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CHAPTER 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This report summarizes the results of The University of South Dakota’s Self-Study for the purpose of requesting continued accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The process of completing this Self-Study has given the University community an opportunity for reflection that will help shape the institution in the years ahead.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The University of South Dakota (USD) is the state’s flagship university and is designated as the only public liberal arts university in South Dakota. It offers more than 115 majors through its eight schools and colleges, and, in fall 2010, USD recorded a record enrollment of 10,151. The University has been continuously accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools since 1913.

By mission and intent, the University promotes excellence in teaching and learning for the citizens of South Dakota and beyond. USD is located on an attractive 286-acre campus in Vermillion, S.D. (pop. 10,417). The small community is nestled along the bluffs above the Missouri River in the southeastern corner of a largely rural state. Vermillion serves as a safe, inviting host for the University, and recreational and cultural opportunities abound in the town, nearby countryside, and neighboring communities.

The campus lies 60 miles south of the state’s largest city, Sioux Falls (metropolitan area pop. 187,093), and 400 miles southeast of the second largest, Rapid City (pop. 67,107). The University reaches out to students through physical learning centers and a growing distance-education program. Although South Dakota is home to eight American Indian reservations, the population is 88.2 percent white, which is reflected in the campus population and fuels efforts to increase diversity and provide a welcoming atmosphere for all students.

HISTORY

When the first Legislature of the Dakota Territory met in 1862, it authorized the establishment of the University at Vermillion, making it the oldest postsecondary institution in the Dakotas. The authorization was unfunded, however, and classes did not begin until 20 years later under the auspices of the privately incorporated University of Dakota, created with great support from the citizens of Clay County. Ephraim Epstein served as the first president and primary faculty member in the institution that opened in loaned space in downtown Vermillion. Before 1883 ended, the University had moved into Old Main, and the first public board was appointed to govern the fledgling institution. Old Main, the state’s oldest public university building, was completely restored in 1997 and houses the USD Honors Program, 17 classrooms, the Oscar Howe Gallery, and the beautiful and intimate W.O. Farber Hall, which is used frequently for lectures and performances.

Enrollment increased to 69 students by the end of the 1883, and, by the time South Dakota became the 40th state in 1889, USD boasted an enrollment of 500 students.
USD’s first academic unit, the College of Arts and Sciences, was established in 1883. The School of Law began offering classes in 1901; the School of Medicine in 1907; Continuing Education in 1916; the Graduate School in 1927; and the College of Fine Arts in 1931.

Today, USD is one of six public institutions governed by the South Dakota Board of Regents (BoR), a nine-member board appointed by the Governor. It is home to the state’s only Law School, Medical School, School of Health Sciences, and College of Fine Arts. The Beacom School of Business is South Dakota’s only AACSB-accredited business school, and the College of Arts & Sciences is the regional center for liberal arts education. The highly regarded School of Education, which partners often with regional schools to improve K–12 education, recently received a $3 million grant from the Bush Foundation to redesign the preparation of future teachers. Moreover, the Department of Nursing within the School of Health Sciences received a $5 million grant from the U.S. Department of Labor to extend nursing education electronically to working professionals.

**LEADERSHIP AND VISION**

In 1997 President James W. Abbott, lifelong resident of South Dakota, became USD’s first alumnus president and one of its most innovative and aggressive leaders. Upon his arrival, he introduced a new vision for the institution that would assist the University’s transition into the 21st century and ensure its continued success well into the future. That vision, “To be the best small, public flagship university in the nation built upon a liberal arts foundation,” is supported by “Building an Extraordinary University: The University of South Dakota Strategic Plan, 2007–2012.” The plan is predicated on supporting academic excellence, increasing research and creative activity, increasing enrollment and retention and improving the campus infrastructure, and those goals have been incorporated into the mission statements and strategic plans of the academic units. USD continues to make progress toward the goals and, with this Self-Study, has begun planning beyond 2012.

**TODAY’S UNIVERSITY**

The University is committed to maintaining the friendly atmosphere of a small college while providing world-class education. Faculty members are key to challenging students and promoting learning. About 80 percent of the University’s 420 full-time faculty members hold a doctorate or other terminal degree in their field, and nearly 90 percent have indicated that teaching is a top priority for them. Faculty members have earned state, regional and national recognition, and they speak at conferences throughout the world.

With a campus student-faculty ratio of 15:1, students have easy access to professors and can develop meaningful relationships during their time on campus. This leads to frequent collaboration between students and faculty, and it offers an education that is diverse, challenging and full of opportunities for hands-on application of lessons learned during classroom instruction.

USD faculty members understand the critical role scholarly research plays in teaching and learning, and they are attracting increasingly larger grants for research projects. In FY 2010, faculty members received a record $36.5 million from competitive grants and other awards. Faculty members also provide outreach, educational and cultural programs, consulting and applied research, and clinical
services to the state and region. Areas of notable research strength include biomedical engineering, materials chemistry, underground physics and neuroscience.

In addition, USD hosts the prestigious Center for Research and Development of Light-activated Materials and collaborates in many experiments with the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory. These centers create the critical mass of expertise, resources and support needed to move cutting-edge research into the marketplace, and they are a strategic component in South Dakota’s initiative to create economic growth through innovation and the development of a high-tech workforce.

USD students also have a long-standing tradition of outstanding achievement. The University is home to the largest and most vibrant Honors Program in the state, and students are regularly among the highly select group invited to Washington, D.C., for the annual Undergraduate Research Poster Session on Capitol Hill. Faculty members also have successfully mentored 10 Rhodes Scholars, 11 Fulbright Scholars and 13 Truman Scholars, among other national scholars, putting USD on a par with prestigious institutions such as William and Mary College, Northwestern University, and the University of California-Los Angeles. The University has produced so many Truman Scholars that it was designated a Truman Scholarship Honor Institution in 2000.

The W.O. Farber Center for Civic Leadership, named after a renowned USD professor of Government and housed within the Department of Political Science, teaches public leadership skills, with courses in political science, business administration, psychology and sociology. These tools help individuals and communities identify, address and resolve public problems. It is the only leadership program in South Dakota, and the oldest, most well-established program in the Midwest.

The Sanford School of Medicine initiated the Yankton Ambulatory Program in 1991, and the unique third-year clerkship for medical students has become a national model. The program stresses continuity of care, problem solving, and community involvement. Traditional third-year students in Rapid City and Sioux Falls rotate through six different clerkships. In Yankton, the clerkships are instead woven together, and students follow their assigned patients throughout the year, providing a true continuity of care experience.

With public service as a key component of the education program, USD students have dedicated thousands of volunteer hours to local and regional non-profit agencies. The Center for Academic Engagement coordinates service activities and encourages global learning, global service-learning, and undergraduate research. Many of the University’s more than 100 student organizations also include service missions. In addition, USD offers an environment in which students can meet and listen to nationally and internationally recognized figures.

The University also is in transition to becoming a National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I member, which underlines the importance of academics for student athletes. USD is part of the Great West Conference; beginning in the 2011-12 athletic season, teams will compete in the Summit League in all sports, except football. Football will be part of the Missouri Valley Conference.
OUTSTANDING ALUMNI

The University, which has awarded almost half of all master's and doctoral degrees ever granted in South Dakota, is proud of its alumni. Graduates have become leaders in a variety of fields, including business, science, education and media. Dr. E.O. Lawrence, a 1922 USD graduate, won the Nobel Prize in 1939 for inventing the cyclotron (the first atom smasher). Other distinguished alumni include Tom Brokaw, former anchor of NBC Nightly News; USA Today founder Allen Neuharth, and Central Asia Institute founder and author Greg Mortenson. The University also is the alma mater for 10 of South Dakota's governors (their portraits are in the Governor's Gallery in Old Main); all sitting justices on the South Dakota Supreme Court; more than 70 percent of the state's practicing attorneys, half of the state's teachers, and 48 percent of South Dakota's practicing physicians.

RESPONDING TO NEEDS

The University has responded to the educational, economic, social and governmental needs of the state through many programs, including the Institute of American Indian Studies, the Government Research Bureau, the South Dakota Small Business Development Center, and the Sophomore Preceptorships that introduce medical students to rural medicine.

In response to student demand and economic need, the University since 2000 has added

- PhD programs in Biomedical Engineering, Materials Chemistry, and Political Science;
- professional programs such as the Doctor of Audiology, the Doctor of Physical Therapy, and a combined MD/PhD program in Medicine;
- master's degrees in Physician Assistant Studies, Mathematics, Social Work, and Addiction Studies; and
- an executive MPA, and a hybrid MBA for working professionals.

At the undergraduate level, baccalaureate majors and/or degrees have been added in International Studies, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Studies and Health Sciences as well as a RN-to-BSN completion program. USD has also received Regental approval to offer a number of degree programs at sites across the state or by distance, and approval for new minors and certificate programs. A recently completed academic program productivity review resulted in the elimination of the PhD in Computational Sciences and Statistics due to low student demand. Many existing programs, including Math and Writing, have also undergone revision during this time period, often in response to assessment data.

CAMPUS GROWTH

Supplementing its wide array of existing facilities, USD has developed a long-range plan to address campus building needs. Because of the success of private fundraising efforts, such as Campaign South Dakota ($160 million raised), students will benefit from new and updated facilities throughout campus.
Visitors and alumni will notice significant improvement as USD continues investing Campaign South Dakota funds in projects that are transforming the campus.

In response to student need, a singular remodeling project created the Academic Commons on the first floor of the I.D. Weeks/Lommen Health Sciences Libraries. Opened in January 2011, the Academic Commons brings together resources to support student academic success, from freshman advising to career counseling. In spring 2011, the completion of the Slagle Auditorium renovation will enhance performances of musical theatre, orchestras, musical ensembles, and soloists.

Coyote Village, a 175-unit residence hall, and a 61,000-square-foot Wellness Center are the newest buildings on campus. The Theodore R. and Karen K. Muenster University Center, which houses a multi-level campus dining area and a 500-person-capacity ballroom, and Beacom Hall, a new home for the Beacom School of Business, opened in 2009. The new Andrew E. Lee Memorial Medicine and Science Building opened in 2008, and the campus science laboratories were renovated in 2000 and 2010.

With renovations completed in 2004, the Dean Belbas Center that once housed the Armory and later, the Women’s Gym, now offers students “one-stop shopping” when it comes to accessing USD’s admissions, financial aid, and registrar’s offices. The renovation and renaming of the E.O. Lawrence Telecommunications Center was completed in 2003 and is known as the Al Neuharth Media Center—home to the Contemporary Media and Journalism Program and the Freedom Forum, as well as

- South Dakota Public Broadcasting
- the award-winning student newspaper, The Volante
- campus radio station KAOR
- television station KYOT

The DakotaDome, which was built in 1979, is the region’s only domed arena, and serves as a gathering spot for local and state residents, as well as a home for varsity athletics. The Dome received a new, permanent roof in 2001 to replace the original pressurized roof.

The University also is home to the University Art Galleries that presents contemporary and historical exhibits, and the National Music Museum, which is home to one of the world’s most extensive collections of musical instruments.

**THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS**

The University of South Dakota’s reaccreditation effort began in the fall of 2007 when President Abbott appointed Dr. William Richardson, chair of the Department of Political Science, and Dr. Laurie Becvar, dean of the Graduate School and Division of Continuing & Distance Education, as co-chairs of the reaccreditation process. They spent fall 2007 through fall 2008 inviting individuals to serve on the steering committee and the criterion sub-committees, developing research methodology, creating a budget, and establishing a timetable. During this time, the co-chairs also spoke to select groups to explain reaccreditation through the Higher Learning Commission and the Self-Study process. Those meetings included presentations to the Executive Committee, Provost’s Council, Colleges and Schools, Information Technology Advisory Committee, and Graduate Council.
A total of 58 individuals actively participated in the Self-Study process. Seventeen served on the Steering Committee, five of whom served as chairs of the criterion sub-committees. The sub-committees were composed of an additional 41 members of the faculty, staff, community, and student body.

### STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-chair, Laurie Becvar</th>
<th>dean, Graduate School &amp; Division of Continuing and Distance Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair, Bill Richardson</td>
<td>chair, Department of Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Ambur</td>
<td>vice president, Administration &amp; Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>associate professor, director, Government Research Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Berry</td>
<td>chair, Department of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Moore</td>
<td>external member, Bureau of Indian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Fairholm</td>
<td>associate professor, Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>director of Marketing, Enrollment and Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gestring</td>
<td>vice president, Finance, and CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersten Johnson</td>
<td>executive director, USD Alumni Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Kelley</td>
<td>director, Center for Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Larson</td>
<td>associate dean, School of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parker</td>
<td>dean of students, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Pietrzak</td>
<td>director, Academic Evaluation &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Rognstad</td>
<td>associate vice president, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Vickrey</td>
<td>dean, School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biao Zhang</td>
<td>director, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A list of steering committee and criterion sub-committee members ([Committees](http://link.usd.edu/83)), including names and titles, can be found in the virtual resource room. The group represented the breadth and depth of The University of South Dakota, including professionals from academic and administrative units, on-campus and off-campus faculty, students from a variety of disciplines, community members from Vermillion, Pierre, Sioux Falls, and Rapid City, South Dakota, and an external member from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C., who previously served as the University’s Chief Diversity Officer.

In September 2008, President Abbott referenced the University’s involvement in reaccreditation through the Higher Learning Commission during his State of the University Address, and, in December of that year, the co-chairs met with the criterion committee chairs to discuss the process to identify documents and data needed for the Self-Study and to plan the Self-Study survey. The co-chairs hosted a “kick-off” meeting for the steering committee in January 2009, sharing the research methodology for the Self-Study and an action plan in the form of a Calendar of Due Dates (Time Frame – Comprehensive...
Schedule [http://link.usd.edu/83). The process was fluid, the co-chairs adjusted due dates as needed, and several iterations of the calendar were created during the two-year process.

