A challenge for the Regents has been to control “mission creep” and duplication among institutions, which has impacted negatively on SUU. Specific local concerns include UCAT being given authority to grant two-year degrees (when they offer no credit), Dixie State College receiving authorization to offer four-year degrees already offered at SUU, and transferability of study completed at UCAT to other USHE institutions. Recent Regents’ efforts have led to revised policy that has sought to clarify the mission of each institution (Regents’ Policy R312).

More specific to SUU, Regents delegate to the Trustees the responsibility of monitoring implementation of the approved institutional mission, including periodic review and update. Further, similar delegated authority to the Trustees is given for reviewing and approving academic program quality reviews, certificates, minors, emphasis and options that are recommended within existing programs, program cancellations and name changes.

The board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner. (6.B.6) Regents submit an annual report of activities to the governor and to the Legislature, and provides copies to all institutions of higher education.

The board ensures that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity. It approves an academic and administrative structure or organization to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management. (6.B.7) Regents are responsible for development, implementation, and maintenance of up-to-date master and strategic plans for the System of Higher Education, including the definition of institutional missions, roles, the determination of related operating and capital budgetary needs,
the approval of new academic and applied technology programs, program reviews involving system wide or multiple institution issues, distance and outreach education and ensuring articulation of courses and programs.

The board establishes and maintains an up-to-date master plan that includes:

- Providing for statewide planning of public higher education in terms of aims, purposes, and objectives of the system as a whole.
- Establishing and defining the role and programs of each institution within the system.
- Establishing criteria for and determination of the future needs and requirements for new programs and new institutions and the elimination, curtailment, or consolidation of existing programs and facilities.
- Providing for the initiation and financing of projects as considered necessary to meet and satisfy the projected patterns of growth and maintenance.
- Establishing criteria for and determination of operating and capital budgetary needs for each institution and the system as a whole.
- Recommending the methods and sources of future financial support of the higher educational system.
- Establishing procedures for the development of maximum utilization of existing facilities as suggested by space utilization studies conducted by the State Building Board.
- Securing an adequate and coordinated program for the community colleges and applied technology/technical programs in the institutions and departments in the state system of higher education.

The board approves the annual budget and the long-range financial plan, and reviews periodic fiscal audit reports. (6.B.8) Regents’ approve the budget request and review periodic fiscal audit reports. Regents are responsible to demonstrate and document the financial needs of higher education to the Legislature. Each year system-wide and institutional needs are conveyed to the Legislature.

Prior to submitting the institutional budget request in July, the President’s staff reviews the budget projects and the President determines the priorities in accordance with the guidelines of the Regents.

Preparation of the capital budget follows guidelines established by the State Building Board and State Regents. The President determines project priorities, and the capital budget request is submitted in August to the State Building Board for action in November. See SUU Policies and Procedures and Standard 7.

The Regents delegate to the Trustees the responsibility of

- Reviewing institutional audits with the participation of the President at the discretion of the Trustees.
- Reviewing and approving reports on financial performance; review and approval of semiannual reports of bad debt write-offs, lease agreements, and budget transfers; approval of institutional residence budgets; and approval of salary budgets as appropriate.
- Reviewing and approving institutional reports on athletics, auxiliary and service enterprises, development fund, institutional discretionary fund, investments, leased property, money management, and real property.
- Approving of consolidated system and institutional budget proposals for recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature, proposals for adjustment of tuition and fees, and requests for approval or modifications of work programs, and definition, collection, and analysis of data that have system level significance.

The board is knowledgeable of the institution’s accreditation status and is involved, as appropriate, in the accrediting process. (6.B.9) Staff of the Regents are aware that SUU is conducting an accreditation self-study and is scheduled for an evaluation visit in October.
2003. Trustees are knowledgeable of the institution’s accreditation status and are involved in the process. A member of the Board sat on the Accreditation Steering Committee and was named to the subcommittee drafting a response to Standard 6. The Chair of the Accreditation Steering Committee met with Trustees to provide an overview of the accreditation process and address questions.

Appraisal

Each board has authority and responsibilities that are clear and specific. Public accountability is equally clear for SUU, as obligations for communication, inclusion, and public reporting challenge the institution. Faculty, staff and students have a voice in institutional decisions. The trustees have begun a regular orientation series and periodic, thematic discussions of key issues facing SUU. This process will help with the flow of information on campus.

Leadership and Management - Standard 6.C

SUU’s chief executive officer's full-time responsibility is to the institution. (6.C.1) The President, as chief executive officer of SUU, is responsible for overall leadership and direction of the institution, and that is his full-time responsibility. He promotes the mission of the university with employees, students, board members, legislators, alumni, and the community.

Regents delegate administrative responsibility for institutional operations to the President who acts with the approval of the Trustees. The President’s duties include the following:

- Authorizing the faculty to determine the general initiation and direction of instruction and of the examination, admission, and classification of students.
- Enacting rules for administration and operation of the institution which are not inconsistent with the prescribed role established by the board, rules enacted by the board, or the laws of the state.
- Exercising grants of power and authority as delegated by the board, as well as the necessary and proper exercise of powers and authority not specifically denied to the institution, its administration, faculty, or students by the board or by law, to assure the effective and efficient administration and operation of the institution consistent with the statewide master plan for higher education.

The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of the institution’s administrators are clearly defined and published. Administrators act in a manner consistent with them. (6.C.2) Administrators and all institutional employees are governed by the Utah Public Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act, Utah Code, Title 67, Chapter 16.

SUU’s administrators are qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management. The chief executive officer is responsible for implementing appropriate procedures to evaluate administrators regularly. (6.C.3) Administrators of SUU either have earned doctorates or years of experience in areas of responsibility at this institution. The two most recent vice-presidential positions were presidential appointments filled with on-campus personnel. Resumes for executives are found in Exhibit 6.2.

There is no institutional policy to evaluate administrators at the vice-presidential or associate/assistant vice-presidential level, who serve at the pleasure of the president. Policy is being written for evaluation of professional staff up to the level of department or program director. Further, a revised policy on academic position descriptions, currently under review in
the Faculty Senate, provides for the regular evaluation of all department chairs, deans, assistant and associate deans, assistant and associate provosts, and the provost.

**Institutional advancement activities (which may include development and fund raising, institutional relations, alumni and parent programs) are clearly and directly related to the mission and goals of the institution. (6.C.4)**

Day-to-day responsibility for institutional advancement activities is delegated to the Vice-President for Advancement and Regional Services, and includes Alumni Relations, Development, and Regional Services. Present fund-raising activities, alumni programming, and the recently completed capital campaign directly reinforce the mission of the University. Exhibit materials provide more information.

**SUU’s administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely. (6.C.5)** Three administrative groups insure that institutional decision-making is timely and effective: the President’s Council, the Deans’ Council, and the Faculty Senate.

The President’s Council, comprised of the President, Provost, vice presidents, assistant to the president for University relations, and legal advisor, meets weekly to advise the President on the direction of the University, consider and recommend policy to the Trustees, and implement strategies and plans for the institution.

The Deans’ Council advises the Provost on academic and budgetary issues. The Provost chairs the council and members include the deans of the colleges and schools, library, continuing education, and Faculty Senate president, along with the academic vice president of the associated students, and representatives from Student Services.

The Faculty Senate advises the President and Provost on issues related to the faculty. The Senate is comprised of elected faculty from the colleges and schools, and at large. Its president is elected from among the senators. The President and Provost attend as *ex officio* members. Additionally, the Provost meets regularly with members of the Senate’s Executive Committee.

These groups and their own subcommittees and responsibilities encourage open decision-making processes and communication on campus. They clearly set the tone for cooperative working relationships and coordination of organizational units. Occasionally, administrators and Faculty Senate leaders explore ways to expedite policy decisions and revisions, a process hampered by a truncated calendar of the academic year. The Deans’ Council and Faculty Senate have tried recently to cooperate better to expedite policy review and revision.

An example of decision-making and communication may be drawn from the prioritization experience that began in 1999. The prioritization process was a major campus activity. The administration (specifically the Provost and President) communicated with the faculty and various departments of the university in a variety of ways, i.e., open meetings; visits to colleges, schools, and departments; by newsletter; and by “President’s Reports” e-mailed to faculty and staff. Almost all university personnel were involved in the evaluations of academic and support programs. An ongoing campus goal is to improve communication at all levels.

**Administrators facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment. (6.C.6)** SUU administration is organized to effectively sustain operations. An executive reorganization was announced in July 2002 to update the administrative structure while encouraging communication and goal attainment. See the current organizational charts for details.

Duties and responsibilities of the provost, the chief academic officer, are defined in policy. Duties of the vice presidents are not similarly outlined in policies and procedures, but published organizational charts indicate the general areas of responsibility for each vice
president. SUU’s organizational charts and names of incumbents are presented in exhibit materials.

SUU’s academic programs are divided among six colleges and schools, each with a dean who is responsible for all faculty, staff, students, and academic programs. Colleges/schools are divided into departments administered by a department chair, who is responsible for academic programs leading to degrees, licensing, majors or emphases, and minors.

Administrators responsible for institutional research ensure that the results are widely distributed to inform planning and subsequent decisions that contribute to the improvement of the teaching-learning process. (6.C.7) The Office of Institutional Research, under direction of the Associate Provost, provides data for institutional decision makers and councils. Institutional research is published annually in the Fact Book and also posted to the SUU website (http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/). In addition to compiling the SUU Fact Book, the Associate Provost serves as Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee.

Other surveys and studies are used in planning and making decisions at departmental and institutional levels. These include the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), College Outcomes Survey, the Faculty Senate Recruitment and Retention Survey, and descriptive statistics and departmental data. Through its Office of Institutional Research, SUU provides detailed assessments of students and graduates.

The process of strategic planning accepted by the Trustees in October 2002 will allow for planning and assessment to be ongoing. The Strategic Plan proposes to use significant data to measure institutional effectiveness to insure that SUU is supporting its mission and goals. Assessment results are shared with University officers who can use the results to influence resource allocations and improve instructional programs, institutional services, and activities.

In July 2003 another organizational change affected campus decision-making when the Provost’s Office began supervising the Registrar’s Office, Student Development Center, and Student Success. New models of inclusion are being explored to expand or restructure the Deans’ Council and possibly create an academic council, an information sharing and advisory body.

Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed. (6.C.8) SUU Policies and Procedures are published both in print form and electronically on the website (http://www.suu.edu/pub/policies/).

The institution has an active Staff Association that represents all administrative and support staff. Communication of policies that need to be changed or reviewed go from the administration to the staff and from the staff to the administration through this association.

SUU’s administrators' and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. (6.C.9) Exhibit 6.3 details the latest (2002-03) study of administrative staff salaries. Adequacy of salaries at all levels, including administrative personnel and staff, has been an issue of great concern to the institution for a number of years. Salary equity studies show employees in all but a few positions to be below their peers in the state employment market and among peer institutions nationally. The 2002-2003 SUU staff salary equity study indicates that “benchmarked salaries are at 85.64% of the salary market.” Faculty and staff salary equity has been a top budget priority for the administration. This challenge is developed more fully in Standards 4 and 7.

Retention of administrators and staff remains a concern on campus. Three of the four vice-presidential-level positions turned over recently. In the summer of 2002, SUU welcomed a new Provost, a new Vice President for Student Services, and a new Vice President for
Advancement and Regional Services. The latter two were internal hires and long-time employees of the university. However, overall staff turnover is below what would be expected nationally (11-12%), according to SUU’s Director of Human Resources. Recent data indicate an upward trend in turnover rates; the staff turnover rate for 2000-2001 was 6.83%, and for 2001-2002 the rate was 9.11%.

Recruitment and retention of competent personnel is aided by positive factors. First, the institution’s benefits package offered to employees averages 40% of salary. The attractive benefits package both attracts applicants for positions and aids in retention. Table 6.2 compares average benefit cost for Utah’s four-year institutions:

Table 6.2
Institutional Benefits as a % of Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Benefits as % of Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Second, the institution is set in an attractive small community that is a desirable place to live. In addition to its proximity to national parks and monuments, there are opportunities for recreation, culture, personal safety, and an affordable and comfortable lifestyle. Administrators and staff may value the ambiance and character of the community over higher salaries found elsewhere.

### Appraisal

More communication between deans and chairs and faculty would help to improve faculty morale. The new chairs forum of monthly training/development sessions, scheduled for the 2003-04 academic year, should also help communications. A systematic, scientific, and regular survey of faculty and staff satisfaction would assist administrators in gauging campus attitudes and provide direction for employee initiatives. The open, campus communications of the past year are in continual need of emphasis and improvement.