Criterion committee chairs used a variety of styles to lead their committees. Chapter drafts were due to the co-chairs during the summer of 2010. Pages 4–7 of the Calendar of Due Dates (Time Frame–Comprehensive Schedule [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Time Frame. See pages 4–7) outline the activities that took place from criterion chapter submission to the completion of the Self-Study.

Several features of the USD Self-Study process were especially important to its success:

- A broad committee structure.
- A clear research methodology using the HLC criteria for accreditation and core components as the foundation.
- The development of a virtual resource room to be used as the appendices to the Self-Study in lieu of paper copies.
- The development and implementation of a Self-Study survey in fall 2009 and early spring 2010 to acquire current constituent feedback on essential research areas.

(The University of South Dakota’s Government Research Bureau conducted a series of four surveys to assess important mission- and satisfaction-related dynamics on and off-campus. The survey populations included students, faculty and staff, and alumni, respectively. They were conducted online only, using The University of South Dakota’s Web-based survey platform, Psychdata. Potential survey participants were culled from the University’s complete list of faculty (n=634), staff (n=916), students (n=9,615), and a partial list of alumni available through the University’s Alumni Association (n=3,743). Potential respondents were contacted up to three times by e-mail and encouraged by USD’s provost to complete the survey linked in the contact e-mail. Respondents were assured confidentiality and anonymity. The final survey response rates for each of the above-identified populations were, in most cases, typical of Web-based surveys of this kind. Alumni responded at the lowest rate (12.1%), while staff (23.9%), students (20%), and faculty (46.5%) responded at rates that leave us confident that the survey is broadly representative of the perspectives of the USD campus. The survey was intended to serve as a baseline: USD is developing a routine survey follow-up procedure in consultation with the Government Research Bureau.)

- The assistance of a professional external reviewer, Dr. Susan Hatfield from Winona State University.

- An extensive review process involving numerous writers and review stages, culminating into the final document organized by the co-chairs, a professional editor, Ms. Ann Grauvogl, and the design team.

In conclusion, the Self-Study accurately portrays The University of South Dakota as it presently exists and its major activities over the past ten years. The study is rich with data and evidence, identifies current challenges, and makes recommendations for the future, all of which will be most useful as the University gears up for its next strategic plan beyond 2012.
Chapter 2: Addressing Past Challenges
For reaccreditation in 2001, The University of South Dakota was required by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) to submit a monitoring report in the area of diversity by June 1, 2004; a progress report on assessment by June 1, 2006; and a progress report regarding the funding base and institutional flexibility by June 1, 2006.


On May 31, 2006, the University submitted two progress reports to the Commission under cover letter of the President. The first report (USD Progress Report on Funding & Institutional Flexibility [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 5]) was regarding the status of the funding base of the University and the institutional flexibility allowed by the Board of Regents (BoR) in allocated resources. The second was to report on assessment processes, outcomes, and institutional assessment actions taken since the accreditation visit (USD Progress Report on Assessment [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 2]). Both reports were subsequently received by the Commission.

The University submitted its progress report on Diversity dated December 1, 2006 and it was formally received and acted upon by the Commission on February 7, 2007 with no further required action.

What follows is an update on each past challenge requiring Commission follow up in 2001.

**ASSESSMENT UPDATE**

In regards to assessment, among the team’s concerns in 2001 were lack of consistent skilled professional staff support and the weak linkage of assessment results to programmatic change and improved student learning.

**IMPROVING STAFFING**

“The lack of consistent skilled professional staff support for assessment seems to hinder progress at USD. Technical/analytical support for such tasks as research design, sampling, instrument development, database manipulation and statistical analysis, development and utilizations of appropriate peer groups for inter-institutional exchange of assessment results, professional presentation of assessment findings, etc. can greatly aid assessment activities on campus.” “…[C]urrent staffing and skill sets do not support professional technical analytical assistance for campus assessment activities.”

(Report of a Comprehensive Visit to The University of South Dakota, April 22–25, 2001, p. 55)
Since the HLC evaluation team site visit in 2001, staffing to support assessment has been dramatically improved. In 2006 when the progress report was submitted, USD had added three new positions: the director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment, the director of Institutional Research, and the assessment coordinator. These positions remain in place, and the assessment coordinator position expanded to full-time in March 2009.

A senior programmer analyst also was dedicated to support the Institutional Research functions. Effective July 1, 2010, the Institutional Research director and the senior programmer analyst positions were moved from the Office of Finance and Administration into Academic Affairs in order to provide greater opportunity for collaboration and coordination between the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment (OAEA) and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). The IR director now reports directly to the provost along with the Director of Academic Assessment and Evaluation.

Each director position is held by a doctorally prepared individual with assessment and data analysis expertise. Dale Pietrzak, Ed.D., formerly assistant dean and director of Assessment in the School of Education, is now the director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment. Dr. Pietrzak's degree is in Educational Psychology and Counseling, with a focus in applied/clinical assessment. Biao Zhang, Ph.D., was director of IR at the time of the 2006 report, and he remains in that position today. Dr. Zhang's degree is in Higher Education Administration. For the six years prior to beginning his tenure at USD, he held IR positions at two other institutions.

The increased expertise and staff in the OAEA support assessment efforts primarily in general education and degree programs, with a focus on student learning. An important result has been the growth and enhancement of data analysis, database development and management, report generation, and related services. The OAEA, for example, has produced longitudinal databases for core measures of the general education student learning outcomes as well as other student academic measures such as course D, Failure, Withdrawal (DFW) rates and grade distributions, National Survey of Student Engagement results, proficiency exam performance, etc. Longitudinal data are also now available for the of the end-of-term IDEA student course evaluations. Data analysis and the resulting reporting have grown in sophistication to the point where there is a rich trove of assessment data available to the faculty and staff on the assessment SharePoint site. Some of the additional resources available at this site include the University Assessment Plan, individual program plans/reports and their associated feedback from the assessment director, various reports specific to student-athlete academic performance, program accreditation notifications, and the assessment plan scoring rubric. These documents are available to team members in the HLC Virtual Resource Room as well (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

The Director of the OAEA works closely with the University Assessment Committee, which is composed of faculty representatives from each of the colleges and schools, a representative from Student Life, and two students. In recent years, the committee has updated and revised the University Assessment Plan and the criteria for general education assessment. It reviews assessment data, particularly those related to general education assessment, and reports on these results to the University Senate. The University Assessment Plan applies to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Institutional Research (IR) provides additional data and analysis targeted at institutional assessment as opposed to assessment of student learning. Reports include the Common Data Set and annual statistical
highlights such as enrollment trends, degrees awarded, retention rates, faculty and staff numbers, and the cost of attendance. These reports are available to the public at [http://www.usd.edu/ir](http://www.usd.edu/ir).

IR publishes another set of reports for internal use at a username/password protected site. They include Freshmen Profile, Fall Enrollment Report, Fact Book, and Retention Report. These reports provide more detailed information than the afore-mentioned publicly accessible data and are available to only USD students, faculty, and staff. They are available to team members in the Virtual Resource Room (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

The directors of the OAEA and OIR now both sit on the Provost’s Council, where they provide periodic reporting for the deans and other key academic leaders. Both also provide periodic updates as well as ad hoc reports for the President and the Executive Committee.

### LINKING ASSESSMENT TO OUTCOMES

“While the assessment plan has received NCA approval and a number of efforts are underway to implement assessment across the campus, the efforts are very uneven and the linkage to programmatic change and enhanced student learning is unclear in many areas of the campus community. The limited progress demonstrated to date, beyond state mandated general education testing, and where required accreditation assessment, leads the team to recommend preparation of a progress report, especially the linkage of assessment results to programmatic change and improved student learning.”

*(Report of a Comprehensive Visit to The University of South Dakota, April 22–25, 2001, p. 68)*

USD has made significant progress in this area, particularly over the last two years largely due to the efforts of the current assessment director. When the current director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment was hired in May 2008, he undertook a review of the OAEA processes, including the Annual Program Assessment Plan reporting process. The review revealed that, while the initial model and tools were solidly developed, the implementation had been inconsistent, with little review of the plan quality and effectiveness, and inadequate feedback to the departments.

Turnover in the director’s position (shortly after the 2006 progress report was provided to the HLC) slowed the advancement of assessment efforts. Additionally, Regental policy regarding student course evaluations, which is within the purview of the OAEA, changed to require evaluation of every course every term. The policy refocused more of the director’s time and energy to the administration of this process rather than higher level assessment activities. To address the situation, the position of assessment coordinator was upgraded and extended to full time, thereby freeing the director to focus greater effort on review and feedback of the annual reports, including a retroactive review of the plans submitted in previous years for AY 2005–2006 and AY 2006–2007. These evaluations are archived on the OAEA SharePoint site. These reports are available to the team in the Virtual Resource Room (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).
The director, along with other USD colleagues, attended the HLC annual meetings in 2009 and 2010, where he gathered examples of assessment plan evaluation tools. Based on these examples, a new reporting form and evaluation rubric were developed to make the reporting process more meaningful and efficient. The revised reporting form was reviewed and approved by the University Assessment Committee and the Provost’s Council and implemented for the AY 2008–2009 reports. The evaluation and feedback process also was greatly enhanced to help units understand the expectations related to assessment and its role in the improvement of student learning.

The University assessment process requires each program to submit annual reports to the OAEA on its assessment plan and efforts over the previous academic year. Required components include identification of the programmatic student learning outcomes (SLO), the assessment methodology, results obtained, and actions taken. Programs are specifically asked to describe how assessment results have been used to improve student learning. These plans are reviewed and evaluated by the OAEA Director utilizing the scoring rubric that can be found at (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13). The director shares the evaluation score with the program and offers feedback on each plan’s structure and rigor as well as the program’s use of data. The reports are not accepted until they achieve a satisfactory score. The director then prepares a summary report of all accepted plans, which is shared with the USD Assessment Committee and the Provost’s Council/deans. The reviews are archived by the director in the OAEA SharePoint site at (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

The retroactive review of existing plans undertaken in 2008 made it clear that expectations and criteria for acceptable plans needed to be raised. The OAEA implemented this process to increase the rigor and quality of the plans over a phased three-year period. At the same time, additional resources were developed and provided to assist the departments in the improvement of their plans and efforts. These resources are available in the OAEA SharePoint site in the “Program Assessment Examples and Resources” folder under the “USD Program Learning Outcomes” folder found at (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

- Phase One (reporting on AY 2008–2009 and due December 2009) required the program-specific plans to have student learning outcomes with clearly linked measures.

- Phase Two (reporting on the AY 2009–2010 and due December 2010) raised expectations for the use of the data, including use of multi-year data, and the sharing of results with students and external constituents.

- Phase Three (to be implemented for AY 2010–2011) includes reports that will be submitted December 2011 and will raise the standards to include the use of multi-year comparisons and to include in the plans as appropriate “developmental” or “growth” measures of student progress over time.

A number of programs have embraced these changes and have successfully integrated assessment into their planning and curricular processes. Others are still lagging, but good progress is once again
being made. Examples of program level assessment plans that demonstrate the use of assessment results to review curriculum and refine programs include:

- AY09–10 A&S Earth Science BS Assessment (changes in lab content)
- AY09–10 A&S Poly Sci BA/BS Assessment (addition of capstone project)
- AY09–10 A&S Biology BS Assessment (change in intro courses)
- AY08–09 EDU Counseling MA Assessment (revised curriculum)
- AY08–09 HS (Health Sciences) CLS Med Tech Assessment

These reports can be found at (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

### CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

The HLC Self-Study survey provides insight into the state of assessment at USD. When asked to respond to whether their department utilizes assessment data to improve academic programs, 57.9 percent of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed. When the respondents are sorted based on years of experience, newer faculty report much stronger agreement (63.7%) than faculty members with 15 or more years of service (44.1%). Improvement is still needed, but progress is clearly being made. Younger faculty members understand the value of assessment for the improvement of student learning. This changing attitude combined with the additional support from both the OAEA and the OIR and their administrative co-location under the provost as well as the heightened visibility and accessibility of assessment data and reporting bode well for the continued advancement of the assessment programs at USD.

### DIVERSITY UPDATE

During its 2001 site visit, the NCA team noted that The University of South Dakota

> “has failed to embrace and institutionalize the inherent educational value of diversity within the university community, its people and programs.”

USD was required to submit a monitoring report (Diversity Report – 2004 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See F - 5) by June 1, 2004, that documented its commitment to diversity, outlined a plan of action, and identified specific changes that had been made. In response to the monitoring report, the University was required to submit a progress report by December 1, 2006. Both the progress and monitoring reports detailed substantive changes in the University’s commitment to diversity (2006 Diversity Update [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - F - 6).

Since its 2006 update to the HLC, USD has continued its efforts to enhance and promote diversity in a number of ways on and off campus as evidenced by the information in this Self-Study and the 2010 Diversity Update (Native Student Activities Inventory USD SP1 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - F - 8).
STAFF DIVERSITY

Progress has been made in diversifying the gender balance of the staff, with notable strides made especially in administration. The number of women in administration increased from an average of 23.1 percent to 35.5 percent since FY 2005–2006. Women currently occupy four of the 12 administrative roles at the university. Recent reorganization also means that four of the eight executives reporting directly to the president are women. The ethnic diversity of the staff, however, has not significantly changed.

STUDENT DIVERSITY

The number of minority students has increased by 48 percent, compared to 14 percent for non-minority students.

- The largest increases have been in Black/African-American, Hispanic, and Asian students.
- The American Indian student population has increased 11 percent since 2004, less than the pace of University growth.
- Women continue to outnumber men on campus by more than 20 percent.

Figure 2-1 charts student enrollment for the fall semesters from 2004–2009 and includes undergraduate, graduate, professional, full-time and part-time students.

FACULTY DIVERSITY

While the overall number of faculty has decreased as a result of the recent economic downturn, the percentage of non-white faculty increased from 9 percent in fall 2002 to 15 percent in fall 2009.

- Women now comprise 47 percent of the faculty.
- The number of Asian faculty has grown from 17 in 2002 to 28 in 2006.
- About 2.3 percent of faculty members are American Indian, slightly more than the percentage of Native undergraduates but well below the percentage in South Dakota.
- Other minority groups have seen moderate gains.

Figure 2-2 shows the extent to which diversity has improved among full-time faculty since 2002.
The Office of Institutional Diversity (OID) has experienced continual turnover in its top position. Bruce King came to The University of South Dakota in 2005, serving as both chief diversity officer and assistant vice president for Academic Affairs. When Mr. King left for St. Olaf College in 2008, the provost focused the chief diversity officer solely on the diversity mission.

Erin Thin Elk served as interim chief diversity officer from September 2008 until October 2009, when Keith Moore assumed the position after a national search. On May 7, 2010, Mr. Moore was announced as the next director of the federal government’s Bureau of Indian Education. Kurt Hackemer, associate vice president for Academic Affairs, is serving as interim chief diversity officer for the 2010–2011 academic year, and the University has initiated a national search to fill the important position.

Although OID leadership has changed often since 2006, USD has begun several initiatives and activities through OID and in partnership with other campus entities.

- Outreach Efforts
  - USD Summer Program at Crazy Horse Memorial
  - The American Indian Student Healthcare Career Conference (June 18–20, 2010)
- Campus Programming
  - Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Campus Event
  - Native American Graduation Ceremony
- Diversity Training and Resources
  - Annual diversity workshop trainings on campus
  - The Center for Teaching and Learning has developed resources to help faculty understand the multiple factors that must be considered if one is to construct a teaching environment that facilitates learning from students who are socially and culturally diverse.
- Oversight of diversity scholarships
- Retention efforts
  - The Student Tracking, Advocacy and Retention (S.T.A.R.) Program
  - Diversity-Specific First Year Experience
- Diversity Climate Survey administered during 2009–2010 academic year.

A more complete discussion of USD’s diversity programs can be found in Criterion 1.
CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

Two significant challenges affecting the University's ability to identify and work with diverse student populations have become clear in the last year.

1) USD was notified during the summer of 2010 that its TRIO Student Support Services grant renewal was not approved. Earlier iterations of this grant had been crucial in funding student support services on campus for first-generation students, Native students, students with disabilities, and students receiving Pell Grants. The University will apply for this grant again, and is committed to maintaining existing services within its current budget even as it seeks out new sources of funding. A recently received College Access Challenge Grant awarded by the South Dakota Department of Education will fund mentoring for Native students beginning in early 2011.

2) As retention efforts administered by Native Student Services have become increasingly sophisticated in recent years, the disparity has become clear between the enrollment and retention numbers for Native American students that appear in the University’s statistics and the actual enrollment and retention numbers for those same students. As many as a third of Native students on campus choose not to identify themselves by race in the Colleague data system, which is used to generate the official enrollment and retention statistics. In addition, Native Student Services tracks student retention across all of higher education, including the tribal colleges, because in USD's experience, Native American students frequently move from one institution to another, even returning to USD, whereas the University officially calculates retention only at USD.
## Figure 2-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>7079.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>7578.0</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>7592.0</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>7987.0</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>8086.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>8086.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minorities</strong></td>
<td>406.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>446.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>495.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>541.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>601.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>601.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td>478.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>520.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>515.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>560.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>610.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>610.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian</strong></td>
<td>1690.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1720.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1990.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1930.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1880.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1880.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Resident Alien</strong></td>
<td>1570.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1440.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1440.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1410.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1220.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1220.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1120.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1170.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1120.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1170.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1120.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1170.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1350.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known total</strong></td>
<td>7642.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8168.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8231.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8593.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8793.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8793.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University total</strong></td>
<td>8120.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8641.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8746.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9243.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9517.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9517.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2001 NCA evaluation team expressed concern that the funding base for USD was seriously inadequate and that the institution had limited flexibility, including increased restrictions from regulatory policies.

“The financial base is judged to be seriously inadequate to support the current comprehensive mission of The University of South Dakota. In absence of an infusion of new resources, the institution will not be able to sustain the current quality level of its programs.”

(Report of a Comprehensive Visit to The University of South Dakota, April 22–25, 2001, p. 65)

“The University, however, operates under severe financial constraints from limited state appropriations and increasing regulatory policies. The institution will need to continue to pursue external funding sources (e.g. foundation dollars, grants and contracts, and new tuition paying populations) if the institution is to continue to effectively meet its institutional goals.”

(Report of a Comprehensive Visit to the University of South Dakota, April 22–25, 2001, p. 65)

These concerns were addressed in a report to the Commission based on FY 2006 results that described the extraordinary progress the University had made in diversifying its financial resources.
The Commission accepted that report, and the University's current financial situation is discussed fully in Criterion 2.

Briefly, the University has aggressively pursued new revenue streams, including more effective advancement campaigns, increased extramural research funding, and increased enrollment (including increases in distance education and in graduate programs) that greatly strengthened USD's fiscal position. The University also made several strategic investments to enhance research and to increase enrollment; these benefits are just beginning to affect the funding base. Headcount enrollment, however, has increased to record levels.

By FY 2006, USD's Composite Financial Indicator (CFI) had reached 7.4. This number was actually incorrectly calculated and reported by our Institutional Research office to the HLC as 4.5 and cannot be updated and corrected at this time. Institutional Research now has clear instructions to consult closely with the Budget Office in preparing the Annual Institutional Update (AIDU). The correct financials (always available to Budget) indicated that USD could and should invest in buildings and programs in FY 2008 and FY 2009. Unfortunately, few in higher education predicted the economic downturn that reduced the value of endowment holdings and simultaneously decreased state appropriations.

USD saw a dip in CFI to 2.4 in FY 2009 (again, corrected value per our Budget Office). This decrease reflected primarily two major debts taken on at that time: construction of a major residence facility and the Wellness Center. These are user charge and fee-supported facilities, respectively, and that income did not begin until FY 2011 with rent on Coyote Village and FY 2010 with the imposition of the Wellness Fee.

**CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES**

Preliminary calculation shows that the University's CFI rebounded to 3.2 in FY 2010, a return to a healthier fiscal position. The University does not anticipate taking on further major debt in the foreseeable future. Although the Governor's budget calls for significant reductions in state appropriations (to be decided by the legislature in 2011 after submission of this Self-Study), USD's diversified revenue with enhanced tuition recovery should buffer the institution from drastic financial consequence.

**INSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY UPDATE**

The NCA's concern that increasing regulatory policies and management by the Board of Regents challenges institutional flexibility reflects enhanced regulatory policies across the country as the demand for public accountability increases. USD has dealt quite successfully with such demands. Although a single-institution board may be a more flexible and often a more responsive form of governance, system boards, such as the South Dakota Board of Regents, provide other advantages, such as efficiencies in shared services and ready student transfer throughout the system. Especially with the 2009 transition in the Board's executive director position, interactions with the Board and its staff have increased in flexibility, respect, and a desire to enhance USD's mission, and certainly do not hamper USD's viability.
In June 2010, for example, the Board adopted a revised funding model that provides for greater revenue growth and flexibility for USD. The previous model allocated new funds based on credit hour growth or loss, but based the per-credit-hour allocation on the resident undergraduate tuition rate, ignoring graduate and non-resident tuition premiums when calculating allocations back to the campus.

The University Managed Resource Model allocates tuition back to the campus based on the revenue generated. It will allow the University to strategically and effectively meet the educational needs of the region and to flexibly grow resources.

The Regent-mandated Reinvestment through Efficiency program also was eliminated in FY 2010, removing restrictions and allowing the University to allocate existing funds to institutionally determined priority initiatives.
Chapter 3: Criterion One: Mission and Integrity
The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Established by state statute and governed by the Board of Regents, The University of South Dakota has reaffirmed and clarified its mission and goals through strategic planning at multiple levels of the institution. It has made significant effort to increase diversity and ensure a welcoming campus environment for all. University activities are guided by its mission, and policies are in place to ensure integrity at all levels.

CORE COMPONENT 1A

The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

The Primary Mission Documents

The University of South Dakota's mission is derived from statutory authority and approved by the Board of Regents (BoR). Last updated in December 2003, it

- names USD the state's comprehensive university,
- authorizes the education provided through academic and professional programs required by statute, and
- requires the University to promote excellence in teaching and learning, to support research, scholarly and creative activities, and to provide service to the State of South Dakota, the region, and beyond.

The University of South Dakota Mission Statement:

The legislature established The University of South Dakota as the liberal arts university to meet the needs of the State and region by providing undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences, and professional education in business, education, fine arts, law, and medicine, and other courses or programs as the Board of Regents may determine. (SDCL 13-57-1)

The Board implemented SDCL 13-57-1 by authorizing undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional education and by requiring the University to promote excellence in teaching and learning, to support research, scholarly and creative activities, and to provide service to the State of South Dakota, the region, and beyond. The University of South Dakota is the comprehensive university with the South Dakota System of Higher Education.

The mission statement provides a context for academic planning at the University, and it is widely available:

- in the policy manual on the BoR website, (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/policymanual.htm),
in documents available to the faculty, including Expectations of the Faculty (COHE Agreement [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See G - 2) and the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See E - 1),

- on the Office of Admissions website (http://www.usd.edu/future-students/),

- in the University strategic plan (http://www.usd.edu/president/upload/StrategicPlanWeb.pdf) on the President’s Office website.

Figure 3-1

USD’s Vision Statement:
To be the best small, public flagship university in the nation built upon a liberal arts foundation.

In practice, the University has adapted the statement approved by the Board for use on its home page and in prominent documents, including the 2007–2012 Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan, 2007–2012 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J-1). It is often accompanied by USD’s vision statement (Figure 3-1) in electronic and print formats.

The University also has adopted statements of vision, values, goals, and organizational priorities that coupled with the BoR’s mission statement clearly and broadly further define the USD’s mission. The Board’s Mission Statement (https://www.sdbor.edu/policy/1-Governance/documents/1-2.pdf) calls on member institutions to

“utilize available resources to provide an environment in which students are encouraged and supported in their intellectual, cultural, and ethical development through interaction with the scholarly communities at the institutions. The System and its institutions must assist students in their search for knowledge, in understanding themselves and their cultural and physical environments, and in developing the wisdom and skills necessary to function as responsible citizens in a democracy.”

Because it is asked to serve as both the liberal arts university and the principal graduate/professional university in the state, USD is programmatically complex and is often hard-pressed to identify peer institutions of its size. While the mission and vision statements provide a guiding framework for the institution, the University has adopted additional goals, values, and organizational priorities that clarify its future directions and commitments.

Clarifying the Mission and Defining Goals through Academic Program Review and Strategic Planning

Shortly after the last HLC reaccreditation, the University voluntarily began a comprehensive planning process known as Academic Program Review (2002 Academic Program Review [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See I - C – 1). The vice president for Academic Affairs led this detailed unit-by-unit analysis of academic programming that re-examined the University’s core values.

Academic departments reviewed their operations—from mission and goals to academic aspirations—and a campus-wide discussion of review results included faculty, staff, administrators, the University Senate, the Academic Affairs Working Group, and the Board of Regents. The president, vice president
for academic affairs, and graduate dean presented their conclusions in April 2003 at a University-wide forum. Their findings further clarified the University’s mission:

- Residential learning with a liberal arts core is the heart of the undergraduate experience.
- Graduate and professional education should be expanded, with research strengthened.
- The fundamental structure of colleges/schools will remain intact.
- Faculty members are expected to serve as teachers, scholars, and public servants.
- The “standard of education” will be gradually increased over time.

The report also included a call for action, and many recommendations were implemented during the relatively good budget times from 2004 to 2006:

- Faculty positions were added in areas including Art, Biology, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Computer Science, Economics, Educational Administration, History, Math Education, Philosophy, and Physics to strengthen the University’s liberal arts character.
- A Department of Languages, Linguistics, and Philosophy was created administratively to incorporate several small academic units, giving them greater prominence.
- Social Work was transferred to the School of Health Sciences.
- An Executive MBA and doctoral programs in Audiology, Chemistry and Political Science were planned and/or launched while the graduate program in Sociology was eliminated and the graduate program in Contemporary Media and Journalism was suspended.
- Faculty positions were added in American Indian Studies to redouble efforts to provide quality education for and about Native Americans.
- General principles were developed to deliver curricula in Sioux Falls in partnership with South Dakota State University and Dakota State University of South Dakota.

(See III - 16)

As the Academic Program Review recommendations were implemented, the University began in the spring of 2005 to consider a broader strategic planning program to reclarify the institution’s mission, goals, and values and chart a path forward. Academic Change Teams, which included administrators,
With the Academic Program Review as a base, faculty, chairs and deans worked with the vice president for Academic Affairs to define the principal goals and objectives for each academic unit. Each unit was asked to consider its plans within the context of the University’s mission and vision. Discussion about the content of the strategic plan again occurred at many levels, including among the academic units, chairs, deans, vice presidents, and president. Feedback was solicited through open, campus forums.