### Faculty Role in Governance - Standard 6.D

The role of faculty in institutional governance, planning, budgeting and policy development is made clear and public; faculty are supported in that role. (6.D) The Constitution for the Faculty Senate of SUU clearly identifies the role of faculty in all appropriate areas of institutional governance. The Constitution is readily available for review on the SUU website. A faculty committee, under a charge from the President of SUU, has undertaken the challenge of revising the Constitution for the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate consists of faculty members that are elected from the recognized colleges/schools of the University, and an at-large senator. Copies of the Faculty Senate meeting minutes for the last three years are available and can be found in exhibit materials.

Individual senators are charged with the responsibility of establishing and maintaining an effective communication link with their colleagues. The Senate’s Executive Committee is elected by the members of the Faculty Senate, and consists of the President, Vice President (President-elect), Secretary, Treasurer, and Parliamentarian. Under the direction of the Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate oversees the organization and operation of numerous standing, ad hoc, and University faculty committees. The purpose of these committees is to empower the faculty of SUU as they fulfill their roles and charges in appropriate areas of institutional governance.

The Faculty Senate is involved in planning and policy development and is notified about budgetary issues. Faculty have access to budgetary information also disseminated by department chairs, the provost, and president. The Faculty Senate spends much time and attention in debating and formulating academic
A standing academic affairs committee reviews all policy changes and proposals, and makes recommendations to the full Faculty Senate for its approval.

Faculty in general, and the Faculty Senate in particular, have expressed some frustration with their limited input. A survey of faculty in 1998-1999 indicated that “overall, SUU faculty are significantly more burned out compared to comparable demographic norms.” In April, 2001, the Faculty Retention and Recruitment Committee distributed a survey to assess levels of satisfaction and morale across campus and to compare these results to an identical survey conducted in April 2000. The executive summary of the 2001 survey suggests that “satisfaction and morale remain low.”

Over the past two years, the Faculty Senate and administration have worked diligently together. Members of the Faculty Senate have expressed a greater sense of their value to the campus through more inclusive efforts toward shared governance. University administrators must be given credit for several positive actions taken to improve faculty morale and satisfaction. These include better communication through formal and informal meetings, such as weekly luncheons with the Provost for a small number of faculty on a rotating basis. SUU’s President communicates directly with the faculty through periodic newsletters and meetings. The President and Provost regularly attend Faculty Senate meetings to address questions. As noted elsewhere, the Deans’ Council and Faculty Senate have made strides in enhanced cooperation, illustrated best by the “Policies Update Project” that has, over several years, sought to review and revise policies as needed.

Appraisal

For some faculty the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Trustees is a concern. The Faculty Senate President-elect attends each Trustees meeting, where he/she makes a brief report. This is not a voting position, however, as is the case with the SUUSA student representative. Some progress in shared governance can be illustrated by regular meetings of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Provost. A greater feeling of shared governance exists today than at any time in recent history, but more can be done. The role of faculty in governance has increased since the self-study process began two years ago. On policy, curriculum, and planning, faculty are heavily involved.

Student Role in Governance - Standard 6.E

The role of students in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public: students are supported in fulfilling that role. (6.E) The Constitution of the SUU Student Association (SUUSA) identifies the role of students in “student” governance, planning, budgeting and policy development. Available in hard copy and on the web, the Constitution of the SUUSA identifies the three branches of the SUUSA government: the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judicial, and further, it describes the responsibilities of those students entrusted with self-governance. Although this Constitution does not clearly identify the role of students in “institutional” governance, there are numerous examples of student involvement. For example, the current SUUSA student body president serves as a member of the Board of Trustees, and a USHE student serves on the Board of Regents.

SUU students have worked effectively with the administration on numerous occasions, but none have been as profound as the 2003 process to increase student tuition. The administration and SUUSA leaders, first working independently, then cooperatively through a series of in-depth meetings and discussions developed and approved a 23.5% tuition increase. Students had an integral role in determining the allocation of resources generated from this increase, and students will be the primary beneficiary of this process.
Standard 6.1 Policy on Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination

SUU has a fully implemented Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policy. Administrators, supervisors, faculty, and staff at all levels of the institutional organization are charged with full compliance with this policy during all hiring and promotion activities and decisions. An institutional Affirmative Action Committee, under the direction of the Affirmative Action Director, has the responsibility to periodically review and monitor all issues and activities affected by this policy.

Appraisal

Students have voice in governance through their elected leaders. Students sit on multiple committees, on the Deans’ Council, and on the Board of Trustees. They are an essential part of SUU management.
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STANDARD 7

Finance
STANDARD SEVEN: FINANCE

Sound management of financial resources has long been one of the hallmarks of SUU. The financial services function is guided by a team of experienced professionals, many of whom are recognized by colleagues throughout the state for their fiscal integrity and managerial excellence. Under this leadership, the university endeavors to secure a position of stronger capital structures, improved cash flow, and greater discipline in the control of expenses and management of net revenues. Inherent in this process is the recognition that integrity and ethical conduct are non-negotiable.

To expand upon the successes of the past, the financial services function now seeks to achieve and maintain an even stronger financial condition commensurate with the size and complexity of the campus. To support this effort, basic accounting, budgeting, and other financial systems are continually subject to revision. With the assistance of exceptionally dedicated employees (another hallmark of SUU), and the expanded use of technology to offset limited staff size, the campus strives for a stronger and more flexible financial position.

Given current economic conditions in Utah, and the nation in general, the task of acquiring additional financial resources poses some spirited challenges. SUU has confronted budget reductions and diminished state funding over the past three years while striving to maintain program and service quality. Despite these perceived setbacks, SUU has not adopted a “poverty mentality.” Rather, the administration has taken proactive steps in the face of an economic downturn and funding challenges. The institution remains firmly committed to the principle of sound financial management, recognizing that such a commitment is not a function of resource levels. In 2000, the University implemented a financial plan to improve its fiscal condition. That plan, developed in consultation with Regents, Trustees and others, remains the operating guide for the institution.

This section of the self-study reports on the status of the financial plan, and discusses general fiscal planning with reference to recent changes in legislative funding and SUU’s own operating processes. The adequacy of current resources is addressed, followed by a descriptive analysis of management practices that insure SUU’s sound financial position. Finally, University fund raising efforts are examined. As noted elsewhere in the self-study report, SUU has responded directly to general recommendations from the 1998 Interim NASC Report (Exhibit i.4). At that time, the NASC Commission requested that SUU submit annual progress reports beginning in 1999 (Exhibit i.5). These reports detail specific steps taken by SUU administrators, faculty, and staff to remedy a number of fiscal concerns. Tables 7.1 through 7.6 are required actual and projected information on SUU finances.
**STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE**

**Table 7.1: Current Funds Revenues - Public Institutions Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (IPEDS Report)</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>12,047,373</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12,667,383</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>23,309,779</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23,895,046</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>257,119</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>249,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>8,198,246</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8,398,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>14,056</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,233,180</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,365,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,341,887</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,679,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endowment Income</td>
<td>177,957</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>192,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>177,957</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>192,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>7,206,701</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7,576,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>5,436,687</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5,663,644</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>584,973</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>713,552</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Funds Revenues</strong></td>
<td>59,846,078</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62,465,210</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source (IPEDS Report)</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PROJECTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>10,197,995</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Operating Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>10,561,356</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Operating Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>2,317,046</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Private Operating Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>4,647,138</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations</td>
<td>9,513,076</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>63,936</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations</td>
<td>27,107,455</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Appropriations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grants - Nonoperating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State nonoperating grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local nonoperating grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, affiliated organizations inclusive</td>
<td>2,098,445</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>91,229</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nonoperating Revenue</td>
<td>31,008</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Revenues and Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Appropriations</td>
<td>1,125,523</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants, &amp; Gifts</td>
<td>470,839</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Additions</td>
<td>246,849</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Current Funds Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,471,895</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE TABLE 7.2 Current Funds Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers - Public Institutions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions (IPEDS Report)</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>16,900,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>8,749,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>4,495,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>5,141,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5,492,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>4,163,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarships and Fellowships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>1,934,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Restricted Funds</td>
<td>5,334,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational and General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Transfer</td>
<td>297,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Educational and General Expenditures/Mandatory Transfers</strong></td>
<td>52,509,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including Transfers)</td>
<td>6,450,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitals (Including Transfers)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including Transfers)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Funds Expenditures &amp; Mandatory Transfers</strong></td>
<td>58,960,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE  TABLE 7.2 (Continued)  Current Funds Expenditures - Public Institutions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions (IPEDS Report)</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>19,303,695</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>11,324,730</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>3,718,208</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6,630,659</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>6,167,210</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>6,621,326</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>3,855,046</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>876,679</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards from Restricted Funds</td>
<td>4,328,799</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>6,409,936</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals (Including Transfers)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>431,130</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Funds Expenditures</td>
<td>69,667,418</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE

| TABLE 7.3 Sources of Financial Aid - Public and Private Institutions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | ACTUAL | PROJECTED |
| **Amount** | **%** |  **Amount** | **%** | **Amount** | **%** | **Amount** | **%** | **Amount** | **%** | **Amount** | **%** |
| Annual Private Contributions | 550,923 | 4% | 559,290 | 3% | 766,961 | 5% | 819,165 | 5% | 839,644 | 5% | 860,635 | 5% |
| Governmental State Aid | 772,754 | 5% | 791,497 | 5% | 1,007,804 | 6% | 1,207,689 | 7% | 1,237,881 | 7% | 1,268,828 | 7% |
| Federal Aid (PELL, SEOG, WS) | 4,939,671 | 32% | 5,211,325 | 32% | 5,545,762 | 34% | 6,323,230 | 36% | 6,481,311 | 36% | 6,643,343 | 36% |
| Endowment Earnings (Non-Foundation) | 150,194 | 1% | 174,500 | 1% | 255,852 | 2% | 265,579 | 2% | 272,218 | 2% | 279,024 | 2% |
| Institutional Unfunded Aid | 1,483,142 | 10% | 1,558,611 | 10% | 1,579,315 | 10% | 1,823,510 | 10% | 1,869,098 | 10% | 1,915,825 | 10% |
| Federal Student Loans (if applicable) | 7,504,989 | 49% | 7,714,671 | 48% | 7,139,752 | 44% | 7,090,612 | 40% | 7,267,877 | 40% | 7,449,574 | 40% |
| Nonfederal Workstudy Aid | 60,930 | 0% | 45,560 | 0% | 84,309 | 1% | 28,958 | 0% | 29,682 | 0% | 30,424 | 0% |
| **Total Financial Aid** | 15,462,603 | 100% | 16,055,454 | 100% | 16,379,754 | 100% | 17,558,743 | 100% | 17,997,711 | 100% | 18,447,654 | 100% |
### Standard Seven: Finance

**TABLE 7.4 Operating Gifts and Endowments – Public and Private Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Gifts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Restricted *</td>
<td>1,280,206</td>
<td>1,574,026</td>
<td>1,427,488</td>
<td>2,098,445</td>
<td>2,129,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Unrestricted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments Exclusive of Foundation Gifts</td>
<td>421,378</td>
<td>376,063</td>
<td>1,292,171</td>
<td>246,849</td>
<td>250,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>4,764,395</td>
<td>4,687,360</td>
<td>4,798,277</td>
<td>4,185,720</td>
<td>4,248,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>2,786,925</td>
<td>2,929,096</td>
<td>3,081,687</td>
<td>3,198,050</td>
<td>3,246,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,551,320</td>
<td>7,616,456</td>
<td>7,879,964</td>
<td>7,383,770</td>
<td>7,494,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Private, gifts and grants reported as nonoperating revenue under GASB 34/35 (2002 and beyond)

** Change in accounting for deposits held by Division of Facilities and Construction Management (2002 and beyond)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depreciation Expense</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 1-1999</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 2-2000</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 3-2001</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 4-2002</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 5-2003</th>
<th>ACTUAL Year 6-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Include</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>9,034,491</td>
<td>12,991,525</td>
<td>13,336,976</td>
<td>13,652,501</td>
<td>13,227,586</td>
<td>13,227,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>3,957,034</td>
<td>442,927</td>
<td>315,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97,476</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>424,915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>82,481,376</td>
<td>87,605,977</td>
<td>88,350,345</td>
<td>109,344,146</td>
<td>105,189,806</td>
<td>105,189,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>5,129,180</td>
<td>744,368</td>
<td>21,133,911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>424,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>87,605,977</td>
<td>88,350,345</td>
<td>109,344,146</td>
<td>105,189,806</td>
<td>105,189,806</td>
<td>105,189,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>15,524,555</td>
<td>16,368,060</td>
<td>16,857,202</td>
<td>18,082,367</td>
<td>10,866,400</td>
<td>10,866,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>2,036,457</td>
<td>1,865,644</td>
<td>2,252,306</td>
<td>1,067,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>1,192,952</td>
<td>1,376,502</td>
<td>1,027,141</td>
<td>8,283,699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>16,368,060</td>
<td>16,857,202</td>
<td>18,082,367</td>
<td>10,866,400</td>
<td>10,866,400</td>
<td>10,866,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>270,994</td>
<td>1,786,820</td>
<td>15,333,838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780,643</td>
<td>780,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1,709,529</td>
<td>13,756,305</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780,643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>193,703</td>
<td>209,287</td>
<td>15,333,838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>1,786,820</td>
<td>15,333,838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780,643</td>
<td>780,643</td>
<td>780,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>623,869</td>
<td>2,123,138</td>
<td>2,185,821</td>
<td>5,772,171</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>596,664</td>
<td>579,356</td>
<td>565,006</td>
<td>431,130</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE*

**TABLE 7.5 Capital Investments - All Institutions**

- **Depreciation Expense (Private Institutions Only)**
As is the case with many other public universities in the state and nation, financial planning at SUU is closely tied to the availability of state appropriations and tuition revenue. The following charts (Figures 7.1 and 7.2) illustrate how SUU has fared in comparison with Weber State University, the other comprehensive regional university in the state. It should be noted that in the past two years, Utah has not funded enrollment growth, and SUU’s enrollment has declined. Hence the apparent improvement in SUU’s position is largely due to retarded funding for enrollment in the state. Nonetheless, the administration has worked tirelessly to improve the financial position of the institution, as noted in the annual progress reports (again, Exhibit i.5).