In the fall of 2006, the University released “Building an Extraordinary University: The University of South Dakota Strategic Plan, 2007–2012” (Strategic Plan, 2007–2012 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J-2). It was predicated on the values of world-class education, an attentive and engaged faculty, innovation, and a welcoming and diverse environment. The plan, and the respective college/school plans that fed into it, has long been available to the public on the Office of the President’s website (http://www.usd.edu/about-usd/president/strategic-plan.cfm).

The plan’s release committed the University to six major strategic goals (Figure 3-2) to position USD as “the best small, publicly funded University in the nation providing students with an extraordinary education.” The goals cover academic excellence, research and creative activity, enrollment, institutional positioning, funding and organizational effectiveness. They provide a roadmap for how the University allocates its resources and makes decisions.

In the summers of 2007 (Strategic Plan Year 1 Progress http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 5) and 2008 (Strategic Plan Year 2 Progress http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 6), for example, the individual colleges/schools submitted strategic planning progress reports to the faculty, students, and alumni began meeting with professional planning consultants. President Abbott called for a five-year strategic plan during his State of the University address that fall.

**Figure 3-2**

“Building an Extraordinary University”

**Goal 1: Academic Excellence** — supporting liberal education, adding selected doctoral programs, enhancing diversity, and delivering distance education (Responsible person: Provost/VPAA)

**Goal 2: Research and Creative Activity** — increasing university research and aligning university priorities with the state’s 2010 initiative for economic development (Responsible person: VP for Research)

**Goal 3: Enrollment Management** — increasing enrollment and retention (Responsible person: Chief Admissions Officer)

**Goal 4: Institutional Positioning** — creating an integrated marketing program (Responsible person: VP for Marketing/University Relations)

**Goal 5: Funding and Resource Development** — improving campus infrastructure, including technology (Responsible person: VP for Finance and Administration)

**Goal 6: Organizational Effectiveness and Change** — developing a high-performance culture (Responsible person: Director of Human Resources)
vice president for Academic Affairs that outlined each unit’s progress toward the goals. The results led to several changes:

- Offices dealing with assessment and diversity were strengthened.
- A new program of musical theatre was added in the College of Fine Arts.
- Doctoral programming was added in Chemistry, Political Science, and through an MD/PhD in the Sanford School of Medicine.
- Student scholarship dollars were increased by incorporating departmental scholarship dollars into the University Promise Scholarship/Coyote Commitment.
- Eleven research/outreach centers (http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/research-centers.cfm) were created and/or given more visibility as a way of bolstering research and service to the public.
- Student retention steadily increased through the recruitment of high-achieving students, work by the faculty of the colleges/schools and the Academic Advising Center (recently renamed the Academic and Career Planning Center), and use of retention devices such as Early Alert.

**Schools, Colleges Articulate Mission**

Each College/School/Library within the University submitted a strategic plan that then aligned itself with the 2007–2012 strategic plan’s six goals (Strategic Plan, 2007–2012 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J-1), listing their respective mission, vision, and accreditation statements. The mission statements outlined each unit’s dedication to providing superior programs and to enhancing student learning of course content and life skills (Strategic Plan, 2007-2012 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J-1).

- The College of Arts & Sciences, for example, emphasizes “as life-long pursuits—the search for truth and learning, the development of personal responsibility and global stewardship, dedication to democratic citizenship, and the application of multidisciplinary problem-solving to improve the human condition.”

- The Beacom School of Business looks for excellence in teaching, promotes intellectual exchange and development, and advocates continuous learning reflecting a dynamic global environment.

- The College of Fine Arts promotes a sense of personal integrity and social responsibility in students, develops an intellectual basis for successful living, and “recognizes its obligation to provide leadership in the cultural environment of the University, the Community, and the state as a whole.”

- The Graduate School provides students with “excellent academic preparation and extraordinary opportunities for research, creative scholarship, clinical experiences, and internships.”
The Self-Study survey showed that the University community understands the institution’s mission, vision and values and finds them readily accessible. (Figures 3-3 and 3-4).

**Figure 3-3**

Clear statements of USD’s mission, vision and values are readily accessible.

Source: (Mission & Integrity Subcommittee Survey Results [link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83)
Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 10, pg. 7).

**Figure 3-4**

I have a clear understanding of USD’s mission, vision and values.

Source: (Mission & Integrity Subcommittee Survey Results [link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83)
Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 10, pg. 7).
CORE COMPONENT 1A: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University’s mission fits well within the BoR system. The mission has been formally updated since the last HLC visit and is continuously revisited through processes such as Academic Program Review and strategic planning.

The University is programmatically complex compared to most universities its size because it is asked to serve as both the liberal arts and the principal graduate/professional university in the state. In fact, the University can be hard pressed at times to identify appropriate peer institutions because most universities with both a medical school and law school – along with its range of graduate and undergraduate programming – are much larger than USD. Despite the complexity, the University's stakeholders understand its mission well.

Because the University’s mission is broad and is mandated by legislation and BoR policy, it is not as useful as a guide to strategic planning as it could be. While the mission is clear and has been refined to inform the operation of the institution, it has not been formally stated or communicated as effectively as desired. A more useful guide is the University’s vision, which should be consistent with the mission but also set forth more specifically the University’s desired direction over the next five years. Strategic planning should determine the goals that will accomplish that vision, and resource-allocation decisions should be consistent with these goals. Because conditions outside the University’s control change rapidly, strategic planning should include annual evaluation of these goals.

CORE COMPONENT 1B

In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

While USD lies in a largely homogenous region of the country, the University recognizes and embraces South Dakota’s significant Native American population and the importance for students to be prepared to live in a global society. The Board of Regents’ System-wide Graduation Requirements for baccalaureate students set the standard that students shall understand the diversity and complexity of the human experience through the social sciences (Goal 3 [http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-academic_Affairs/documents/2-7.pdf] See pg. 2 – 3) and the arts and humanities (Goal 4 [http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-academic_Affairs/documents/2-7.pdf] See pg. 4 – 6). Those goals set the expectations that, among other things, students will be able to identify the social or aesthetic values of different cultures; understand the diversity of values, beliefs and ideas embodied in the human experience; or speak another language.

University assessment shows that more than 80 percent of USD students attained these two system wide general education goals during the last four academic years. (Figures 3-5 and 3-6)

The BoR also has adopted policies to ensure fair treatment for all, including:

- BoR Policy 1:17: Sexual Harassment
- BoR Policy 1:18: Human Rights Complaint Procedures
- BoR Policy 1:19: Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination, Affirmative Action
• BoR Policy 1:23: Employee-Employee and Faculty-Student Consensual Relationships
• BoR Policy 3:3: Freedom of Speech
• BoR Policy 3:4: Student Conduct Code
• BoR Policy 4:14: Faculty Code of Professional Conduct

Moreover, USD’s Institutional Graduation Requirements anticipate students will be successful “working in, living in, and contributing to an increasingly diverse, interdependent world (Goal 2),” as well as “understanding how multiple perspectives affect global issues and ideas (Goal 3).” USD’s Institutional Graduation Requirements are more thoroughly discussed in the Criterion 4 chapter.

Figure 3-5

Goal #3: Students will understand the organization, potential and diversity of the human community through study of the social sciences.


Figure 3-6

Goal #4: Students will understand the diversity and complexity of the human experience through study of the arts and humanities.
The University also is committed to the objectives of affirmative action, equal opportunity, and nondiscrimination in compliance with federal, state, and local law as well as BoR and internal policies. University policies and procedures provide guidelines and expectations regarding civility in interactions and respect for diversity of ideas and backgrounds of students, faculty, staff, and administration.

The Equal Employment website ([http://www.usd.edu/human-resources/equal-opportunity.cfm](http://www.usd.edu/human-resources/equal-opportunity.cfm)) includes the University's official equal opportunity statement, which can be found in virtually every printed campus document:

*The University of South Dakota is committed to providing equal opportunity without discrimination based on race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, religion, age or disability. Students, faculty and staff are encouraged to contact our office with questions and concerns relating to equal opportunity issues on campus.*

**Planning for Diversity**

A significant aspect of the University planning efforts supports the enhancement of awareness and sensitivity to issues of diversity among faculty, staff, and students. In 2004, the Campus Diversity and Enhancement Group presented its report, which outlined a baseline of then current information and census data related to diversity efforts on campus. Data, including an inventory of diversity events, groups, programming, and impact, continues to be collected. The report resulted in the Campus Diversity Enhancement Group Report (Diversity Report – 2004 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - F – 5), which was made public through the website, open forums, and presentations to constituent groups and endorsed that April by the president, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and the Career Services Advisory Council.

The University’s most succinct commitment to diversity can be found in the plan’s vision statement, which positions USD as an institution in which “Everyone Belongs.” And all are encouraged to explore

**Figure 3-7**

**Diversity Plan Vision Statement**

*The University of South Dakota is an institution where EVERYONE BELONGS! All members of the University community are encouraged and empowered to explore and develop their uniqueness while learning to recognize and appreciate our interrelatedness. USD is committed to creating an inclusive and welcoming environment, conducive to the exploration and discovery of diversity, because we recognize that such an environment is an essential part of the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, at USD we recognize our leadership responsibility to the rich and unique heritage of our state and that we have a special responsibility to provide opportunities for American Indian people. We are committed to creating opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and administration to experience a variety of perspectives to prepare them for living and working in a world where EVERYONE BELONGS!*
and develop their uniqueness in an inclusive and welcoming environment. Embracing diversity is considered an essential part of teaching and learning and recognizing South Dakota's American Indian heritage a University responsibility. (Figure 3-7).

The plan provides a structure for University-wide planning to create a welcoming environment for diverse constituents by increasing the representation of diverse ideas in the curriculum and scholarship, increasing diverse student/faculty/staff recruitment and retention, and enhancing services for diverse students. Substantial progress has been made in fulfilling the plan's objectives:

- Creation of a new Office of Institutional Diversity (OID) was included in (and critical to the success of) the plan. The OID encourages an inclusive and welcoming environment, in which students, faculty, staff, and administration can experience a variety of perspectives that prepare them for living and working in a multicultural world.

- OID, in collaboration with the Campus Diversity Enhancement Group, is charged with overseeing and collaborating with campus stakeholders to implement, assess, and/or modify the campus diversity plan.

- OID managed the federally funded TRIO Programs that are designed to encourage low-income, first-generation college students and students with disabilities to continue their education beyond high school. In January 2011, the management of TRIO programs was transitioned to the Division of Continuing and Distance Education because most of the activities pertained to off-campus efforts and programming. The Campus Diversity Enhancement Group also operates as an independent and complementary advisory group for the OID and is charged with planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating diversity initiatives across campus.

- Each year, the OID presents three prestigious awards to students, faculty and staff.
  - The Dream Catcher Award recognizes an individual or individuals who, “through deeds or actions, represent the principles of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., including social justice, equality, and the preservation of Dr. King’s ‘dream.’”
  - The Viva La Difference Award recognizes a Career Services Employee who supports and fosters diversity on the USD campus.
  - The Rosa Louise Parks Award is presented to a student who contributes to intercultural awareness, supports diverse activities and demonstrates positive interactions with others.

- Educational programming, including new and continued efforts, encourage an awareness of and sensitivity to diverse peoples and ways of thinking (e.g., the International Studies program, Women’s Studies, American Indian Studies, Indian Law, Building Bridges programs, the Sanford School of Medicine Diversity Affairs, Oral History Center, International Film Series, Annual Thurgood Marshall Lecture, Annual Oscar Howe Lecture, and Summer University Program at Crazy Horse Memorial).

- Administrative units enhanced their focus on diversity issues (e.g., Office of Equal Opportunity, Office of Student Life, International Student Services, Native Student Services, TRIO Programs).
• In 2006, the University opened Unity House as a multicultural center dedicated to providing a place where awareness and sensitivity can be fostered. The Unity House functions were later moved into the Theodore R. and Karen K. Muenster University Center, which opened in 2009.

• The Native Studies program moved into East Hall to raise its visibility and access to shared office services.

• TRIO moved in January 2011 to more visible space in the Arts and Sciences Building.

**Maintaining and Fostering Diversity through the Strategic Plan**

The University’s continuing commitment to diversity was integral to the strategic planning process and is documented in the 2007–2012 Strategic Plan. Three goals, especially, identify the University’s commitment to preparing students to live in a global society, and they include strategies to increase diversity on campus.

**Goal 1:** Academic Excellence recognizes the need to prepare graduates to make a positive contribution to the world and calls for recruiting, retaining, and developing a diverse faculty of teacher/scholar/citizens dedicated to great teaching and mentoring. It also calls for strengthening graduate and professional programming to meet standards of Carnegie Research Universities by enhancing student engagement at the graduate and professional level to integrate students into the University culture, improving student retention to increase diversity, and giving special recognition to the Native American heritage of the state and region.

**Goal 3:** Enrollment Management calls for a university-wide integrated enrollment management process to recruit and retain students consistent with USD’s flagship status to reflect increased selectivity and broader diversity. Enrollment management has a specific recruiter focused on diversity, who is integrated with the rest of the staff.

**Goal 6:** Organizational Effectiveness and Change considers a diverse and high-performing staff (as well as faculty) necessary to define and develop a high performance culture.

The plan looks to “extraordinary faculty” to prepare students to be critical thinkers, leaders, lifelong learners, and productive citizens in a diverse world. “Extraordinary students,” meanwhile, are expected to “grow and learn in a welcoming environment that embraces and celebrates diversity.” Students also are expected to participate in experiences to master intellectual and practical skills to participate in an increasingly complex and diverse society and apply their knowledge in a manner that positively affects the world.

Evidence of success in these efforts includes student mastery of learning outcomes, enhanced recruitment and retention of Native students, results of the Foundations of Excellence® program, and the levels of student and faculty participation in the University’s numerous diversity initiatives. Details of each follow below and in future chapters.
Academic Units Foster Diversity

USD’s schools and colleges, as well as the divisions and departments within them, formalize their commitment to diversity in new programs, strategic plans, and documents required for reaccreditation.

- The College of Arts & Sciences, for example, established the Department of Native Studies in 2005 to provide education, research and experiences that prepare students to live and work in a multicultural world. The Department recognizes the priorities of South Dakota’s American Indian communities in its teaching and research. After an 18-month evaluation and assessment process, the department introduced a cutting-edge, interdisciplinary Native Studies curriculum with opportunities to utilize an independent and distinct approach to research and teaching. The revised Native Studies major will attempt to understand Native peoples from within the culture and to disseminate and share knowledge from a Native perspective.

- In 2003, the School of Education’s newly formed diversity committee was charged with developing a school-wide diversity plan, providing ongoing guidance for diversity implementation, and reporting annually on diversity activity with recommendations for change to the Administrative Council and dean.

- In 2004, the Sanford School of Medicine recognized that students must be educated in diversity to deliver competent health care. The School has implemented a set of proactive measures, practices, and programs to achieve these diversity goals, including a number of pipeline programs and key curricular initiatives. Third-year students, for example, complete a cultural immersion directed by an American Indian faculty member, and electives include experiences with minorities throughout the state and world. The School maintains a Multicultural Affairs program. A Council of Indigenous Advisors also can be found in the Clinical Psychology program in the College of Arts & Sciences.

The Medical School Missions Management Tool (a document of the American Association of Medical Colleges) places the medical school well above the 90th percentile in the percent of students who are Native American/Alaskan. The School’s recruitment efforts target middle school, high school, and college students and have led to, typically, two or three American Indian and another one or two minority applicants a year, leading to the graduation of an average of one minority student annually.

Through the Indians into Medicine (INMED) collaborative agreement with University of North Dakota School of Medicine, the Medical School recruits, retains, and continues to produce about two American Indian students per year who transfer into the third-year classes. Counseling services for minority students, including the transfer process for INMED students, have been significantly strengthened to address academic, personal and mental health needs. With a 400 percent increase in scholarships since 2004,

“Diversity is essential for the education of all our students to provide culturally competent health care and to produce practitioners capable of serving the underserved populations of South Dakota.”

—Sanford School of Medicine Diversity Statement, 2004
all students, including minority students, are more likely to receive financial aid that increases retention.

The School's dean of clinical faculty and the director of human resources also are successfully collaborating to recruit and retain diverse faculty and staff. Since the last accreditation visit, the number of American Indian faculty has increased from two to seven, Hispanic faculty from four to 11, and African-American faculty from five to ten. Overall, this equals a significant increase in minority faculty representation.

- The Department of Art hosts the Oscar Howe Summer Art Institute for students with a demonstrated interest in the visual arts and American Indian culture. The Institute provides workshops for a small group of talented and committed art students to learn about contemporary Native American Fine Arts with a focus on Native American culture, history, and traditions. All students attend free of charge, including food, housing, instruction and art supplies.

- The Division of Continuing & Distance Education (CDE) organizes a 10-week Summer University Program at Crazy Horse Memorial especially designed for Native students to prepare individuals for the rigors of college, provide introductory university courses (including Basic Composition, Basic Algebra, and Early American Indian History) that will transfer to any regionally accredited college or university, to provide paid internships at the visitor center, and to further fulfill the mission of the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation.

The summer program celebrates the spirit of Crazy Horse and the Ziolkowski family that has been in charge of the memorial project. In addition to classes, the program offers tutoring, career exploration, cultural events and college application help.

- CDE also coordinates the GAIn–IT Project, “Getting American Indians to Information Technology,” which is an opportunity to earn an M.S. in Computer Science through Web-based instruction, in partnership with Sinte Gleska University and Sisseton-Wahpeton College.

The University’s academic units also have demonstrated a commitment to diversity in their respective reaccreditation documentation. A number of examples of the mission-driven strategic planning and the outcome of this planning are available in the following Self-Study documents.

In 2003, the Beacom School of Business endorsed a curriculum that emphasized the study of national and international business issues in a culturally diverse world [http://www.usd.edu/business/study-abroad.cfm].

In its 2007 NASM report (Music Reaccreditation – Music Accred – NASM Report [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See D - 33]), the Department of Music listed “Promotion of Diversity” as one of its four institutional priorities, expecting students to achieve “the interdisciplinary sensibilities necessary for success in a diverse and increasingly complex and inter-related world” and designing coursework to explore “the history and diverse cultural settings in which musical instruments have been built and used.”

In its 2006 accreditation Self-Study (Self-Study 2005–2006 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See G - 3]), the School of Law listed among its strengths a commitment to diversity, the student
pro bono programs, and the national prominence of its Indian Law Program. The Law School's strategy to improve diversity among faculty and students led to a simultaneous search to fill the Indian Law teaching position and an Indian Law Fellowship, increasing applicant awareness of both. The School successfully recruited Native American women for both positions.

The national Native American Law Students Association (NALSA) has recognized the School's leadership in Indian Law, selecting the School to host the prestigious, national NALSA moot court competition in 2010 that attracted more than 40 teams from law schools across the nation. In addition, the School's NALSA chapter was selected chapter of the year nationally in 2008 and 2010, and two Law School students were elected president and public relations director of the national NALSA in 2010.

Despite its successes, the Law School recognizes the number of minority applicants remains disappointingly low. The School has begun several efforts to recruit a more diverse student population, including a two-day conference for high school and college students interested in a legal education, as well as continuing a summer law screening program that often increases minority enrollment. Determining strategies to increase minority applicants remains an important objective.

**Other Campus-Wide Diversity Initiatives**

- **The Institute of American Indian Studies** ([http://www.usd.edu/iais](http://www.usd.edu/iais)) develops and promotes American Indian related projects, activities, and programs in collaboration with the Tiospaye U. Student Council, TRIO Programs, Native American Cultural Center, Oscar Howe Memorial Association, USD Native American Recruitment & Retention Committee, Division of Student Services, and various departments across campus. The Institute helps the University recruit and retain American Indian students, faculty, and staff; encourages increased levels of research relating to American Indian issues and culture; and works to strengthen relations with tribes, tribal colleges, and other American Indian organizations within the state, region, and nation.

  The Joseph Harper Cash Memorial Library, dedicated to American Indian history, is located in the Institute and Native Studies Department offices. The annual Joseph Harper Cash Memorial Lecture each October brings distinguished lecturers in the fields of Indian Studies and frontier and western history to campus. The Institute and the department also host other prominent Native scholars and citizens during the academic year.

- **The Native American Cultural Center (NACC), dedicated in 1988, develops a variety of cultural and academic programs in response to student needs. It delivers personal support services to help Native American students succeed at USD and provides academic and cultural support through Wawokiya mentoring and class tutoring. NACC also is the headquarters for the Native American student organization, now called Tiospaye U., and the home of the Office of Native Student Services (NSS), which specializes in meeting the cultural, social, and academic support needs of Native American students through enriching programs and activities.**

- **The Department of Residential Life** ([http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83)), which addresses the importance and
value of civility and diversity in the living environment as well as in the classroom. Select University policies and procedures provide guidelines and expectations regarding civility in interactions and respect for diversity of ideas and backgrounds of students, faculty, staff, and administration.

- Clubs and organizations provide a student-centered (and often student-led) way to create effective learning environments for all learners. More than 100 of these groups include faith-based student organizations, political clubs and cultural associations such as the 10% Society, the Black Student Association and the Native American Law Students’ Association.

**Measuring Success**

In 2006, the University was selected by The Policy Center on the First Year of College as one of 35 colleges and universities to participate in the 2006–2007 Foundations of Excellence® in the First College Year program. The program asked institutions to examine to what extent introduce diverse ideas, worldviews and culture to first-year students to enhance learning and prepare them to become members of pluralistic communities. In July 2007, the Self-Study Task Force for that program issued its Report and Recommendations (Foundations of Excellence® Final Report, July 2007 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 15), which concluded that the University currently provides both informal and formal structures within which first-year students.

- experience diverse ideas, both in and out of class;

- interact with others who are different from themselves on and off campus; and,

- are encouraged to adhere to standards of behavior (regarding interactions with others different from themselves) that are consistent with an open and civil campus community. For example, the current University Strategic Plan addresses the value of “creating a diverse and vibrant learning environment” and learning outcomes that include “becoming open to diverse people, ideas, and experiences” and “recognizing his/her responsibilities as a global citizen.” Selective university policies and procedures provide guidelines and expectations regarding civility in interactions and respect for diversity of ideas and backgrounds of students, faculty, staff, and administration.

On the other hand, diversity also received some of the lowest ratings on the faculty/staff and student Foundations of Excellence® surveys.

- Students reported relatively lower ratings for the University’s performance in exposing them to different world cultures, world religions, and social class/economic status.

- Faculty, staff, and students reported less than moderate ratings for the University’s performance in providing first-year students with opportunities to interact with diverse individuals from outside the University.

- They also gave only moderate ratings for opportunities for interaction with other students and faculty and staff members who represent differing backgrounds and cultures than theirs.
The report concluded that while the University provides structures to support its commitment to civility and diversity, additional steps should be taken to reduce the variability in how this commitment is communicated and experienced by University stakeholders.

This conclusion is disappointing, given the University’s emphasis on diversity and contrary to findings in several other contexts. For example, the Mission & Integrity Subcommittee Survey revealed the following (Mission & Integrity Subcommittee Survey Results [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 10):

- 70.2 percent of students and 74.2 percent of alumni agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Building and sustaining a diverse campus community is a priority at USD.” (Figure 3-8)

- 72.2 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “There is respect at USD for the expression of diverse values and perspectives.” (Figure 3-9)

- 65.7 percent of alumni and 65.7 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “USD has, on the whole, been successful in fostering a diverse campus.”

- 71.95 percent of the current students and alumni agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “USD provides a campus environment that is supportive of all types of learners.”

**Figure 3-8**

Buildings and sustaining a diverse campus community is a priority at USD.
The 2010 Campus Climate Survey (Figure 3-10) detailing diversity issues suggests a discrepancy between how “mainstream” and “minority” students, faculty and staff view the success of diversity initiatives on campus. (Minority students are defined in the survey as people of color, GLBT (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender) people, people with disabilities, and international students.) Responses from minority populations suggest serious differences of opinion with mainstream populations in these kinds of areas:

- perceptions of being “welcomed” or “fully included” in campus life,
- appreciation of diversity and open dialogues about diversity as a value for USD,
- experiences of bias on the campus and in the community, and
- the commitment of USD administration to diversity issues.

The discrepancy is more significant in light of the relatively strong agreement among minority populations.
CORE COMPONENT 1B: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

USD fully recognizes the need for and the value of a diverse campus community to meet its educational and institutional goals. The University has dedicated human capital, financial, and physical resources to expand diversity in its curriculum, the variety of its programming, and the makeup of its student body, faculty, and staff. Much of what the liberal arts foundation of the University demands is a mix and intermingling of different points of views, perspectives, and insights.

Diversity, however, is not explicitly mentioned in the University mission statement, nor is it evident in the abbreviated mission statement on the Web or in other University documents. To find this commitment, a stakeholder must search the documents described above. Although the OID website and diversity plan present a statement about the University’s commitment to diversity, they do not include an official mission statement to this effect. What is clearly a broadly accepted and embraced commitment to diversity should be institutionalized in the mission statement and modeled (even expanded on) by each of the colleges/schools/units across campus. These statements should then be reflected in written and electronic materials shared with stakeholders. As a result of this Self-Study, the University plans to act on this recommendation in its next strategic plan.

The survey information above also would indicate USD has more work to do to fully create a welcoming environment for all and to develop a shared and inclusive understanding of diversity, which are the first two areas of emphasis from the 2004 Diversity Plan. The plan was labeled a five-year-plan, and the University should update it.

Conclusions from the 2010 USD Climate Assessment survey could spur that discussion. They included four main objectives—and 12 more specific recommendations—to increase and enhance diversity efforts on campus:

- Increasing the numbers of students from historic minority populations;

---

**Figure 3-10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not a Distinctive Aspect</th>
<th>2. Somewhat Distinctive Aspect</th>
<th>3. Highly Distinctive Aspect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USD Self-Study Survey 2010
• Strengthening the perception of USD's commitment to inclusion;
• Making savvy interventions to improve daily interactions affecting students; and
• Improving inclusion among USD’s workplace culture.

CORE COMPONENT 1C

Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

Mission in Action

From the Board of Regents to individual departments, decisions are made to reflect the University’s mission and its strategic goals.

Schools, colleges and the library have aligned many of their operations to the 2007–2012 Strategic Plan, outlining strategies to meet the goals and action points in support and fulfillment of the mission. The implementation of the University’s 2007–2012 Strategic Plan is among its strongest pieces of evidence of support for mission and how those activities pervade the organization.

Annual reports from the deans address how many of the action points have been accomplished and which ones are yet to be implemented. The clearest evidence of this is found in the Year 1 and 2 progress reports filed by each unit (Strategic Plan Year 1 Progress; Strategic Plan Year 2 Progress http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J – 5 - 6) Within 2 years, most of the initiatives had been implemented and many already completed. In the process, systems and operational procedures changed accordingly. Those not implemented in Years 1 or 2 required new or redirected financial resources. Such programs often require delays due to State budget processes. In addition, the difficult budget environment of the 2009–2010 fiscal year began to emerge in the 2008–2009 fiscal year, which is discussed in Criterion 2.