**Figure 7.1**

**Comprehensive Universities**

*Education & General Tax Funds per FTE Student (constant dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weber State</th>
<th>SUU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USHE Data Books

**Figure 7.2**

**Comprehensive Universities**

*Tuition & Fee Revenues per FTE Student (constant dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weber State</th>
<th>SUU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USHE Data Books
In addition to seeking more state support, SUU has embarked on an ambitious capital campaign to increase private support. As of December 2002, the campaign had received over $43 million in pledges to expand the doors of educational opportunity, enhance the learning environment, provide support for land acquisitions and building projects, enrich existing programs, and plan for unforeseen opportunities. SUU has also initiated self-imposed exercises to better align the mission and resources of the institution. These exercises included 1) a campus-wide review, and subsequent reprioritization, of both academic and non-academic programs; 2) a redistribution of campus operating budgets through formulaic and other mathematical processes; and 3) a series of internal adjustments for better program support.

For fiscal years 2001-02 through 2003-04, SUU responded (as did most schools in the nation) to budget cuts and revenue shortfalls by increasing tuition and reducing expenditures. SUU reduced its total expenditure budget by 3.5% in 2001-02, 4.1% in 2002-03, and 4.6% in 2003-04, respectively. Since the NASC interim visit in 1998, some funding requests to the Utah State Legislature have resulted in greater appropriations. In many cases, SUU received increases exceeding the average percent for the Utah System of Higher Education. Concurrently, tuition has been increased over 30% from 1997-98 to 2002-03, and 23.5% for 2003-04 alone.

In an effort to better align mission and resources, SUU engaged in a comprehensive process of prioritizing academic and non-academic programs through the use of nationally accepted criteria and mechanisms. Beginning in 1999, for two years the entire campus engaged in a prioritization process that involved numerous stages (illustrated in Exhibit i.7). The President’s Prioritization Report was issued in January 2002 (Exhibit i.8), and all relevant documents were posted to the University’s web site.

Since 1998, SUU has pursued multiple and overlapping strategies to address financial planning, resource adequacy, financial management, and fundraising and development. The institution’s administrative team, faculty, staff, and students deserve credit for their proactive, productive, and prudent efforts. Together, they have worked to sustain the institution despite significant challenges resulting from economic fluctuations, political realities, and funding uncertainties.

Financial Planning - Standard 7.A

Governing boards and state agencies have given the institution appropriate autonomy in financial planning and budgeting matters within overall mandates and priorities. (7.A.1) Utah law vests in a State Board of Regents the power to govern the state system of higher education consistent with state law, delegates certain powers to institutional boards of trustees and institutional presidents, and vests certain powers in institutional boards of trustees and institutional presidents. See http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/contents.htm for more details; also see Standard 6.

All institutions in the state system are empowered to contract and be contracted with. These institutions are designated as bodies politic and corporate with perpetual succession and with all rights, immunities, and franchises necessary to function as such. Each institution may have and use a corporate seal and may take, hold, lease, sell, and convey real and personal property. Each institution is vested with all the property, franchises, and endowments of, and is subject to, all the contracts, obligations, and liabilities of its respective predecessor.

An institution or its foundation or organization engaged in a program authorized by the Board of Regents may do the following: 1) enter into contracts with federal, state, or local governments or their agencies or departments, with private organizations, companies, firms, or industries, or with individuals; 2) accept contributions, grants, or gifts from, and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with, any private organization, company, firm, industry, or individual, or any government agency or department; 3) retain, accumulate, invest, commit, and expend proceeds from said contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, including the acquisition of real and personal property reasonably required for their accomplishment. In short, each institution may do its own purchasing,
issue its own payrolls, conduct its own financial planning and budgeting, and otherwise handle its own financial affairs under the general supervision of the Board of Regents.

Boards of Trustees are delegated specific fiscal authority and responsibility by the Regents, as are institutional presidents. SUU has exercised its financial planning authority to develop a comprehensive financial plan with seven elements, as described in the 2000 Annual Progress Report to the Commission. See Exhibit i.5 and Table 7.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Element</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Institutional Development</strong></td>
<td>Capital campaign successfully completed (See 7.D below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2. Increased State Support for Mission-related Activities** | Received state funding for two new master's degrees  
Received state funding for larger faculty and staff compensation increases  
Received state funding for construction and O&M for a new physical education building  
Received state support for an engineering science program  
Improved communication with regents and legislators on SUU priorities  
Supported new higher education funding formula that derives institutional budget requests from multiple mission-related indicators (as opposed to being driven exclusively by student enrollment)  
Received student/state support for tuition increases, including a 23.5% increase for 2003-04 and associated expenditure plan |
| **3. Increased Revenues from Existing Resources** | In an uncommon partnership with student leaders, SUU increased its tuition:  
• 3.00% in 1999-00  
• 5.75% in 2000-01  
• 7.50% in 2001-02  
• 9.00% in 2002-03  
• 23.50% in 2003-04  
Increased grant funding as described below in 7.D |
| **4. Efficient and Effective Resource Management** | Completed the formal prioritization process and implemented non-fiscal recommendations.  
Reprioritized and reorganized Administrative/Financial Services, Academic Affairs, and Student Services for greater efficiency and responsiveness to students (See Exhibit i.5 for further details) |
| **5. Marketing for New Opportunities** | Since 1999-2000, two new master's degrees were approved, funded, reported to NASC, and implemented  
Implemented a new marketing plan for athletics, a new plan for enrollment management, a shifting of selected student services operations to academics, a renewed investment in institutional marketing and enrollment growth, and improvements to campus facilities |
| **5. Enrollment Management** | Assigned enrollment management to the assistant to the president for university relations  
Reviewed and strengthened new students’ and parents’ orientation programs  
Developed and implemented a student success center and advisement program  
Hired academic advisors for each college or school (effective FY 2004)  
Changed the administration of summer school and expanded course offerings by 24% (effective Summer 2003)  
 Adopted a First-Year Experience course for new freshman and added it to general education  
Remodeled residential housing and developed a plan for a living and learning center (see Standard 8) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Assessment &amp; Institutional Research</th>
<th>Hired an Executive Director of Enrollment Management (Summer 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUU demonstrates that financial planning for the future is a strategically guided process. This planning includes a minimum of a three-year projection of major categories of income, specific plans for major categories of expenditures, and plans for the management of capital revenue and expenditures. Short and long-range capital budgets reflect the institution’s goals and objectives and relate to the plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment. (7.A.2) The operating budget request cycle, both at the institution level and at the system level, is an ongoing and strategically-guided process. The process begins at the bottom, works up to the top, and then filters back down. At every stage of the process, budget development is driven by strategic plans and objectives, including instances where budget reductions must be made. During the last three fiscal years, SUU has faced budget reductions mandated by the state legislature and Board of Regents. SUU has consistently followed the approach of cutting more than required so that funds can be plowed back into the budget (i.e., reallocated) in strategic areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUU is bound by the state statutes and policies that define the annual budget request process. The Board of Regents must annually recommend a combined appropriation for the operating budgets of all USHE institutions for inclusion in the state appropriations act. The Board’s recommendations must be available for presentation to the governor and legislature at least thirty (30) days prior to the convening of the legislature, and must include schedules showing the recommended amounts for each institution. Institutional operating budgets must be submitted to the board at least ninety (90) days prior to the convening of the legislature, in accordance with procedures established by the Board. Funding requests pertaining to capital facilities and land purchases must be submitted in accordance with procedures prescribed by the State Building Board. The appropriations recommended by the Board must be made with the dual objective of 1) justifying for higher education institutions appropriations consistent with their needs, and consistent with the financial ability of the state; and 2) determining an equitable distribution of funds among the respective institutions in accordance with the aims and objectives of the statewide master plan for higher education. The Board must also recommend to each session of the legislature the minimum tuition, resident and nonresident, for each institution which it considers necessary to implement the budget recommendations. The Board may adjust tuition, fees, and charges for each institution to meet budget requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a recent example, the legislature met in special session in July 2002 and enacted a mid-year base budget cut for all state agencies, including higher education. SUU was compelled to reduce its budget by $148,000, but went beyond the mark, cutting approximately $735,000. The additional funds were then reallocated to strategic initiatives such as student employment, employee compensation, and ADP upgrades. In addition, SUU administrators recently approved a plan to expend a portion of the accumulated E&G fund balance in support of other vital strategic initiatives, including marketing the university image and brand, improving student recruitment and retention, and raising employee morale.
Money allocated to each institution by legislative appropriation may be budgeted in accordance with institutional work programs approved by the Board, provided that expenditures are kept within the appropriations for the applicable period. Dedicated credits (including revenue derived primarily from tuition and certain fees) received by the institutions are appropriated to the respective institutions to be used in accordance with institutional work programs.

The passage of the appropriations act at the conclusion of each legislative session is the culmination of months of preparation and deliberation. Funding for the system of higher education, which is included in the general appropriations act, involves cooperation between the colleges and universities, the State Board of Regents, the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget, and the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst, as well as the Governor and Legislature. Exhibit 7.1 describes this process and the steps to budget development.

Two other financial planning approaches deserve recognition as important parts of the operating budget request process at SUU. First, directors, department chairs, and other campus managers are continually encouraged to share with their supervisors the budgetary needs of their offices and departments. This upward communication is intended to continue until vice presidents and the President ultimately become aware of campus needs. Because this process is somewhat informal, the communication of budgetary needs is not restricted to the few months during which official annual budget requests are being developed. The President and vice-presidents review and prioritize all of the many requests received during the year. As a general rule, only those requests related to the strategic plans of the university are forwarded for further consideration.

A second element of institutional financial planning occurs at the end of the budget request cycle. If new funds are appropriated by the Legislature, those dollars are allocated to new and existing departments in strict accordance with the strategic plans of the institution. But the Legislature also funds (to differing degrees each year) student enrollment growth within the system. Such enrollment growth funds are budgeted at the discretion of the institution, and can be directed to those areas of most strategic importance to the campus. In this manner, the strategic plans of the institution guide not only the development of the budget request, but also the allocation of any resulting new dollars.

SUU publishes an annual budget distributed to appropriate constituencies, and the policies, guidelines, and processes for developing the budget are clearly defined and followed. Budget revisions are made promptly, and, when necessary, a revised budget or schedule of budget changes is developed and distributed to appropriate constituencies. (7.A.3) Budget distribution and allocation takes place following each legislative session. The president, provost, and vice presidents receive summary copies of budget changes, while incremental or roll-over adjustments are made for the next fiscal year. The budget office builds original budgets for each account, and budget revisions are made promptly and reported both electronically and in regular reports. Exhibit 7.2 is an SUU budget book that details the budget and both internal and external budgeting processes. This valuable tool is available annually to campus leaders. Exhibit 7.3 provides information on the goals and accomplishments of administrative and financial services. Issued annually to campus leaders, these documents set objectives and report on achievements during a fiscal year.