Despite these difficulties, though, the University still retained a focus on its strategic priorities and operational alignment had already taken place.

Figure 3-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Library</th>
<th>Sub Goals</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Goals Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Weeks Library</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford School of Medicine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Lib</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A considerable effort was made at USD to cascade strategic goals throughout the campus community. USD recognized that a plan on a shelf is not useful and showed itself committed to ensure a consistent, strategic thread weaving the tapestry of a diverse campus. The progress reports below provide evidence of implementation of the Strategic Plan:

- Strategic Plan Progress Reports for Year 1 (2007) and Year 2 (2008) (Strategic Plan Year 1 Progress [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 5]);
- (Strategic Plan Year 2 Progress http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 6); and
- (Progress Snapshot Through FY09 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 8).

**Understanding the Mission**

The survey conducted in preparation for this Self-Study indicates that a solid majority of faculty, staff, alumni and students support the University’s mission, vision and values (Figure 3-12) and believe USD acts in a way that is consistent with them (Figure 3-13).

**Figure 3-12**

I am supportive of USD’s mission, vision and values.

Source: (Mission & Integrity Subcommittee Survey Results [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 10, pg. 8]
The University’s Internal Constituents Articulate the Mission in a Consistent Manner

Although the majority respondents, including faculty, clearly indicated (above) that they agreed or strongly agreed with the University’s mission, the mission is less likely to inform their teaching and research. The Self-Study survey found 59 percent of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the mission informed their teaching, and 52 percent agreed that their research aligned with the mission. (Figures 3-14 and 3-15) More than a third of the respondents, however, neither agreed nor disagreed that their research aligns with the mission and more than a quarter neither agreed nor disagreed that the mission informed their teaching. These results may speak more to a challenge in communicating the mission and its relationship to each faculty member’s teaching and research.
CORE COMPONENT 1C: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The strategic decisions of the BoR, the University, and its academic units are consistent with its mission and vision. Most faculty, staff, students, and alumni understand and support the mission, vision, and values of the University. Communication about the mission and its relationship to each faculty member’s teaching and research should be strengthened.

CORE COMPONENT 1D

The organization’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

The South Dakota Higher Education System

The University resides within a unified system of six universities, Black Hills State University, Dakota State University, Northern State University, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, South Dakota State University, and The University of South Dakota, designed to serve the public under the Board of Regents. The BoR is established by Article XIV, Section 3 of the South Dakota Constitution.

“[Since 1897], The Board of Regents has [had] the constitutional responsibility for governing the Unified System of Public Higher Education in South Dakota, which encompasses its supervision, coordination, management, and regulation. The Board sets policy direction for the System, oversees the management of its resources (personnel, facilities, and financial), and establishes and monitors its educational program. The Board executes its authority through the adoption of policies, approval of programs, selection and evaluation of System and institutional executives, and the setting and approval of annual budgets, tuition and fees, and legislative budget requests.”
It is made up of eight public members who serve six-year terms, and one student member who serves a two-year term. They are appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate, and supported by an executive director and other staff.

The BoR’s Policy Manual (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/policymanual.htm) outlines the Board’s responsibility to govern the six institutions as a harmonious system that will assure access to quality education for every qualified South Dakotan. The BoR governance structure and practice encourage cooperation among, yet individual distinction, for the six state universities.

Since the 2001 accreditation site visit, the BoR has created several opportunities for the University community and leadership to engage the governance process, providing input and receiving feedback. Advisory boards, committees, and councils have become integral features of the BoR’s governance. They include:

- BoR Policy 1:7:1 Council of Presidents and Superintendents
- BoR Policy 1:7:2 Academic Affairs Council
- BoR Policy 1:7:3 Business Affairs Council
- BoR Policy 1:7:4 Student Affairs Council
- BoR Policy 1:7:5 Career Service Advisory Council
- BoR Policy 1:7:6 Technology and Telecommunications Council
- BoR Policy 1:7:7 Council on University Relations
- BoR Policy 1:7:8 Discipline Councils
- BoR Policy 1:7:10 Electronic University Consortium
- BoR Policy 1:7:11 Research Affairs Council

In addition, Board members interact with the USD community during the annual Board meeting in Vermillion. The meeting includes a reception for the Board members and staff, the University leadership, and other meeting attendees; a breakfast with local state legislators, and an open forum for University and community members with the Regents.

**University Governance**

The University’s Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan, 2007–2012 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J-1) encourages participation in the shared governance of the institution. Organizational effectiveness and change is a featured goal, and faculty and staff are challenged to “[d]efine and develop a high-performance culture that values strong leadership, sound planning, and excellent execution, leading to the achievement of goals and distinction for The University of South Dakota.”

At the institutional level, BoR policy (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/1-Governance/documents/1-2.pdf) makes clear that dynamic and progressive leadership should be cultivated through the campus presidents, faculty, and staff. BoR by-laws also provide for the appointment of presidents following national searches. Their duties mirror the intent of the mission statement:
• Maintain an effective communications link between the campus and the Board, the Executive Director, other System campuses, and all constituencies at the campus levels, including faculty, students, administrators, CSA employees, alumni, and community.

• Provide academic leadership and promote academic excellence at the campus and formulate educational policies and academic standards consistent with Board policy.

• Determine the overall administrative organization of the institution and annually present to the Board an outline of the structure, noting any recommended changes.

The president and the vice presidents who report directly to the president sit on the University’s executive committee and are responsible for discrete but inter-related units with significant institutional impact, including health affairs, finance, administration and information technology services, academic affairs, research, and marketing, enrollment and student services.

Academic deans lead their respective schools and colleges, managing budget, personnel and programs. They work for the benefit of the University and collaborate with the faculty members within their units to implement a system of shared governance.

Several other entities also contribute to University governance:

• The University Senate, composed of elected faculty members, the provost/vice president for academic affairs, and two student representatives, exercises the powers vested in the faculty through The University of South Dakota Faculty Constitution and by-laws. The by-laws also establish several standing committees that report to the Senate.

• The Council of Higher Education (COHE) has been the recognized bargaining unit for most of the faculty since 1978. The COHE agreement (http://www.sdbor.edu/policies_initiatives/COHEfacultyagreement/agreement.pdf) sets standards and procedures for faculty rank and salary, promotion and tenure, disputes and grievances, academic freedom, and working conditions.

• The Career Services Advisory Council, a peer-elected advisory group, discusses and makes recommendations on working conditions and other employee issues.

• The Student Government Association (SGA), with 35 student members from across campus, excluding the medical and law schools, conducts its business through the Student Senate. The SGA president represents the student body to the USD administration, the Board of Regents, and the South Dakota Legislature, appoints committee members and, with the vice president, holds a seat in the University Senate. The SGA budget committee allocates student activity fees to recognized student organizations.

• The Graduate and Professional Student Association, an emerging organization, is a recognized subset of SGA and devoted to building a sense of community and representing the policy and administrative interests of graduate and professional students.
• The Residential Housing Government Association (http://www.usd.edu/campus-life/student-services/university-housing/residence-halls.cfm) works to improve the quality of life for students on campus.

• The Interfraternity and Panhellenic Councils, the governing bodies of the Greek fraternity and sorority communities, plan and coordinate Greek activities.

Although the University structure provides for faculty, staff and student participation in University governance, based on the Self-Study survey, many of those constituents are not convinced their voices are being heard:

• Only 45 percent of all participants agreed or strongly agreed that faculty/students/staff have an appropriate voice in planning for the campus’s future (Figure 3-16).

• Only 40 percent agreed or strongly agreed that faculty/students/staff are sufficiently involved in campus decision making (Figure 3-17).

• Only 27 percent agreed or strongly agreed — and 42 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed — that faculty participation in university governance is sufficient to ensure fair representation of the diversity of faculty opinion (Figure 3-18).

• Only 20 percent agreed or strongly agreed — and 44 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed — that faculty governance structures have been effective in influencing campus decision making (Figure 3-19).

**Figure 3-16**

*Faculty/Students/Staff have an appropriate voice in planning for the campus’s future.*
Faculty/Students/Staff are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement by different groups: Alumni, Faculty, Staff, and Student.](Image)

Faculty/Staff participation in university governance is sufficient to ensure fair representation of the diversity of faculty opinion.

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement by Faculty and Staff.](Image)

Faculty/Students/Staff are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.

*(By Faculty Years of Service)*

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement by different years of service: Under 5 years, 5-14 years, 15 or more years.](Image)
CORE COMPONENT 1D: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

Systemic and institutional governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes at USD, providing many opportunities for all constituencies to engage in the governance process. These constructs enable the University to fulfill its mission as the state’s comprehensive liberal arts university.

Responses to the Self-Study survey, however, indicate faculty, staff, and students desire more involvement in decision making. This disconnect may reflect challenges related to communication. Results of a communication survey (Communication Audit Results, Oct. 2008 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See Q - 4]) conducted in October 2008 reveal dissatisfaction with institutional communication. Staff and faculty found communication at the University to be less than satisfactory (58% and 63.5%, respectively). A focused effort to communicate decisions made, changes implemented, and emergent plans might narrow this gap appreciably and the University has already taken steps towards that end, e.g., legislative updates from the president, appointment of new budget committees, addition of the Senate chair to the Provost Council, and regular contact of the president with the Senate and Deans Council.

CORE COMPONENT 1E

The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

The University of South Dakota makes every effort to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws. It retains two private attorneys as University counsel; they report directly to the University president. The University also strives to act consistently with its legislative mandate, the mission propounded for it by the Board of Regents, University departmental expansions to the mission, and the expectations of its students, faculty, staff, and the public.

The University Protects its Reputation for Academic Excellence

Promoting academic excellence and supporting research, scholarly and creative activities are key components of the Board of Regents’ mandates to the University. The University’s academic programs and entities, including the state’s only Fine Arts, Law, and Medical schools, maintain a reputation for academic excellence by adhering to the standards of specialized accrediting bodies. The University also participates in a host of assessment and academic accountability activities, including the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency [http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-Academic_Affairs/documents/2-28.pdf] (“CAAP”), the NSSE [http://www.sdbor.edu/services/academics/ReportsAccountability/documents/NSSE_stud_engage_report_BOR06-2009.pdf], the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement [http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-affairs/upload/USD-FSSE-2010-Report.xls] (“FSSE”), and the Foundations of Excellence® (Foundations of Excellence® Final Report, July 2007 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 15) in the First Year of College program.

In 2008–2009, for example, the BoR reported that at least 60 percent of South Dakota students performed above the national mean in all four categories of the CAAP: writing skills, math, reading, and science reasoning (BoR Factbook 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B -16). Using the assessment data and the Academic Program Review (2002 Academic Program Review
http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See I - C – 1), the University has established specific academic goals with learning outcomes and benchmarks for measurement as well as an assessment plan (http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-affairs/upload/Assessment-USD-Assessment-Plan.pdf) and specific expectations for faculty (COHE Agreement http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See G - 2).

The result of USD’s commitment to “excellence in teaching and learning, advancement of knowledge, public service, freedom of thought and expression, and personal responsibility and development” (Undergraduate http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See C - 1) and to students’ academic growth can be found in a variety of assessments:

- Many academic units maintain long-standing accreditation by their professional organizations, from theater and business to law, medicine and education.

- An average of 93.7 percent of USD students who took licensure and certification examinations in 2009 passed those examinations, in areas from audiology and dental hygiene to nursing and physician assistant. In almost all instances, USD graduates outperformed the national success rate (BoR Factbook 2010 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 16).

- The BoR also reported that, in 2009, the University system’s student retention rate from freshman to sophomore year averaged 74 percent, above the national average of 65.9 percent.

**Integrity in Athletics**

The University’s athletics program was recently reclassified Division I and accepted into the Summit League conference. The University is undergoing Athletic Certification Review by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Continued participation in Division I includes regular compliance reviews and audits with both the NCAA and conference office.


Recent personnel decisions also foster the academic excellence of student-athletes that NCAA requires. In 2006, the University hired a dedicated, full-time Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance and a second graduate assistant for additional support. The Registrar’s Office hired an NCAA Compliance Auditor in 2008, a critical hire for ensuring the details of NCAA academic eligibility certification occur independently of the Athletics Department. Although the NCAA committee noted some room for improvement after a December 2009 campus visit, it concluded that “a top-down commitment to compliance exists at [The University of] South Dakota” and that “there is a general understanding regarding the various compliance monitoring processes.”
Evidence of USD’s dedication to its student-athletes can also be found in its full-time head athletic advisor, a part-time athletic advisor, and two graduate assistants dedicated to the academic success of student-athletes.

The effectiveness of USD’s attention to its student-athletes is reflected in the BoR’s annual report on student-athlete academic performance. The Board’s most recently published report (Athletic Academic Report BoR May2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 25] (2008–2009) showed that student athletes in the University system earned a higher overall grade point average than non-athletes (2.97/2.61).

**Integrity in Student Organizations**

The University’s student organizations also are expected to uphold the University’s mission and maintain an overall reputation for academic excellence and meaningful service. The Student Organization Handbook [Student Organization Handbook http://links.usd.edu/83 Student Services & Co-Curricular Activities. See G – 13] sets standards for organizations, including a required faculty advisor and a University review and reapproval every three years through the Student Government Association’s Student and Internal Affairs Committee. The University has been named to the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll for the past three years ([http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1890&uid=user](http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1890&uid=user)).

**Financial Integrity**

The State of South Dakota audits the University as part of the system-wide Comprehensive Annual Financial Report ([http://www.state.sd.us/bfm/CAFR/FY09/SD_CAFR_2009.PDF](http://www.state.sd.us/bfm/CAFR/FY09/SD_CAFR_2009.PDF)) that is available through the state website ([http://sd.gov/](http://sd.gov/)). The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, the Single Audit Act of 1996, provisions of the Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-133, and Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations. The FY 2009 report noted that the University proper and its medical school operated within budgetary constraints. The Board hired a Financial Compliance Officer in October 2009 and began reviewing policies and procedures to address the one material weakness (in internal control over financial reporting) identified in the audit.

On its website (BoR Factbook 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 16]), the BoR provides the history of general fund appropriations and reports on all funds’ operating budgets by fiscal year, operating budgets by program for each fiscal year, budgeted salaries, and actual expenditures.

University accounts are maintained and reports are presented in accordance with standards recommended in the Manual on College and University Business Administration and are consistent with classifications and procedures required by the State of South Dakota. The University and the BoR use SunGard Higher Education (Banner) software for their financial and human-resources processing.

In addition, the University provides extensive finance and human resources training and guidance for staff. Topics have included budget development procedures; salary planning manuals; procedures for chart of accounts, accounts payable, and approvals; and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act accounting procedures. The BoR Policy Manual also sets standards for financial accounting and reporting ([http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/5_FinanceBusiness/documents/5-1.pdf](http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/5_FinanceBusiness/documents/5-1.pdf)) and other policies and procedures ([http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/5_FinanceBusiness/index.htm](http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/5_FinanceBusiness/index.htm)).
Maintaining Fair and Successful Student Relationships

The University’s student handbook (Student Handbook http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See E -16) outlines policies and procedures for all student services, including academic advising, student housing, campus dining, public safety, student counseling, and health services. It also includes a variety of measures designed to keep students safe that cover communicable disease, immunizations, smoke-free zones and winter weather. Students can easily find information about how to respond to disasters, from fires to bomb threats and, in light of recent tragedies on other campuses, how to respond to an active shooter. The University has installed blue-light emergency phones on campus, offers safe-ride services to students, maintains a campus-alert system to alert students of emergencies such as assault reports, and provides campus escorts upon student request.

The University also publishes an annual report (Clery Annual Report (2010–2011) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See T - 3) of incidents, pursuant to the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crime Statistics Act, which is available to students, parents, faculty, staff, and the public.

The Board of Regents academic appeals process (revised in 2008, BoR Policy 2.9 (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-Academic_Affairs/documents/2-9.pdf) (for academic appeals initiated by the student) can be found in the student handbook and the BoR website. In response to those actions, the University revised its procedures. A three-year summary of appeals and their resolutions is available in the virtual and physical resource rooms (Student Academic Complaint Log 2007 – 2010 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See E - 23).

A student code of conduct that parallels the BoR’s Student Conduct Code (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/3-Student_Affairs/documents/3-4.pdf) also can be found in the student handbook. BoR policy 3.4 (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/3-Student_Affairs/documents/3-4.pdf) details the processes, initiated by the University, for students who are accused of violating the Code of Conduct. The University’s Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities publishes an annual report (Clery Annual Report (2010–2011) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See T - 3) on student misconduct, ranging from housing violations (including use of candles, vandalism, guest violations, noise problems, and smoking) to academic dishonesty, sexual misconduct, student-to-student harassment, theft, damage to property, possession of stolen property, hazing, bomb threats, alcohol and drug violations, and computer violations. Comparatively, student misconduct at the University is infrequent and minor.

The University’s commitment to student privacy begins with federal law and is implemented through privacy policies and notices for student health activities, student counseling services (http://www.usd.edu/scc), and research activities (http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/irb-other-forms.cfm). Student health employees, for example, must follow a privacy policy that complies with Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act requirements. The University registrar maintains a website (http://www.usd.edu/registrar/student-records-policy.cfm) that explains Family Educational and Privacy Act rights, links to the United States Department of Education’s website, and provides forms for inspection of records and disclosures.

The University also complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and related federal and state legislation and regulations. The Disability Services office works to ensure that all students are able to access and participate in all of the University’s activities, programs, and services. Student, faculty,
and organizational rights and responsibilities (http://www.usd.edu/academics/disability-services/rights-and-responsibilities.cfm), as well as a description of the accommodation process (http://www.usd.edu/academics/disability-services/accommodation-process.cfm) and relevant forms (http://www.usd.edu/academics/disability-services/student-forms.cfm) can be found on the Disability Services website. Disability Services responds to student concerns and continually improves its services through a satisfaction survey.

The success of the University’s efforts to respect students’ rights and comply with legal requirements in student affairs is affirmed in the Self-Study survey. Almost 84 percent of current students and 85 percent of alumni agreed or strongly agreed that, if they were starting again, they would still attend USD.

**Employment Relationships**

Employees may file grievances or complaints, and appeals of those matters, pursuant to a number of policies and procedures described in relevant employee handbooks (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/4-Personnel/documents/4-1.pdf), the BoR Policy Manual (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/policymanual.htm), and the BoR-COHE Agreement (http://www.sdbor.edu/policies_initiatives/COHEfacultyagreement/agreement.pdf). Since 2001, the University has had only 18 grievances filed by all faculty and staff. The concerns included non-renewal of contracts, reduction in force, denial of tenure, workload, discrimination, and violation of the SDBOR-COHE Agreement. All but two grievances have been voluntarily withdrawn, dismissed or denied by the pertinent decision maker (the president or BoR). The other two grievances were settled.

The University also tracks other informal and formal complaints, including those based on protected categories within state and federal employment and public-accommodations law. Including all faculty, staff, and students, the University has received 15 informal complaints or inquiries to date at the time of this Self-Study and they have all been resolved informally.

- In 2009, six of 74 complaints or inquiries were formal complaints; the rest were resolved informally. Three of the 2009 formal complaints were filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which issued no-cause findings on each.
- In 2008, 15 of 70 complaints or inquiries were formal complaints. Four of them were filed with the EEOC or its state or local counterpart, and all resulted in no-cause findings.
- In 2007, 24 of 106 complaints or inquiries were formal complaints. Only one was filed with the EEOC or its state or local counterpart, and it resulted in another no-cause finding.

Similarly, the University tracks other informal and formal complaints, including those based on protected categories within state and federal employment and public-accommodations law. Again, the Office of Academic Affairs maintains records collected by individual colleges tracking academic appeals.

The University educates employees about personnel matters through a variety of training sessions, including mandatory training for supervisors on discrimination, harassment, the ADA, the Family and Medical Leave Act, workers’ compensation, hiring and discipline, interviewing and selecting new
employees, new-employee orientation, discipline documentation, and other topics. Since 2007, the University has offered more than 100 training sessions. The Human Resource Office also conducts communication and culture-climate surveys and communication audits to improve its services.

**An Open Door**

A wealth of information about the University, including its policies, financial information, governance, and other accountability issues is readily available to the public. The BoR’s meeting schedules, agendas, policies and agreements, news releases, factbooks, Regents updates, and dozens of different reports are available on its website [http://www.sdbor.edu/](http://www.sdbor.edu/). The Board’s Accountability Report ([http://www.sdbor.edu/mediapubs/accreports/AccountabilityReport08.pdf](http://www.sdbor.edu/mediapubs/accreports/AccountabilityReport08.pdf)) is among these and provides the public with information regarding the BoR’s four primary policy goals: access to education, quality of education, enhancement of state wealth, and efficiency.

The University, as demonstrated above, provides information in a variety of ways, especially through its website. The University welcomes press inquiries, and its Marketing & University Relations ([http://www.usd.edu/marketing-communications-and-university-relations/media-relations.cfm](http://www.usd.edu/marketing-communications-and-university-relations/media-relations.cfm)) department includes a designated media contact person.

USD also is well respected for its research programs, which fully comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws. The Office of Research & Sponsored Programs ([http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/irb-other-forms.cfm](http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/irb-other-forms.cfm)) maintains policies, procedures, and publicly available information on such areas as human-subjects protection, animal care, environmental health and safety, and technology transfer. BoR policies ensure against conflicts of interest in its research programs.

The University also provides information to external agencies that, in turn, provide information to the public. As noted above, the University participates in both the NSSE and FSSE, and it also reports to the United States Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange, the Princeton Review, U.S. News and World Report’s review, and other college guidebooks. The University has been consistently regarded as offering high-quality, lost-cost educational programs:


- In 2010, the Princeton Review ([http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1701](http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1701)) again included the University in its “Best Colleges” edition, and the University was the only institution in the state to be chosen.

CRITERION 1E: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University operates with integrity on all levels and expects the same from students, staff and faculty. USD has established ethics policies and other guidelines to ensure consistent, ethical behavior.

CRITERION ONE: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

Evidence demonstrates that the University operates with integrity and consistently with its mission through structures and policies that govern and inform its administration, faculty, staff, students, and the public.

The BoR actively oversees the University’s mission, programs, and services. Its governance is implemented through regular meetings, committees, extensive planning, and frequent reporting. The Board adopts a statewide perspective that is consistent with its constitutional responsibility for operating all the higher educational institutions in the state.

The University’s integrity and reputation, both maintained in furtherance of its mission, are ensured through policies and procedures that are well defined and consistently administered through many area-specific offices and programs. These policies and procedures are implemented with the ultimate goal of complying with federal, state, and local laws as well as its students’, employees’, and the public’s expectations for the University. The Self-Study process and other planning initiatives help to identify further steps to be taken to ensure the University continues to operate consistently with its mission and with integrity and accountability.

Future Considerations

Given the breadth of the University’s mission and the fact that it is State-mandated, the University’s mission must be further refined during the strategic planning process so it can serve as a strong base for strategic planning and the programmatic decisions that should flow from sound planning. Consequently, the University’s planning should focus on a clear statement of a vision that is consistent with the mission but also sets forth more specifically the University’s desired direction over the next five years. This would provide a more realistic basis for the identification of goals that can guide resource-allocation decisions. Because conditions outside the University’s control change rapidly, strategic plans should not be so detailed as to impede flexibility in implementation and the strategic goals should continue to be evaluated annually in light of changed circumstances.

The University’s commitment to diversity, which is substantial, is not articulated as effectively as it should be. In addition to the emphasis on diversity in the mission statements and other key documents of various units, there needs to be a strong central statement.

Communication within a complex organization is always difficult, and the various technological options for communication seem to exacerbate rather than alleviate the problem. Recognizing the difficulty in communicating effectively with constituents who are bombarded with communication, the University has given more attention to communication about governance and policy matters. The president’s updates on 2010 legislative actions related to funding are an example of increased communication that seemed to be effective and well-received. Adding the Senate chair to the Provost Council is another recent step to enhance communication between academic administration and the faculty.
INTRODUCTION

The University of South Dakota is in a growth mode even in the midst of decreasing state funding and demographics that show fewer high school graduates ready to enter the University system. While the challenges are real and even intimidating, USD is meeting those challenges by revising processes, raising funds, recruiting students in more rigorous ways, and instilling a sense of growth in the campus community. The fruits of these efforts are evident in increased enrollment, research productivity and private support, and campus policy and administrative revisions.

The University has effective allocation processes for current resources and planning to respond to current and future challenges and opportunities. USD’s planning documents also clearly acknowledge emerging factors such as the expectation for the increasingly ubiquitous use of technology in instruction, the mushrooming popularity of online education, the need for a global and multicultural perspective, and an acknowledgement of the changing demography of South Dakota—the source of the University’s primary student population.

CRITERION 2A

The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

General Economic Trends

The State of South Dakota has the Number 2 business climate in America, according to the March 2010 Economic Indicators report from the Governor’s Office on Economic Development (http://sdreadytowork.com). The state had the highest rankings for low costs of doing business, an environment for entrepreneurs, a productive workforce, and fiber-optic connectivity. The economy of South Dakota is solid but not extremely robust, and economic indicators are mixed:

- Unemployment has remained below the national average, reaching 4.8 percent in February 2010 compared to 9.7 percent nationally. The labor force, however, declined between 2008 and February, 2010, from 444,890 to 444,635.
- Gross Domestic Product enjoyed a 5 percent increase from 2007 to 2008 (compared to 3.3 percent nationwide), which suggests the state will have additional capacity to support higher education.
- Per capita personal income also increased during the same period; however, South Dakotans’ real income of $38,661 per capita is significantly less than the national average of $40,208.
• The state’s cost of living index is 91.3 (compared to 100 nationally).

• The percentage of South Dakotans living in poverty hovers around the national average of 13 percent; however, the state’s American Indian reservations have among the highest poverty rates in the nation.

Source: Economic Indicators, March 2010 (Governor’s Office of Economic Development); Poverty: 2007 and 2008 American Community Surveys (US Census)

Basic Demographics

The demographics of the state, as reported by the Governor’s Office of Economic Development, present both challenges and opportunities for higher education in South Dakota.

• The state’s population has steadily increased since the 2000 census, from 754,844 to 804,194 in 2008.

• 88.2 percent of South Dakotans are white, 8.5 percent American Indian, 3.3 percent Asian and Hispanic and 1.1 percent African American.

• Only about 35 percent of the population is younger than 25 years of age, with 82,869 between the ages of 18 and 24, the traditional college age, in 2008.

(Source: 2009 South Dakota Profile (Governor’s Office of Economic Development)

Although the state’s population is increasing, the number of South Dakota high school graduates continues to decrease.

• From FY 2000 to FY 2010, the number of students enrolled in South Dakota high schools declined significantly, from 129,093 to 121,015.

• The number of high school graduates dropped from 9,224 to 8,123 from FY 2000 to FY 2009.