Debt for capital outlay purposes is periodically reviewed, carefully controlled, and justified, so as not to create an unreasonable drain on resources available for educational purposes. SUU has a governing board policy guiding the use and limit of debt. (7.A.4) Long-term debt includes revenue bonds secured by a first lien on and pledge of student center building fees, net revenues derived from the operation of the auxiliary enterprise system, and investment income on the bond security reserve funds. The pledged revenues are used to make debt service payments, to finance renewal and replacement expenditures, and other lawful purposes. Use of pledged revenue for bond payments protects resources available for educational purposes. Long-term debt also includes unsecured notes payable and contracts.
payable secured by equipment. Notes and contracts payable are also paid from revenues directly related to the purpose and use of the assets acquired.

All long-term debt is recognized in the notes to the financial statements, and is reviewed each year. With legislative approval, the Board of Regents is empowered to issue revenue bonds, and the University is very conservative in the use of this type of debt. The Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, and Legislature must review and approve any debt issue. SUU has used revenue bonds for student housing, athletic facilities, and other capital projects. SUU has a Triple A bond rating (AAA) as part of the state system of higher education, and a Double A rating as a stand alone entity, (AA).

With respect to long-term debt, the university has a particularly strong record of prudent financial management. Bonds payable of $10.18 million on June 30, 1997, have been reduced to $7.75 million as of June 30, 2002. This amounts to a $711 – or 36% – decrease in debt per FTE student in only five years (from $1,975 to $1,264). The university is now in the process of issuing new bonds to finance the construction of a new campus living and learning facility, which will cause an increase in debt per FTE student. This new bond issue will be subject to the same scrutiny and careful management that has kept past bond issues from creating an unreasonable drain on the resources of the institution. See Exhibit 7.4 for information on SUU’s debt.

**Appraisal**

Financial planning is strategic and deliberate. SUU meets its responsibilities for public accountability, reporting, and timely budgeting to address institutional priorities. Current financial planning could be improved with the inclusion of multi-year revenue projections. Campus participation and communication would be enhanced with an advisory committee to the President on budget.

**Adequacy of Financial Resources - Standard 7.B**

*SUU provides evidence that it seeks and utilizes different sources of funds adequate to support its programs and services. The commitment of those resources among programs and services reflects appropriately the mission and goals and priorities of SUU.* (7.B.1) As noted above and in the introduction to this self-study, securing adequate financial resources is an ongoing challenge at SUU. Both in 1993 and 1998, accreditation recommendations cited resource adequacy. SUU has addressed the challenged in multiple ways.

A variety of funding sources support SUU, most notably tuition and tax dollar appropriations. Both sources have increased in recent years, but tuition has climbed at a faster rate than tax funds. SUU has further compensated for reductions in state appropriations by initiative and successfully completing its capital campaign. See Figure 7.3 for revenue sources.
Yet there remain some continuing challenges, and many are detailed in Exhibit i.5. Most have become more pronounced in the last two years. For example, the legislature does not fund inflationary increases in agency operating budgets. And, in fiscal year 2001, the Utah Legislature began to fund enrollment growth at less than 100% (the percent has varied each year since then, but has always been only partial funding). Finally, beginning in fiscal year 2002, the softening state economy forced the legislature to start mandating one-time and permanent budget reductions. Exhibit 7.5 offers examples of both the SUU and USHE operating budget requests to the Utah Legislature.

In evaluating the adequacy of financial resources, fiscal year 2000 can be used as a base year. That was a relatively “good year” without budget cutbacks. Even so, the average salaries of faculty and staff were 15-20% below averages at peer institutions, suggesting inadequate levels of state support (see also Standard 4.4). Even if funding were deemed adequate in the base year, a point subject to debate, the level of state funding certainly could not be deemed entirely adequate today.

Since FY 2000, several noteworthy events have taken place. First, existing operating budgets have been eroded by the annual rate of inflation for the last three years. Second, due to enrollment growth being funded at less than 100%, the system of higher education now has 9,515 students for which no state support is provided. Third, since FY 2002, the system has experienced budget reductions of over $36 million. The consequence of these events is that state funding per FTE student (in inflation-adjusted dollars) has declined steadily over the last five years – down $788 or 14.3%.

Declines in state support are not unique to SUU or Utah. In fact, almost every state in the nation is experiencing similar declines. The National Conference of State Legislatures found that, through October 2002, thirty-three states had...
lower-than-predicted revenue that forced revised estimates and spending cuts. SUU, like other public higher education institutions, will continue to wrestle with these economic difficulties and budgetary upheavals.

SUU has undertaken a series of bold initiatives to improve the adequacy of financial resources. First, campus administrators, in concert with faculty, staff, and student leaders, recently won support for the largest tuition increase ever imposed on this campus – 23.5% for resident undergraduates in the 2003-2004 year. While a small portion of the proceeds from this tuition increase will be used to mitigate the effects of budget cuts, the majority of the proceeds will be used to launch a new round of strategic initiatives.

Funds have been designated for student advisors, student success courses, student recruitment and retention, university marketing, faculty and staff retention, faculty and staff development, employee compensation, ADP system upgrades, student financial aid, and student employment.

In addition to the tuition increase, the institution launched the largest capital campaign in university history – almost 2.5 times larger than any previous capital campaign at SUU. Its five vital objectives include:

- Expanding the doors of educational opportunity for deserving and needy students.
- Enhancing the learning environment.
- Providing support for selected buildings, land acquisitions, and campus beautification projects.
- Enriching existing programs.
- Planning for unforeseen opportunities.

The capital campaign was completed on December 31, 2002. SUU went beyond its original $42 million goal to receive pledges of over $43 million. As with most university capital campaigns, a majority of the gifts are pledges and planned (deferred) gifts, including real estate and stock gifts held in trust for use in the future.

Again, the proceeds from this campaign are being allocated to areas that are represented in the strategic plan and mission of SUU. While the overall financial goal of the campaign was met, individual areas of emphasis received more or less funding than originally planned. Because the critical area of student scholarships received less funding than anticipated, a follow-up campaign has been launched specifically to generate additional funds to support student scholarships.

Adequate resources are available to meet debt service requirements of short-term and long-term indebtedness without adversely affecting the quality of educational programs. A minimum of three years’ history of the amount borrowed (whether internally or externally) for capital outlay and for operating funds is maintained. A five-year projection of future debt repayments is maintained. (7.B.2) SUU manages its resources not only to fulfill the mission of the institution, but also to meet debt service obligations. Again, both a history and projection of payments is maintained and available as Exhibit 7.4.

Financial statements indicate a history of financial stability for the past five years. If an accumulated deficit has been recorded, a realistic plan to eliminate the deficit is approved by the governing board. (7.B.3) Audited financial statements for the past five years comprise Exhibit 7.6. A pattern of stability – if not improvement – is validated in these documents. Exhibit 7.7 provides unaudited financial statements that include reserve summaries. These documents are an internal management resource.

Transfers among the major funds and interfund borrowing are legal and guided by clearly stated policies in accordance with prudent financial planning and control. (7.B.4) Transfers among major funds and interfund borrowing are restricted by Regent policy, and on occasion, by statute. When transfers are allowed, guidelines are strictly followed and reviewed by the Board of Trustees and/or Board of Regents.

SUU demonstrates the adequacy of financial resources for the support of all of its offerings including specialized occupational, technical, and professional programs. (7.B.5) To enhance the equitable and strategic allocation of scarce financial resources among academic offerings, SUU introduced an allocation formula based on staffing and student credit hour (SCH) generation in each department. Although the formula more adequately funded some programs, including specialized applied technology and professional
programs, it had some limitations. Beginning in FY 2003-04, a more comprehensive budget formula was to be implemented based on SCH’s. The formula included staffing, summer school, sabbatical leaves, adjunct and overload compensation, student employment and special initiatives. Further, discussions are underway to recast the MFA program to increase its efficiency and improve its use of limited resources.

SUU identifies the sources of its student financial aid for current enrollments and provides evidence of planning for future financial aid in light of projected enrollments. It monitors and controls the relationship between unfunded student financial aid and tuition revenues. (7.B.6) SUU has a wide range of student financial aid programs, including waivers, scholarships, endowments, grants, loans, and work-study awards. In Standard 3 and its exhibits and Exhibit 7.8 summarize the latest student financial aid activity. The campus recently established a new scholarship committee to examine available resources and optimize distribution of student aid funds. As a result of this committee’s work, the awarding of student aid, a previously fragmented process, has now been centralized in the Financial Aid Office.

SUU is making every effort to stretch scholarship dollars to recruit and retain the maximum number and quality of students. To this end, the institution carefully monitors the relationship between tuition revenue and unfunded financial aid. The administration has dedicated 1% of the 2003-04 tuition increase to the establishment of an ongoing need-based scholarship fund. To assess and document progress, the financial services offices prepare several annual reports detailing tuition collections and sources of student aid. These reports are distributed to campus administrators and to the Boards of Trustees and/or Regents.

SUU maintains adequate financial reserves to meet fluctuations in operating revenue, expenses, and debt service. (7.B.7) As a non-profit entity, SUU strives to maintain adequate working capital reserves, while maximizing the financial resources available to support current operations. Realization of these seemingly incongruent goals is always challenging, but is particularly so during periods of economic uncertainty. Striking the right balance is complicated by the fact that “rainy day” reserves tend to be tapped when other funding sources decline. SUU reserve balances built up in the past are now expended to bridge the gap between expenditure budgets and available revenues. Financial reports detail reserve amounts, as seen again in Exhibit 7.7.

SUU demonstrates an understanding of the financial relationship between its education and general operations and its auxiliary enterprises and their respective contributions to the overall operations of the institution. (7.B.8) Auxiliary enterprises at SUU must (by policy) operate as self-support entities. See Table 7.7. These operations cover all of their own direct costs, and they must also pay rent charges for the space they occupy and overhead charges for the administrative burden they impose on the service arms of the institution (payroll, purchasing, accounting, etc.). Beyond this, auxiliary operations are expected to generate net revenue that can be used at the discretion of the institution. While this net revenue is not technically required to balance the education and general budgets of the campus, it is a source of revenue pledged to the retirement of auxiliary system revenue bonds. Any net revenue not required by bond covenant is used to provide working capital balances for the auxiliaries, to provide student scholarships, or for any other lawful purpose.
## Table 7.7

**Auxiliary Enterprise Report of Net Revenues**

*For the Year Ended June 30, 2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bookstore</th>
<th>Food Service</th>
<th>Resident Living</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore Sales</td>
<td>$3,451,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Sales</td>
<td>$1,437,721</td>
<td>$953,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$14,918</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>3,466,618</td>
<td>1,439,517</td>
<td>964,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Goods Sold</strong></td>
<td>2,503,642</td>
<td>559,310</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Margin</strong></td>
<td>962,976</td>
<td>880,207</td>
<td>964,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>230,113</td>
<td>224,222</td>
<td>194,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>128,204</td>
<td>288,139</td>
<td>64,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>134,370</td>
<td>143,245</td>
<td>76,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>69,067</td>
<td>82,465</td>
<td>338,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>66,118</td>
<td>30,918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>1,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Capital</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>10,751</td>
<td>52,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Overhead</td>
<td>26,625</td>
<td>25,875</td>
<td>26,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>664,213</td>
<td>809,570</td>
<td>764,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Before Transfers</strong></td>
<td>298,763</td>
<td>70,637</td>
<td>200,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>(298,763)</td>
<td>(70,637)</td>
<td>(200,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-mandatory:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>43,145</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td>(198,763)</td>
<td>(27,492)</td>
<td>(197,684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>43,145</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance - June 30, 2001</strong></td>
<td>966,593</td>
<td>28,408</td>
<td>283,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance - June 30, 2002</strong></td>
<td>$1,066,593</td>
<td>$71,553</td>
<td>$285,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequacy of resources continues to be a challenge for the University, particularly during tough economic times. The administration, faculty, and student leaders, to their credit and to the benefit of the institution, are addressing this situation through deliberate efforts. Tuition revenue increases are earmarked to specific, mission-related priorities such as:

- Student recruitment and marketing.
- Recruiting and retaining quality faculty and staff.
- Investing in faculty and staff development.
- Faculty and staff salary equity.
- Summer school expansion.
- Academic advisement and student success.
- Reducing student-to-faculty ratios.
- Hiring and paying more for student jobs.

Additionally, campus administrators and managers have been asked to think creatively in implementing budget reductions for FY 2004. Leaders have been asked for new ideas and methods for performing essential functions, restructuring the institution, and meeting needs. They have also been asked to determine functions that are no longer appropriate or central to the mission of SUU.

Despite current efforts and successes, some SUU departments and offices are suffering from the long-term effects of budget uncertainty and impoverished support. Although resource allocation may be more equitable as a result of strategic budget cuts/reallocations and formula-based approaches, the size of the pie is lamentably smaller than SUU desires and its students deserve.

**Appraisal**

With the resources authorized, SUU does a remarkable job. Operating budgets are lean and salary levels lag behind peer institutional averages, but much is accomplished with the resources allocated to SUU. Tuition, private giving, and internal reallocation have increased to help align resources with programs. Some progress has been made and other progress planned for the near future.

Despite the ups and downs of the economy and state appropriations, SUU has a history of making fiscally responsible and prudent decisions. As a result, the institution remains a financially viable entity, even in uncertain economic times. There is a growing dependence on tuition revenue, but at the same time, students are participating in decision making as never before. The challenge remains to recruit and retain quality faculty and staff, but SUU is trying to compensate through salary equity adjustments, opportunities for professional development, and workload considerations.

The Board of Regents, in conjunction with Legislative leaders, has introduced a new approach to budgeting that may bring some relief. Internally, SUU’s administration is translating appropriations into more viable programs through improved allocation models and considerable reallocation.

**Financial Management - Standard 7.C**

_The president reports regularly to the governing board about the financial adequacy and stability of the institution._ (7.C.1) The President or his designee regularly reports on the financial position of the University to the Board of Trustees. Routine, system-wide reports are also prepared for the Commissioner’s Office and Board of Regents. Examples include budget reports, work programs, auxiliary services reports, intercollegiate athletics reports, and annual financial statements. Trustees agendas and minutes are among the exhibit materials.

Financial functions are centralized and are under a single qualified financial officer responsible to the president. Institutional business functions are under one or more qualified officers, are well organized, and function effectively. The complexity of the business organization reflects the size of the institution and the significance of its transactions. (7.C.2) Responsibility for financial management is the primary duty of the Vice President for Administrative and Financial Services, who reports directly to the President. A team of able, well-qualified accountants, directors and other officers support the day-to-day
operations of the institution. Not only are financial functions centralized for management and control, but related administrative functions such as human resources, security, plant operations, facilities planning, mail service, purchasing, and risk management are housed within the unit. Organizational charts and administrative and financial services reports (available in the exhibit materials) document the strength of the unit, the qualifications of key staff, and goals, objectives, and assessment indicators for the division’s success. SUU’s financial position is reported each year to USHE and in IPEDS. Exhibit 7.9 offers copies of five years of IPEDS reports.

All expenditures and income from whatever source, and the administration of scholarships, grants in aid, loans, and student employment, are fully controlled by the institution and are included in its regular planning, budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures. (7.C.3) All items of income and expenditure, regardless of the source, are processed through the institution’s regular accounting and budgeting systems, and are governed by the policies of the Board of Regents (i.e., no financial transactions are processed outside the institution’s formal accounting system). The accounting and budgeting offices manage financial resources and associated expenditures. Supplemental management is offered by deans, department chairs, directors, and other line managers. The working relationship between these offices is professional and helpful.

A newly established scholarship committee, working with financial staff and the financial aid office, administers scholarships, grants, and student loans. The program is regularly audited and reviewed to insure adequate controls are in place. SUU also administers a number of endowed scholarships. All sources of student support are reviewed and monitored centrally in coordination with appropriate offices. See Standard 3 for more information.

SUU has clearly defined and implemented policies regarding cash management and investments which have been approved by the governing board. (7.C.4) Most USHE funds are managed by the Treasurer of the State of Utah. However, some funds are locally managed and regularly reported to the Board of Trustees. In both cases, the State of Utah has adopted strict cash and investment management practices into law (see Utah State Money Management Act and Rules of the State Money Management Council). Compliance with these policies and procedures is verified by an independent accounting firm during the annual audit of the university’s money management report (an annual summary required by the state money management act).

SUU’s accounting system follows generally accepted principles of accounting. (7.C.5) The institution’s accounting system follows generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Compliance with GAAP is verified during the annual financial statement audit.

If public institutions are, by law, audited by a state agency, an independent audit is not required except for any funds not subject to governmental audit. (7.C.9) Audits of the institution’s financial statements are always performed by an independent accounting entity. The Office of the State Auditor either performs the audit directly or contracts with a certified public accounting firm to do the work.

All funds for financial aid and other specific programs not subject to governmental audit are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant and include a management letter. (7.C.10) All funds are audited annually during the financial statement audit. This process includes the issuance of a management letter. The financial aid office is audited annually for compliance with federal regulations governing the distribution of student aid.

SUU demonstrates a well-organized program of internal audit (where appropriate) and control that complements the accounting system and the external audit. (7.C.11) Within the Utah System of Higher Education, the function of internal audit is assigned to accountants and other staff employed by the Board of Regents. Reviews are performed on a rotating basis, or as issues are identified by the Board. Any findings are reported to the Audit Committee of the Regents. In addition to this coverage, tests of internal controls are conducted by the external auditor as an integral part of the annual financial statement.
audit. SUU does not have a discrete office of internal audit.

SUU demonstrates that recommendations in the auditor’s management letter accompanying the audit report have been adequately considered. (7.C.12) Audit recommendations are reviewed by the President and other administrators. The controller must respond to all comments in the management letter. While the institution may not always agree with recommendations and comments made by the auditor, each point in the management letter receives a written response explaining the position of the institution. Any corrective action is implemented as quickly as possible.

Federal, state, external, and internal audit reports are made available for examination as part of any evaluation conducted by the Commission on Colleges and Universities. (7.C.13) All audit reports are public documents, and are made available as necessary.

Appraisal

Reporting and financial maintenance are priorities for SUU, and other improvements are also underway. In July 2003 a new administrative data processing system (SCT Banner) became operational. Migrating to the new system has required an extensive commitment of staff time, but the new system is expected to improve work methods and efficiency -- all made possible by dedicated people and sound financial planning.

The self-study process found several areas that can be enhanced. The development and maintenance of a rolling three-year financial plan that reflects external factors, enrollment projections, and budget allocation mechanisms would help top management with planning and forecasting decisions. With the new Banner software, it was suggested that budget details and access be preserved, and reporting expanded as may be helpful to directors, deans, department chairs, and other line managers. Finally, although budget priorities for the future will echo the past (e.g., salary equity and professional development), a recommendation is to remedy ongoing shortfalls in departmental operating budgets, particularly for capital budgets, library acquisitions, and general operations support.

Even with ongoing financial stresses, SUU will continue to engage in planning activities that make optimal use of scarce resources and uphold the mission of the institution.

Fundraising and Development - Standard 7.D

All college/university fundraising activities are governed by institutional policies, comply with governmental, requirements, and are conducted in a professional and ethical manner. (7.D.1) All university fundraising activities are coordinated through the University Advancement and Regional Services office. The office includes Development, Alumni Relations, Rural Development, the Utah Center for Rural Health, and the Southwest Utah Center for Rural Life. The office reports directly to the President and manages the fundraising and friend-raising programs of the University. Institutional policies and accounting procedures govern the operations of the development office. The administration and the Board of Trustees monitor appropriate financial accountability. Confidential data on donors and prospective donors is carefully protected to maintain trust, integrity and the right to privacy. The second round of the capital campaign is aimed at increasing available scholarship funds.

Endowment and life income funds and their investments are administered by an appropriate institutional officer, foundation, or committee designated by the governing board. The organization maintains complete records concerning these funds and complies with applicable legal requirements. (7.D.2) Endowment and life income gifts are generally given directly to the University, which serves as trustee. As trustee, the University manages and invests assets of the trust or endowment in a pooled investment fund, whose status is reported regularly to the Board of Trustees. Each endowment or trust is separately accounted for and tracked in compliance with policies governing the gift, its investment, and spending. The development office maintains records for all endowment and life income funds, including the original gift agreement or contract, a record of
subsequent gifts (if any), and a copy of acknowledgments provided to the donor.

SUU has a clearly defined relationship with any foundation bearing its name or which has as its major purpose the raising of funds for the institution. (7.D.3) The Southern Utah University Foundation, a nonprofit organization, was incorporated under Utah law in 1996. The foundation was established to provide support for the university, its students and faculty, and to promote, sponsor, and carry out educational, scientific, and charitable activities at the university. The foundation meets the requirements of Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) as an exempt nonprofit organization. The foundation has no paid employees and no physical facilities, but is housed on the university campus. The University has a controlling number of positions on the Board of Directors of the foundation.

Since its formation in 1996, the foundation has fulfilled its mission to provide for and enhance the educational mission of the university. On behalf of the university, the foundation receives and administers gifts and donations, including cash, gifts in kind, planned giving programs, bequests, and real estate. The foundation is a component unit of SUU, as defined by Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 14, The Financial Reporting Entity. The foundation is included in the financial statements of the university as a blended component unit. A blended component unit is an entity that is legally separate from the university, but is so intertwined with the university that it is, in substance, the same as the university.

Appraisal

Fundraising and friend-raising are significant aspects of SUU monitored and directed by the President. Accountability is managed in the advancement office. The activities of this office are professionally handled, reviewed at the executive level, and reported to the Board of Trustees. An annual report to the campus on fundraising activities would be informative and constructive.
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Physical Resources
STANDARD EIGHT: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Facilities of the University were designed and constructed, and they are currently used and maintained, to support the mission and role of SUU. Facilities and the campus environment are outstanding and may be SUU’s greatest strength. Exhibit 8.1 is the Fall 2001 Campus Master Plan, including a map of the campus. Also among the exhibit materials is a more detailed campus map.

The primary focus in the care and upkeep of university resources and facilities is student recruitment and retention. SUU’s superb facilities are situated in an arboretum-like setting and are overseen by energetic and dedicated staff. The meticulously maintained buildings, beautiful grounds, and colorful gardens are a major attraction to students, faculty, staff, and visitors. Our exemplary facilities complement the personalized learning environment for which we are renowned. Great efforts have gone into the facilities and grounds to elevate the senses and enrich the learning experience. The well-trained and highly-skilled facilities staff demonstrate great pride in their work. Increased energy efficiency, water conservation efforts, and preventative and ongoing maintenance have earned SUU recognition among higher education institutions inside and outside of Utah.

Instructional and Support Facilities - Standard 8.A

SUU consists of the main campus (133 acres), valley farm acreage (1,032 acres), mountain property (2,502 acres), plus an observatory, archaeology site, and other property for a total of 3,844 acres. The campus boasts of superb landscaping and well-maintained grounds that feature tall spruce and pine trees and nearly eighty acres of lawns and flowerbeds. Building maintenance and pride in appearance enhances the university’s reputation as a safe and beautiful campus. Annually, over 130,000 visitors from every state and several foreign countries attend the Utah Shakespearean Festival to observe theatre in one of the world’s most authentic Shakespearean stages. In the spring of 1999, a Dan Jones and Associates (public opinion polling firm) survey found that USF patrons commended the “overall atmosphere and campus setting.”

The Plant Operations Department is responsible for overseeing the physical support services of 78 University-owned buildings that total 1,323,438 square feet (compared to 813,163 at the time of our last accreditation report). The total insured replacement value of campus buildings is $162,969,767 (as of July 1, 2002). Table 8.1 is a summary of major facilities of the University, including their date of construction or major remodeling. Exhibit 8.2 provides a detailed inventory of University space and a summary of significant facilities changes in the past five years.

Plant Operations has 66 full time employees and 150-250 student employees depending on need. In 1993, the NASC on-site evaluators commended SUU for “its signal improvements and expansion of its physical facilities,” adding that the “campus is well maintained and is immaculate.” Since then, improvements in the campus physical facilities have continued apace, and one-third of all facilities were built in the last decade.
Table 8.1

Summary of Major Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gross Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Year Built or Remodeled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Building</td>
<td>26,419</td>
<td>1973/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studio</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>1923/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>35,475</td>
<td>1955/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrum</td>
<td>104,613</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Leavitt Business Building</td>
<td>26,123</td>
<td>1980/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles Coliseum</td>
<td>22,409</td>
<td>1987/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles Living &amp; Learning Center</td>
<td>105,860</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Learning Center</td>
<td>54,214</td>
<td>1968/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Classroom Building</td>
<td>52,912</td>
<td>1962/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald R. Sherratt Library</td>
<td>82,418</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Residence</td>
<td>11,314</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Sorenson Physical Education Building</td>
<td>138,358</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science Building</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Building</td>
<td>21,003</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Main</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>1897/50/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Center</td>
<td>50,819</td>
<td>1965/77/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. Braithwaite Liberal Arts Center (under repair)</td>
<td>19,091</td>
<td>1907/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Haze Hunter Conference Center</td>
<td>37,024</td>
<td>1928/62/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Jones Theatre</td>
<td>35,894</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Building</td>
<td>65,082</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharwan Smith Center</td>
<td>180,502</td>
<td>1998/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hall</td>
<td>10,921</td>
<td>1930/88/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Building</td>
<td>42,435</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Acquisitions, Building and Remodeling Projects

Significant structural additions and renovations have characterized the past decade, as highlighted above in Table 8.1. Since 1993, six new buildings have greatly enhanced the academic and service programs at the university, with a seventh in progress. The following is a summary of new construction:

- South Hall and the Art Studio Buildings were replaced in 2003 to provide new offices and instructional space for the College of Performing and Visual Arts.
- The J.L. Sorenson Physical Education Building was completed in March 2000 at a total cost of $21,500,000 and added 90,000 net assignable square feet to the academic space.
- The Sharwan Smith Center, completed in 1997 for a total cost of $16,480,806, added 142,000 gross square feet to the existing student center.
- The Eccles Coliseum, completed in 1997, has 22,409 gross square feet and was constructed for $2,677,724.
- The Gerald R. Sherratt Library, completed in 1996 at a total cost of $10,293,880, increased the assignable square footage from 22,543 to 61,691, and its bold architecture also stands as an important focal point for the campus and community of learners.
- The Institutional Residence was completed in 1996 for a total construction cost of $675,000.
- The Eccles Living and Learning Center is new student housing comprised of 50 units with 300 beds, along with common areas.
Currently under construction, it is scheduled for completion in March 2004.

Six buildings have undergone significant renovations in the past decade for a number of reasons, as outlined in the following list.

- To preserve a historic campus landmark, a $2.2 million-dollar appropriation was approved by the Utah Legislature for implementing seismically-stable conditions to the R. C. Braithwaite Center, initially constructed in 1907. To address the need for temporary accommodations for the academic departments in the building, 2,922 square feet of existing space on campus was converted into 23 offices and 4,051 square feet of lab space was converted to four classrooms. Renovations for this project were finalized in mid 2003.

- In 2002, 4,554 square feet of space in the Technology Building was converted into lab/classroom space for the Department of Physical Science to be used for studying engineering fluids analysis and structural testing.

- In Fall 2001, a portion of the space in the old Physical Education Building, renamed the Multipurpose Center, was converted to provide Intercollegiate Athletics with a new academic center and several offices. In addition, two large dance labs were converted over the former pool area. The two labs provided the department with the 2,600 square feet necessary to meet national accreditation standards for the discipline.

- The Burch Mann House was renovated through 2001 to accommodate the new Master’s of Fine Arts in Arts Administration program.

- The University remodeled existing space in the Life Science Building into two large student research labs. In 1998, the Keck Foundation made a substantial donation of $250,000 for lab equipment. See Exhibit 8.3.

- The Electronic Learning Center, formerly the Library building, was renovated in 1997. The upper three levels were renovated for computer services with 6 computer labs, 1 classroom, 32 offices, 2 conference rooms, and 1 room for clerical staff. This building houses the main computer system of the university and several open-access computer labs.

In addition to building projects, SUU has upgraded parking lots to meet the needs of faculty, staff and students. In 1993, the university had 2,009 spaces available for parking, and now the number has improved to 2,811 spaces. Utah standards require a minimum of 508 parking places for employees and 1,756 for students (a total of 2,264); consequently, SUU has 547 more parking spaces than is required.

Also noteworthy are efforts by Plant Operations to make significant strides in water conservation during the past ten years. SUU has partnered with Cedar City in new well development to lower ongoing water costs, and the institution has incorporated a computerized central irrigation system with a weather station. In addition, areas of campus have been improved with xeriscaped features that take advantage of natural plant and rock materials to reduce campus water consumption.

Institutional facilities are sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals. (8.A.1) The University’s Strategic Plan includes the goal “To ensure human, financial and physical resources necessary to fulfill the University’s mission.” A number of indicators measure the University’s success in achieving this goal. Table 8.2 summarizes relevant objectives and assessment activities that link mission and facilities of the University. The complete plan is explained more fully in Standard 1.
### Table 8.2
**Physical Resource Objectives and Assessment Indicators**
**SUU Strategic Plan**

**Objective:** Obtain pivotal capital development and improvement funding with the new teacher education building being top priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>How the measure demonstrates institutional effectiveness</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain legislative funding for the Teacher Education building</td>
<td>Assess institutional ability to acquire facilities.</td>
<td>President and Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to receive capital improvement funding based upon total square feet</td>
<td>Assess institutional commitment to capital and plant renewal and effectively demonstrate project value and need</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant operations Space management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Plant Operations Administration building and return existing building in the heart of campus to academics</td>
<td>Assess institutional ability to acquire funds for facilities and academics</td>
<td>President Administrative Services Plant Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding for basic maintenance and operation of facilities to allow infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>Assess institutional commitment to capital and plant renewal and effectively demonstrate the project value and need</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant Operations Space Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire capital needs based upon SUU master plan</td>
<td>Work with state agencies and lobby for adequate funding of capital needs through better formula models</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant Operations Space Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive proportional State funding and personnel for ongoing and preventative maintenance of University facilities</td>
<td>Assess physical facilities funding commitment based on State appropriations</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant Operations Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue implementation of campus facilities master plan and associated capital budget projects</td>
<td>Assess capital campaign private donations including operational appropriations and legislative lobby</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement plan for deferred maintenance backlog to preserve physical facilities</td>
<td>Assess physical facilities funding and staffing commitment based on State appropriations</td>
<td>Administrative Services Plant Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accreditation 2003* 216 *Standard 8*
Objective: Develop and efficiently use physical spaces to enable academic and athletic programs to grow and improve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Indicators and Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of use by space type in annual space utilization reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous acreage acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor square footage and playfield space for athletic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Q&amp;P (Qualification &amp; Prioritization) data compilation in accordance with State standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase as enrollments warrant the amount of square footage in classrooms, laboratories, offices and other institutional spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the amount of on-campus parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complementing these assessment activities are several audits and reports for external agencies. For example, the Utah State Building Board, in coordination with the Utah State Board of Regents, engages the following:

- A five-year capital development (new facilities) plan that is updated annually and submitted to the Utah Legislature.
- A five-year capital improvement (renovations) plan that is updated annually and submitted to the Utah Legislature. See Exhibit 8.4.
- Preventative Maintenance Audits that benchmarks facility maintenance and repairs to 18 standards, including life safety, and “scores” each campus. See Exhibit 8.5.
- Capital improvement audits that bring third-party review of campus needs.

- Space utilization reports that are annually required of colleges and universities.

In general, the academic space at SUU is underutilized according to state guidelines. The amount of space available, however, is not the only indicator of space adequacy.

Facilities assigned to an institutional function are adequate for the effective operation of the function. (8.A.2) The University has had great success in converting existing space for specialized academic purposes, although programmatic needs still exist according to some departmental data templates submitted for this self-study. For example, there was a reported need for increased television and radio labs and additional laboratory space for modern chemical instruction. Another concern was that of rehearsal space for the music instrumental program and space for the art methods courses,
issues to be addressed with completion of the new Performing and Visual Arts Building in Summer 2003.

To achieve optimal utilization of classroom and laboratory space, central control of academic scheduling throughout the year is the responsibility of the Campus Scheduling Office, in coordination with the Provost’s Office. Revised policy, procedures, and guidelines for academic scheduling were adopted in the 2002-03 academic year. Academic departments submit space requests through their Deans and to the Scheduling Office by an established due date. Courses with special classroom needs are given appropriate priority with emphasis placed on matching room size with maximum course enrollments.

To optimize the use of academic space for instruction and to increase course availability for students, SUU policy states that each college shall schedule no more than 12 percent of its class offerings per hour with beginning times between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.

The academic unit most challenged in achieving its academic mission due to an inadequate physical facility is the Teacher Education Program. The bulk of instruction takes place in SUU’s Old Main, a 104-year-old structure, the oldest building on the entire campus. Although the building has a rich historical legacy, it is too small to accommodate student demand for Teacher Education classes. SUU administrators have made a new Teacher Education Building their top capital facilities project. The land was purchased in 1998 from the local school district and the proposed building will have 87,500 square feet of space at a cost of $14,200,000 (2002 estimates).

SUU’s facilities are furnished adequately for work, study, and research by students, faculty, and staff. (8.A.3) All new building projects come with furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) budget. DFCM representatives help to determine the appropriate FF&E level early on.
in a project’s conceptual development, during the Capital Budget Estimate (CBE) phase of a project.

*The management, maintenance, and operation of institutional facilities are adequate to ensure their continuing quality and safety necessary to support the educational programs and support services of the institution.* (8.A.4.) The Plant Operations staff inspect and approve all maintenance, repairs, upgrades and work plans to ensure that proper code requirements are met.

The office has an online work request system through which employees request routine maintenance and small repairs. Satisfaction surveys are available for users to assess Plant Operations’ level of service and quality. Survey responses have shown excellent satisfaction. See **Exhibit 8.7** for examples of the work order system and survey. Figure 8.2 shows the 2002 condition of SUU space.

**Figure 8.2**

**Summary of Building Condition, 2002**

SUU completed a Higher Education Facility Preventative Maintenance Audit on October 9, 2002. The audit compared university facilities with standards of the Utah State Building Board, and it included a physical inspection of the facilities, documentation of processes, and interviews with related personnel relative to more than a dozen different classifications. SUU's cumulative audit score of 94.6% in October 2002 was the highest audit score among all USHE institutions. Table 8.3 summarizes the results of the audit. Again, see **Exhibit 8.5** for further details.
Table 8.3
Higher Education Facility Preventative Maintenance Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Architectural and Mechanical</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment Data Base and Tagging</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Corrective Maintenance</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Boilers</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Life Safety</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Eq.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Plumbing</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Electrical</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Facility Inspections</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Indoor Air Quality &amp; Energy Mgt.</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Required Documents</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Custodial</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mechanical</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Electrical / Lighting</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Roof</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Architectural</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Parks and State Lands</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUU’s highest Facility Preventative Maintenance Audit score in the State suggests that facilities are in good operating condition. Over the past decade, budget challenges related to building and furnishing maintenance have taken on increasing importance. Rarely are additional resources added to the operational budget to defray the growing costs. Although the university is proud of its high ranking in facilities maintenance and upgrades, the eroding resources make the goal of maintaining high quality an increasing challenge.

SUU’s facilities are constructed and maintained with due regard for health and safety and for access by the physically disabled. (8.A.5.) University facilities are constructed in accordance with all applicable federal and state codes and regulations. The DFCM, Utah State Fire Marshals Office, and Plant Operations Maintenance staff reviews new Capital Development projects for compliance prior to construction. Final plan review is essential in ensuring compliance with regulations such as ADA, International Building Code, International Fire Code, International Electrical Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code, and International Fuel Gas Code.

The Campus Fire Marshall is responsible for fire-related equipment inspections. The main campus fire alarm system is located in the Public Safety Office and monitored twenty-four hours a day.

The Safety and Risk Manager is responsible for:
- OSHA compliance
- Hazardous Materials management and disposal
- Annual inspection of all University facilities and grounds
- Liability insurance
- Claims processing
- Accident investigation
- Safety training

The Safety and Risk Manager established a Risk Committee in 1994 that meets quarterly to
evaluate safety concerns and to find resolutions for problems.

In 1999, the university purchased a “Blue-Light” system and installed it in five strategic locations on campus. It has been used on several occasions and has proved a valuable resource for those needing immediate assistance. Most university buildings have courtesy phones with local access.

During the past decade, the university has made an extensive effort to remove barriers and improve access to individuals with physical impairments. The majority of university facilities met compliance standards previous to 1996. In 1996, the university received additional funding from the State to make the entire campus barrier-free, a consequence of a complaint filed in 1995 with the Office of Civil Rights alleging that the University was not in compliance with ADA regulations. The complaint sparked the interest of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, the Utah State Division of Risk Management, and DFCM, agencies that helped with project funding.

After funding was obtained in 1996, the project was completed in 1998. The project included all necessary modifications to make the university campus ADA-code compliant. On January 28, 2000, SUU received a letter from the Office of Civil Rights closing the monitoring of the complaint effective that date and stated: "we appreciate the University's cooperation and efforts in the implementation of the agreement and recognize the significant achievement represented by the many accessibility projects that have been completed throughout campus." See Exhibit 8.8.

The University ADA Coordinator, The Director of Disabilities, and the Safety and Risk Manager work together in coordinating ADA issues. The number of students with disabilities that SUU accommodates varies from semester to semester. In Spring 2002, for example, the program serviced 196 students. Examples of accommodation included computer labs and workstations with special furniture, early course registration, extra time for testing, the use of scribes and books on tape. The Sherratt Library provides a computer for manipulation of data such as text enlargement. The Director of Disabilities, along with the Cedar City Council, have established the Cedar City Disabilities Action Team to partner together to provide accommodations for individuals with disabilities.

When programs are offered off the primary campus, the physical facilities at these sites are appropriate to the programs offered. (8.A.6.) Undergraduate Teacher Education classes are offered at Dixie State College located in St. George, Utah, at the Udvar-Hazy Business Building, the newest instructional space on the DSC campus. The technology is comparable to that used in EdNET courses taught on SUU’s campus. Courses taught at the Snow/Richfield Campus have exceptional physical facilities and are adequate to meet educational needs.

When facilities owned and operated by other organizations or individuals are used by the institution for educational purposes, the facilities meet this standard. (8.A.7) No other instruction is offered under such arrangements.

**Appraisal**

A strength of SUU is the beauty of its campus and functionality of its physical facilities. The Plant Operations department and its well-trained staff are recognized across campus for their hard work, dedication, and skill. The physical resources of the campus are maintained in a superb manner as demonstrated in the recent Higher Education Facility Preventative Maintenance Audit. SUU ranked first among USHE peer institutions for its maintenance and standard of care for facilities. Recent changes in leadership and focus have allowed a renewed emphasis on the statewide maintenance mandate.

During the course of the self-study process multiple strengths were noted in SUU’s facilities. Regular maintenance through consistent (though limited) state funding resources allows for a stunning and well-maintained campus. The Plant Operations staff is recognized statewide and plant administrators are often tapped to assist with various state task
force issues. There exists a well-defined organizational structure with functional relationships and management responsibilities clearly defined. A maintenance work identification system is in place to identify substandard conditions, and a work request system has been implemented and scheduling procedures have been established. Internal surveys and external audits document a high level of customer satisfaction and staff proficiency. Within the past decade, SUU’s compliance with ADA issues received commendation from the Office of Civil Rights. Safety policies and procedures have been established, written, and communicated to all staff.

Challenges, particularly in times of limited funding also affect SUU's facilities. Limited funding for deferred maintenance (a reserve funding mechanism that methodically accrues resources and replaces equipment based on reasonable life cycles) remains a critical issue. Recent cuts in state funding have reduced staff by 4.0 FTE and limited funding for major maintenance and repair, and staff training opportunities are in jeopardy. While the Campus Planning Committee is helpful in the facilities planning process, the funds available for it to allocate have remained stagnant for several years. Although the state of Utah statutorily requires a 1.1% capital improvement fund each year, language also exists for funding exceptions at only the 0.9 level, an approach the state took during the lean 2002-03 year.

**Equipment and Materials - Standard 8.B**

The 1993 Northwest Accreditation team commended SUU for its “strong commitment to the use of technology in its educational programs.” At that time, the institution was in the initial stages of entering a new “information age.” Since then, SUU has tried to keep pace with new computing, laboratory, telecommunication, and educational technologies. Always, the mission of the institution has been kept front and center in confronting the needs and costs of new technologies.

Suitable equipment (including computing and laboratory equipment) is provided and is readily accessible at on- and off-campus sites to meet educational and administrative requirements. (8.B.1) During the past ten years, most capital equipment budget increases have been prompted by the growing number of computers and advanced technology classrooms. As detailed in Standard 5, extensive telecommunication and computer infrastructure projects have been completed during the past decade.

A few examples demonstrate SUU’s commitment to maintaining suitable equipment:

- The telecommunication system (Definity G3S1) is the latest version and gives the greatest capacity for expansion.
- The voice mail system (Octel) was installed in 1996 and upgraded in 2001 with the latest technology.
- Some 24 department computer labs have been established to meet the specific needs of disciplines.
- A total of 70 mediated classrooms have been completed, 24 installed since 2002.
- The Sherratt Library now has 92 computer work stations (with an additional 24 more planned for Fall 2003), and is a leader in providing traditional and electronic resources to faculty, staff and students.
- Cutting-edge wireless internet access is available at the Sherratt Library and a portable unit can be obtained from the IT Department for use through campus.

Currently all faculty members who request computer technology on their desktop have it. New faculty members routinely receive a computer, printer, and complete internet access as part of a start-up package.

Equipment is maintained in proper operating condition, is inventoried and controlled, and replaced or upgraded as needed. (8.B.2) Controller’s staff are responsible for inventory and control of equipment, adhering to Board of Regents Policy R561 and SUU Policy 7.6. See Exhibit 8.9. Regental policy provides for standardized accounting records and procedures for the USHE. This policy sets the capitalization...
limit for equipment at SUU at $3,000; all of these items must be tagged and counted at least biannually. According to SUU Policy 7.6, equipment is capitalized and inventoried on SUU’s books based on full acquisition cost, including freight and handling. Equipment acquisition cost must exceed minimum value per Regents Policy R561, and have a useful life expectancy of one year or greater.

In regard to non-inventoriable equipment, departments have the responsibility for controlling and maintaining equipment items and regularly capitalized equipment. Each employee is considered the property custodian of all equipment in his/her office, classroom, or work area. Property custodians are responsible to verify the equipment inventory at least annually.

The institution faces challenges in replacing equipment because of budget constraints. According to some departmental data templates submitted for this self-study, the maintenance and replacement of equipment cannot always meet some disciplines’ needs. For example, Family and Consumer Sciences reported a need to shorten the replacement cycle on equipment. In addition, the College of Education lost State ETI funding, and current capital expense accounts cannot meet the needs of routine replacement of key instructional equipment. The Department of Physical Science reports a lack of institutional funding for specialized chemistry instruments used for instruction in a laboratory setting. Although external funding for equipment might be available through Keck, National Science Foundation, ILI and some LSTA programs, these grants usually require a 50/50 match and SUU has limited funds for matching grants.

Appraisal

Equipment is acquired and maintained for long-term use. A systematic cycle for renewal or replacement of obsolete equipment often lacks practice perspective when budgets are lean. Assistance from foundations and grants has supplemented capital budget in ways that are both profound and gratifying.

Physical Resources Planning - Standard 8.C

The master plan for campus physical development is consistent with the mission and the long-range educational plan of the institution—and the master plan is updated periodically. (8.C.1) The Fall 2001 Campus Master Plan is Exhibit 8.1. By definition, a campus master plan is to mirror and support the mission and long-range educational plan of the institution. SUU complies with relevant policies of the Board of Regents regarding capital facilities master planning and oversight. These policies include R-710, R-714, and R-720. See Exhibit 8.10.

Regental policies provide the structural framework for assuring that campus master plans are an integral part of a larger whole. Comprehensive campus master plans are completed and approved for each USHE
institution based on approved programmatic planning. Construction of new, and remodeling of existing, facilities may only be undertaken when the need for such is demonstrated through student enrollment data, space utilization rates, structural obsolescence, operational inefficiencies, or operating budget constraints.

Once an institution develops and approves internally a facilities master plan that serves the educational mission, a community (public) hearing is held. Finally, the governing boards (the institutional Board of Trustees and state Board of Regents) review and approve master plans. The approval process is outlined more fully in 8.C.4. An institution may proceed with construction of new and/or major remodeling of existing capital facilities only with full approval of the governing board(s).

The SUU Master Plan Strategy includes the following goals:

Perpetuate the personalized learning climate
- Use the former physical education building as a temporary surge space.
- Support the Utah Shakespearean Festival’s efforts to create its own Centre.
- Embrace the former middle school property by strongly physically connecting it to the existing campus.
- Continue to allocate property to open/green space as the campus grows.
- Continue the location of parking areas on the campus perimeter.
- Provide campus entryways that signal a stronger presentation.
- Facilitate continued campus growth through building renovation.
- Work in harmony with the community in meeting future campus growth goals.

The Implementation Plan includes the following:

Create a surface parking lot and possibly some green space playing fields on portions of the former middle school property
- New parking lot at 300 West and Center, constructed Fall 2002, with 261 stalls.

In cooperation with the City and UDOT, realign the 300 West 200 South street intersection.
- Hosting Center demolished, Summer 2002.
- Road realignment completed, Fall 2002.

Create seismically stable conditions for Braithwaite and Old Main buildings, utilizing surge space in the Multipurpose building
- Converted office and classroom space in the Multipurpose building into necessary surge space, Fall 2001 through Summer 2003.
- Created space of Braithwaite gallery move (into Alumni building), Summer 2002.
- Received state funding ($2.75 million) for Braithwaite renovation.
- Braithwaite renovation completed Fall 2003.

Construct a new Teacher Education facility
- Continue process of procuring approvals and funding.
- Site location identified and approved by governing bodies.
- Building Board approval for programming phase received in summer 2002.
- Programming document to be completed February 2003.
- Presentation to governing boards, Building Board, legislative groups continues.

Complete a new Eccles Living and Learning Center housing complex
- Programming phase completed Fall 2002.

Construct a new Performing and Visual Arts Building
- To house PVA programs under one roof.
- Project start contingent upon fund raising and state resources.

**Expand the College of Business building**
- Contingent upon state resources.
- Longer term priority.

**Expand the Plant Operations compound to include administrative offices**
- Contingent upon state resources.
- Longer term priority.

**Support the Utah Shakespearean Festival’s master planning efforts in creating a new, two-block center**
- Governing board and state legislative approval in place.
- Fund raising for the Production component underway.
- Design development document for Production component completed.
- Development team for Retail component selected.
- Developer agreements to be completed in process.

**Athletics to build out currently shelled space in Harris Center and Stadium to accommodate programmatic needs**
- Harris Center construction completed early Summer 2003.
- Stadium work to begin after Harris Center move and two donors identified.

**Work in harmony with the community**
- New City Water Agreement reached.
- DFCM receives best energy payback project of all its state projects.
- City receives $200K towards completion of a new well to meet city water needs.
- SUU receives reduced water rates for future years, plus immediate return on investment.

**Physical facilities development and major renovation planning include plans for the acquisition or allocation of the required capital and operating funds.** (8.C.2) Facilities projects are of two primary types, the handling of which is outlined in Board of Regents Policy R710.

Once an institution has completed programmatic planning and a campus (facilities) master plan is in place to support the programmatic planning efforts, these two types of facilities projects are then pursued for approval and funding.

**Capital Development Projects** are considered permanent additions of square footage to the state’s fixed capital assets, and major structural renovations or reconstruction or major remodel project are included. In line with Regental policies, an institution determines its primary capital development projects through the master planning process. Each institution is requested to have in consideration a “capital investment plan” that outlines desired development projects for the next five years.

Because of the present financial constraints within Utah, institutions focus primarily on their number-one priority state funded project request. Still, SUU has the following capital development project requests on the books:

- Teacher Education Building (State funded, $14.2M)
- Eccles Living and Learning Center (Non-state funded, $11.0M)
- Business Building addition (State funded, $7.0M)
- Performing and Visual Arts Building (State funded, $29.8M)
- Physical Plant Administration Building (State funded, $2.1M)
- Shakespeare Centre (Non-state funded, $70.0M)

For each capital development project, USHE institutions are required to have completed “Capital Needs Statements” outlining the programmatic need for the building and the scope of the project. These Statements are utilized as starting points by the Regents, DFCM staff, and the State Building Board in prioritizing projects.

Utilizing “Capital Needs Statements” and additional materials, SUU representatives make presentations to the various governing boards and numerous state agency representatives about institutional needs. Throughout the request process and as part of the final legislative
An approval process, an Operation and Maintenance (O&M) component is included in the request. The State of Utah provides O&M funding for new building projects along with approval for the new buildings themselves. O&M dollars funded are based on an institution’s historical operating costs, adjusted upward for any special conditions, such as unique building type and hours of operation. These O&M dollars allow new campus buildings to be brought on-line without harming existing programs.

Similarly, each new building project comes with furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) budget. These funding allocations recognize that new buildings need start-up furniture, fixtures, and equipment to be functional. DFCM representatives help to determine the appropriate FF&E level early on in a project’s conceptual development, during the Capital Budget Estimate (CBE) phase of a project.

The second type of campus facilities projects — “Capital Improvements” -- also deserves brief mention. With a statutorily fixed amount of funding (1.1% of state capital assets) going to improvement projects each year, each USHE campus is assured of an annual allocation for its most pressing deferred maintenance needs. The regularity of funding for this purpose allows each campus to prepare a multi-year planning cycle of capital improvement projects. While the actual dollars available for both types of facilities project – both capital development and capital improvement -- could always be higher, the State of Utah has provided a well-understood structural framework for planning and accessing such funding.

Physical resource planning addresses access to institutional facilities for special constituencies including the physically impaired and provides for appropriate security arrangements. (8.C.3) All university facilities and pathways of travel, from parking lots to facilities, are accessible for those with physical impairments. For those needing special accommodations to particular events or activities, tickets and signs provide information about accommodations and contact arrangements with the ADA Services Coordinator. Appropriate notices are printed in student registration materials. Security service arrangements are made through the Public Safety Office.

Governing board members and affected constituent groups are involved, as appropriate, in planning physical facilities. (8.C.4) The approval process for SUU’s campus master plan mirrors the process for all USHE institutions. Regents’ reviews of campus master plans normally take place during public meetings when the Board convenes on each campus. Each substantial revision in a campus master plan, beyond discussions at President’s Council and other internal groups, must be presented at a public hearing, and then must be approved first by the institutional Board of Trustees and finally by the system-wide Board of Regents.

For example, the most recent substantial change in SUU’s Campus Master Plan took place in Fall 2001. Once discussion and agreement was reached on campus, an advertised public forum was held in September 2001. Following the public hearing the Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the Plan in October 2001. Finally, the Board of Regents discussed and approved the plan in October 2001. While such plans go through the approval process annually, a full-blown update and modification of the plan involving community hearings occurs on a more periodic basis. For example, the last significant revision to the Plan occurred in 2001, and prior to that in 1998.

**Appraisal**

The State of Utah has provided SUU with substantial support for capital facilities, maintenance, and planning. The State’s annual Capital Improvements allocation is beneficial in long-term planning for campus facility improvements. SUU’s Campus Master Plan, following established system-wide procedures for campus and community input, has provided a solid template for implementation of institutional facilities projects. The institution’s Campus Planning Committee, with campus-wide and student body participation, provides an important internal mechanism for prioritizing institutional facilities renovation projects.
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STANDARD 9

Institutional Integrity
STANDARD NINE
INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

Southern Utah University adheres to high ethical standards in its representation to faculty, staff, students, and community. SUU’s mission statement urges all university citizens “to encourage a lifelong love of learning, to foster academic excellence, to install ethics and values and to honor thought in all its finest forms. . . . Affirm integrity, the search for the truth and respect for all people as the foundation of education.” SUU maintains policies and procedures that support the institution’s mission to serve students, employees, and the community with honesty and integrity.

The institution, including governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff, subscribes to, exemplifies, and advocates high ethical standards in the management and operations and in all of its dealings with students, the public, organizations, and external agencies. (9.A.1) SUU was founded on the concept of hard work and the love of learning. SUU affirms that the institutional missions and goals are being fulfilled by the institution with integrity. Evidence of Southern Utah University's strong commitment to institutional integrity is reflected in its policies. All institutionally approved policies are posted to the web: http://www.suu.edu/pub/policies/. For the purpose of this self-study, policies that reflect institutional integrity have been categorized into five areas based on the university constituents they most affect: university, faculty, human resources, staff, and students.

University-wide policies include the following:
- 2.1 Mission Statement.
- 5.5 University Property
- 5.8 Computer Software Licensing.
- 5.9 Drug Free Workplace.
- 5.20 Political Activity
- 5.23 Public Meetings
- 5.27 Sexual Harassment
- 5.53 University Archives and Records Policy
- 10.12 University Investment Policy
- 10.15 Travel

These policies cross job descriptions and responsibilities to provide guidelines for all members of the SUU community.

Policies that primarily affect faculty members include the following:
- 5.1 Academic Freedom (Exhibit 9.1).
- 5.52 Intellectual Property.
- 6.10 Faculty Senate Constitution.
- 6.14 Leave, Rank and Tenure procedures.
- 6.22 Faculty Due Process.
- 6.27 Faculty Workload.

The structure provided by these policies allow faculty to meet their major responsibilities in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Human resource policies ensure the integrity of the university in areas concerned with personnel matters and conditions related to employment. These policies include:
- 5.3 Affirmative Action.
- 5.14 Hiring Faculty and Staff.
- 5.18 Nepotism.
- 5.19 Personnel Records and Privacy Rights.
- 5.21 Procedures for Hiring New Personnel.
- 8.3.2 Probationary Period of Employment.
- 8.3.3 Search Committees.

Policies that affect staff most directly include:
- 5.30 Constitution and Bylaws of the SUU Staff Association.
- 8.4 Employment Grievances.
- 8.5.1 Overtime (non-exempt personnel).

As with faculty policies, staff policies are designed to allow staff to function at optimal levels.

Many policies exist to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of students. The annual Student Handbook and calendar is made available to all students and includes “Student Conduct” as it relates to university Policy 5.46, on-campus behavior, off-campus behavior, university disciplinary agencies, student disciplinary boards and committees and
disciplinary penalties and sanctions. Policies that directly impact students and their rights include:

- 5.32 Student Employment.
- 5.33 Student Loans.
- 5.39 Records Access and Management.
- 6.13 Grading.
- 6.19 Grade Appeal.
- 7.3 Student Complaints.

The structure and organization for institutional integrity exists through SUU’s policies and procedures. The University, however, has some “policies” that have not been institutionally reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

SUU regularly evaluates and revises as necessary its policies, procedures, and publications to ensure continuing integrity throughout the institution. (9.A.2) A major policy review was conducted in conjunction with the transition from quarters to semesters circa 1996-1998. For the last three years, the University has engaged in a systematic process to evaluate and revise, as necessary, academic policies, procedure, and publications to ensure continuing integrity throughout the institution. Revisions of a strategic plan reflect institutional engagement of faculty and staff in a timely and meaningful way. Documents in the Exhibit area track the status of current policy revisions. In general, policies are reviewed continually by the department or area that is responsible for maintaining the policy.

Although policy reviews continue apace at SUU, there is no formalized policy to initiate the regular and ongoing review of policy. Policy is revised on an as-needed basis for many areas within the university. Only two committees (the Leave, Rank and Tenure Revision Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee) appear to regularly review and update policy. Generally, other areas (Human Resources, Financial Services, Continuing Education, Plant Operations, Athletics, and the Student Handbook) keep policies up to date. Some areas in Student Services have their own policies and procedures that are not institutionally reviewed and approved. During the self-study process, discussion has occurred to incorporate student services policies in institutional processes.

The institution represents itself accurately and consistently to its constituencies, the public, and prospective students through its catalogs, publications, and official statements. (9.A.3) SUU strives to provide an environment where communication is open and information is shared. The University’s web site is a key communication element, as demonstrated in the accreditation self-study process. New and revised policies are posted for broad accessibility. Other avenues of communication supplement the web. For example, the President issues a periodic report about ongoing issues; the T-Bird Talk is circulated monthly in both print and electronic media; an SUU electronic "Bulletin Board" announcement is sent daily to all campus personnel via email.

Although the SUU campus is very safe, the reporting of criminal activity is a good example of information dissemination. Crime reports are distributed through 1) SUU’s University Journal; 2) SUU public safety website; 3) monthly campus reports to administrators; 4) monthly crime reports to the state’s Bureau of Criminal Information; and 5) annual orientations for students, parents, faculty and staff. In addition, the Wellness Center also sends out annually to all registered students a pamphlet that discloses statistics for selected crimes on campus for the past three years.

Institutional policy defines and prohibits conflict of interest on the part of governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff. (9.A.4) Among the exhibit materials are approved policies governing conflicts of interest, ethics, and conduct in the hiring process, including avoidance of nepotism. See Exhibit 9.2.

SUU demonstrates, through its policies and practices, its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. (9.A.5) By Policy 6.6, SUU explicitly addresses and endorses academic freedom. Exhibits 9.3, 9.4, and 9.5 extend the concept of academic freedom to other policies of the University.
Appraisal

Policy review is strong within specific areas of the university: Athletics, Human Resources, Student Services, Continuing Education, and Administrative Services. These areas have a mandate within their responsibilities to continually revise their policies.

The real challenge in policy revision is seen in the ongoing committee structure of the university. Committees formed by the Faculty Senate or other officially constituted bodies on campus do not have a mandate to continually update policies. For example, a Faculty Senate committee in 1998-1999 was charged with the task of ongoing and systematic reviews of leave, rank, and tenure policies. After two years of work, the committee ceased to exist, only to be resurrected in 2002-2003. Policies such as leave, rank and tenure, academic administration positions, faculty appointments, and professional responsibility need attention, and the revised policies have yet to be communicated to faculty in a comprehensive fashion.

The issue of shared governance is one which appears to be having a significant effect on the university, notably as faculty surveys have suggested low levels of satisfaction. Further, SUU has attempted to provide venues for all campus constituents to be heard and to support a shared governance model. The following policies are in place to ensure that effort: Board of Regents Policy section 1 (R100-199) provides for cooperation between the individual institution and the Board of Regents. More specifically, Board of Regents Policy R223 grants and guarantees that faculty and staff will have representation on the institutional Board of Trustees.

While policies and procedures provide an infrastructure for faculty to have a voice in shared governance, perceptions are not consistent with practice. Of all items on the two most recent surveys of faculty satisfaction, the items receiving the lowest scores dealt with shared governance. To begin to remedy this perception, the Provost and Faculty Senate Executive Committee meet regularly to discuss an array of academic and faculty issues.

Another solution may be seen in a proposed statutory change allowing faculty representation on the Board of Trustees of the University. Board of Regents Policies implies that faculty, staff and students all have equal representation on the Board of Trustees of the university, yet the same is not offered for the institution’s Board of Trustees. Perhaps providing representation equal to that of the students for faculty and staff would help to rectify the perceptions of limited shared governance.
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EPILOGUE

Standard 1. At the time this self-study was submitted, SUU began revising its mission statement and strategic plan to comply with a recently adopted Policy R-312 of the Utah State Board of Regents. A committee of faculty, staff, and students was organized to develop these revised documents as a foundation for unit mission statements and strategic plans. Projected as a two-year process with input from institutional to unit levels, this campus dialogue will focus on issues of mission, role, and strategic direction, with appropriate measures of institutional effectiveness.

Standard 2. Assessment findings identified weaknesses in the first-year experience and general education programs. Changes were made in the advisement and first-year program in 2003, and results will be reported in 2004. However, general education and academic rigor arose during the self-study process as primary issues yet to be addressed. A general education task force has been formed with specific charges to 1) reduce the menu of courses in the general education program; 2) develop more curriculum and program integration with the first-year and capstone experiences of students; and 3) investigate a thematic structure for general education similar to that of Portland State University.

A campus culture of assessment has been expanded through more systematic emphasis and regular training. Use of assessment results to improve learning and to document SUU’s effectiveness is widely understood by faculty and academic administrators. Still, faculty and staff are cognizant that assessment activities can be better integrated into the planning process at all levels of the university. Assessment findings are used to make improvements, and there is increased evidence that assessment is improving student learning as well as programs.

Standard 3. SUU’s self-study helped to reveal some areas within Student Services that could be strengthened. The University has made a commitment to improved advising for all students and to their academic progress through a revamped Student Success Center. Using current assessment methods, these changes will be evaluated and altered if needed.

Standard 4. Increasingly, the University is sensitive to faculty compensation and workload issues. Indeed, a commitment to compensation is the first priority of the administration. With some creativity the challenges of this standard are also being addressed through initiatives that include 1) the Faculty Education Enhancement program; 2) the development of courses for distance education; 3) opportunities for faculty development and release time; 4) the new funding model for summer school instruction; and 5) the academic budget formula for the allocation of resources. Close attention must be paid to improving the institution’s faculty evaluation system in response to both external and internal concerns. SUU faculty and administration have begun to operate within a culture of shared governance, but further maturity, understanding, and experience is needed.

Standard 5. With the recent migration to SCT Banner software, campus personnel continue to grapple with its optimal use. SUU has demonstrated a significant investment in information technology resources that support the institution’s educational mission. A continuing challenge will be to maintain adequate services in the face of funding constraints.

Standard 6. As with all member institutions of the Utah System of Higher Education, SUU must respond to many stakeholders and constituencies. The self-study suggested selected areas for improvement including better orientation for and involvement of the Board of Trustees. Steps have been taken to strengthen this effort.

Standard 7. Evidence indicates that SUU plans and manages its finances well, and complies with fund-raising guidelines. SUU stretches its resources impressively to accomplish its mission, but financial resources are sparse. Funding adequacy -- having sufficient funding to fulfill the mission -- is a continuing challenge for SUU and will need persistent attention in the future. Positive momentum was achieved in
several areas prior to the economic downturn of 2001.

*Standard 8.* SUU’s physical facilities and campus grounds remain a hallmark of the institution, and will undoubtedly serve as a key component of future marketing efforts. Recent efforts to xeriscape portions of campus have been well received and will help the institution to reduce water consumption and costs.

*Standard 9.* As a dynamic institution in a growing region, SUU must maintain its values and its commitment to fairness, quality, integrity, and serving the public good.