• On average, however, South Dakota students’ ACT scores improved during that period, from 21.5 to 22 to be ranked 16th nationwide. (In 2009, the average Math and Reading SAT scores in South Dakota schools ranked sixth in the nation).

Source: BoR 2010 Fact Book; Statewide Longitudinal Data (State Office of Education); 2009 South Dakota Profile (Governor’s Office of Economic Development)

Given the state’s relative lack of diversity, USD’s student profile is not unusual for the area or other Regental institutions. Ethnic minorities are underrepresented. More women than men are attending. The number of non-traditional students is increasing, perhaps mainly because of the off-campus and distance programs stated earlier.

Using the average ACT scores of incoming freshmen as a criterion, the quality of USD’s students is increasing, thus underscoring the University’s stated goal of becoming a more selective institution of higher learning in the Regental system. From 2007 to 2008, the average ACT score for incoming freshmen increased from 23.06 to 23.24, which was significantly higher than the national average.
21.1. In 2004, the number of incoming freshman with ACT scores of 24 or more increased 15 percent, and the number continued to increase through 2008. Forty-six percent of the 2008 incoming freshmen had an ACT score of 24 or higher compared to 45% in 2007. Furthermore, students in the Honors program have an average ACT score of 28.7 or higher which is above state and national averages. (The Honors program is the largest and most vibrant in the state and spearheaded in 2002 the graduation designation of University Scholar and Thesis Scholar because of its leadership in academic excellence.)


Increasing Enrollment is Key to Future

Despite fewer South Dakota high school graduates, USD’s enrollment has been characterized by steady, but small, increases. In the last 15 years, enrollment has increased 13.5 percent -- or a little less than 1 percent a year. See Figure 4-1, Figure 4-2, Figure 4-3 and Figure 4-4 for details.

However, overall enrollment for fall 2010 increased 5.5 percent in headcount and 2.52 percent FTE as

1. on-campus undergraduate enrollment decreased by 1.07 percent, but new full time, first time freshman increased 6.01 percent FTE, and new freshman transfer students on campus increased 18.74 percent FTE. Losses in sophomore, junior, and senior classes led to the overall decrease of undergraduate students on campus.

2. the University reached a significant milestone by enrolling 1,091 new, on-campus freshmen, again, a six percent FTE growth over fall 2009.

3. off-campus undergraduate enrollments increased by 11.74 percent FTE.

4. on-campus and off-campus FTE graduate enrollment increased 9.85 percent in general graduate programs and another 2.97 percent in professional programs.

Source: (Fall 2010 Final Enrollment Report Self-Study [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 65)

To serve more students and bring additional resources to the University, the president in 2007 set a goal of 1,200 first time, full-time freshman, as well as increased student retention, graduation rates, graduate programs, and distance learning. To accomplish this goal, the undergraduate admissions office has employed new strategies including:

- The use of a new student prospect management software (EMAS)
- A new marketing campaign
- Strengthened follow-up services
- The purchase of more student prospect names
- Revised campus visit days
- Strategic scholarship strategies
Figure 4 - 1

Fall Semester Headcount Enrollment, Fall 2004 through Fall 2009

Source: The University of South Dakota Fact Book — Institutional Research

Figure 4 - 2

Full-time Headcount Enrollment 2004 – 2009

Source: The University of South Dakota Fact Book — Institutional Research

Figure 4 - 3

Historical Fall Headcount Enrollment: 1994 – 2009

Source: The University of South Dakota Fact Book — Institutional Research
### Figure 4 - 4

#### Enrollment Statistics For FY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unduplicated Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman – Last Year Hs Grad</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman – Other Hs Grad</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Terminal</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>23.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Professional</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>72.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>62.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>37.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Date Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Or Younger</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>5,113</td>
<td>70.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Or Older</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>71.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate/First Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Date Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Or Younger</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>37.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>22.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Or Older</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>28.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grads and Undergrads</strong></td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>8,484</td>
<td>83.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Racial</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing/Refused</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As demonstrated by the charts above, USD’s enrollment continues to increase, includes a significant contingent of nontraditional learners and shows room for increased diversity.

**Faculty and Staff are Keys to Quality**

The University relies on its faculty and staff to achieve its mission and to prepare for a future shaped by multiple trends. The University strives to be equitable and focused on merit in its hiring practices and annual raises. The qualifications for faculty represent high scholarly and professional credentials and skills, and the skills mix of the staff ensures sound performance. Recruiting and retaining high quality faculty and staff are essential to the University’s mission. Competitive and comparable salaries help make that happen.

**Faculty Profile**

In 2010, 65 percent of the 420 faculty members had earned their doctoral degree and 81.2 percent had a terminal degree in their field. Among the faculty, 23.4 percent were ranked as professor; 23.4 percent as associate professor; 36.7 percent as assistant professor, and 16.5 percent as instructor.

With 86.5 percent white, the faculty’s ethnic majority mirrors that of South Dakota. The ranks also include 2.7 percent American Indian, .7 percent Black, 7.6 percent Asian/Pacific, 2.5 percent Hispanic, and 2.7 percent American Indian. Faculty members were almost evenly divided between male (51.2 percent) and female (48.8 percent). *Source: Figure 4-5*

**Figure 4-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>29.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highest Degree Attained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other/Accredited</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Degree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.70%</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>23.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Terminal Degree</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>76.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnic Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>86.50%</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>87.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,503</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SDBoR 2010 Fact Book*
Student-Faculty Ratio

Despite the ups and downs of the economy, the University’s faculty-student ratio has consistently been below that of the Regental system as a whole (14.9 to 16.7) for FY 2010. The University is dedicated to maintaining its small class size to encourage individual and meaningful relationships between students and faculty and to preserve USD’s desirable small-campus feel. That ratio, however, is likely to increase with the additional emphasis on distance education.

*Source: BoR 2010 Fact Book*

---

**Figure 4 - 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHSU</th>
<th>DSU</th>
<th>NSU</th>
<th>SDSMT</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY10</strong></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY09</strong></td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY08</strong></td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY07</strong></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY06</strong></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY05</strong></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY04</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY03</strong></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY02</strong></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY01</strong></td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SDBoR 2010 Fact Book*

Faculty Salaries

When the Oklahoma salary surveys showed that USD faculty salaries were falling behind the national norm, the University took steps in 1998 to adjust them. Without the adjustments, faculty salaries would have fallen to 29.6 percent below the national average in FY 2009. Instead, they were only 5.04 percent lower.

Within the Regental system, USD faculty salaries are comparable to other institutions, especially when considering the size and scope of the University’s mission. Faculty salaries also are regionally competitive and comparable to other state institutions of higher education.

The salary picture could change, however, because recent state budget shortfalls have prompted a freeze on salary increases for state employees. The impact of such freezes over time is not known.

*Source: Figure 4-7 BoR 2010 Fact Book, pg. 51*
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction

As knowledge-based organizations, universities understand their most important resources are people, not machinery, buildings, or technologies. People bring to work their physical and intellectual capacities, but they also bring their emotional, cultural, and even spiritual needs.

The 2007 Campus Culture survey measured two key indices: Leadership (composed of scores for Leader-Member Exchange, Feedback Environment, and Interactional Justice) and Organizational Culture (composed of scores for Perceived Organizational Support, Procedural Justice, and Affective
Commitment). Results showed a leadership index of 76.9 percent, which the faculty team that conducted the survey concluded was typical for most organizations and, therefore, encouraging.

The Organizational Culture index was 51.9 percent, again, typical for most organizations, yet less encouraging, especially in light of the University’s 2007-2012 strategic plan for building an extraordinary university (see Figures 4-8). Faculty scores for the Organizational Culture index fell about four percentage points lower than the University averages for each component. Career Service employees also scored below the average for two of the components and Supervisors scored below average for one of them (see Figures 4-9, 4-10, and 4-11). The surveyors concluded that respondents, especially faculty and CSA employees, believed their supervisors were doing a great job, but they did not feel as if they had a say in major decisions, a strong emotional attachment to USD or a need to work hard toward broad, organizational goals. They also did not believe the University valued their contributions or cared enough about their well-being.

The survey generated several ideas for improvement, which have been manifested in University actions such as open office hours with the president, USD employee of the month, and the development of more budget advisory committees. The suggestions included:

- More personalized recognition for outstanding accomplishments (e.g., exceptional student evaluation scores, top-tier publications)
- More personalized recognition for personal milestones (e.g., 25 years of service, birth in the family)
- More requests for input on important decisions
- More personal interaction with administration

Follow up surveys measuring these cultural indices are in order.
Figure 4-10

Procedural Justice
(2007 Organizational Culture Survey)

![Bar chart showing Procedural Justice scores for different roles.]

Source: Organizational Culture Questionnaire: Results, Lonsdale and Peterson (PowerPoint presentation)

Figure 4-11

Affective Commitment
(2007 Organizational Culture Survey)

![Bar chart showing Affective Commitment scores for different roles.]

Source: Organizational Culture Questionnaire: Results, Lonsdale and Peterson (PowerPoint presentation)
CORE COMPONENT 2A: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

South Dakota finds itself in challenging times in terms of its citizens’ financial capacity to support higher education and the demographic reality of a shrinking high school population. The University recognizes these challenges and has tried to strategically respond in bold ways. Despite the decreasing number of high school graduates in the state K–12 system, for example, ACT scores show the University is accomplishing its goal of recruiting more qualified students. When faculty salaries were lagging behind peer institutions, the University adjusted them to ensure they remained regionally competitive and comparable to other state institutions of higher education. USD also remains committed to the educational advantage of more interaction with faculty, a focus on undergraduate research, and the small-town feel of Vermillion.

The University sees other challenges and opportunities in the economic and demographic data:

- A shrinking workforce may reflect an aging population, opening the door for expanded non-traditional education programs.
- The population of South Dakota does not easily lend itself to a diverse, expanding student body. Recognizing the challenges of demography will require the University to carefully plan its strategic direction. It also presents the challenge to recruit minorities, including students from outside South Dakota. Enhancing diversity is a worthy goal because diverse views and backgrounds provide a broader foundation for the pursuit of knowledge.

CORE COMPONENT 2B

The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Once the backbone of higher education funding, state general fund dollars are no longer sufficient, President Jim Abbott said in his January 19, 2010, budget address:

“Less than one-third of University revenues come from the state which causes the University to focus on private support, contracts and grants, and the recruitment and retention impact of higher tuition and fees. With state support declines planned for the future, USD must grapple with the options of increasing tuition and fees and external funding or reduce personnel and other operating costs.”

In light of shrinking state support, USD is seeking new sources of revenue to maintain its margin of excellence.

**State Support for Higher Education Shrinks**

USD is complex from a budgetary and organizational perspective, which is similar to most research universities. The State of South Dakota separately budgets for the University campus in Vermillion and the Sanford School of Medicine. Both units report to the president and are governed by central budget and planning processes.
The Board of Regents (BoR) approves the University’s budget and the Board’s budgetary decisions influence the institution. The Board advocates for state funding with the Legislature and sets tuition and fees. The BoR also works with the University via its Business Affairs Council to address financial decisions.

In FY 2010, the overall budget of the State of South Dakota was $1.13 billion, of which $170.9 million was allocated to the BoR. USD received $31.3 million of state support from the general fund or 26 percent of its $116,895,225 budget for the Vermillion campus. The Medical School received $17.1 million from the general fund to support its $52,662,031 budget. In total, for FY 2010, USD’s budget included $48.4 million of state support from the general fund.

In June 2010, the BoR changed its funding model effective for the next fiscal year and set FY 2010 as a baseline, promising additional funding if student enrollments by student type increased (in-state, out-of-state, and graduate student). The previous funding model placed all state support tuition and fees into a system pool that was allocated by the BoR and calculated at the value of an undergraduate resident student regardless of the number of nonresident or graduate students.

The new model permits universities to keep the tuition revenue they generate including increased levels of tuition paid by nonresident and graduate students. The financial impact of this budget allocation model is not yet clear, but it should generally benefit USD as enrollments of all types of students have increased, especially out-of-state undergraduate and graduate students.

USD generally views the budgets of the Main Campus and the SSOM separately. The primary components of those budgets for FY 2011 are represented in the pie charts below.

---

**Figure 4 -12**

Sanford School of Medicine FY 2010 Revenue — All sources.

Total $52,662,031

- **Grants and Contracts**: $22,594,121 (43%)
- **State General Funds**: $17,141,721 (33%)
- **State Support Tuition and Fees**: $6,310,192 (12%)
- **Self-Support Tuition**: $176,909 (0%)
- **Other Unrestricted**: $6,399,088 (12%)
The largest components of the budgets are restricted grant/contract funds, tuition and fees, state funding, and revenue operations. Tuition has two major components at USD. One component is called state-support tuition and is collected on all courses offered in USD (state-supported) facilities in Vermillion, with the exception of remedial courses. Self-support tuition is paid by students taking remedial courses and off-campus and distance courses and programs.

Source: January 19, 2010 Budget address, President Abbott

**Philanthropic Support Increases**

In light of decreasing state dollars, the University relies more heavily on support generated by the USD Foundation to expand programs and services to the campus community. The Foundation operates independently of the University but works closely with the president. The Foundation’s endowment provides a reliable source of revenue for scholarships, academic programs, and faculty support to supplement state resources and pursue additional opportunities.

In 2008, Campaign South Dakota raised $160 million, significantly more than its initial goal of $60 million, leaving the Foundation in a strong financial position despite recent economic conditions. The endowment grew from $27.4 million in 1995 to more than $115 million at the end of the 2009 fiscal year, thanks to sound investment practices, the successful campaign, and subsequent fundraising.

Source: USD Foundation
The Foundation supports:

- Awards for outstanding classroom teachers and faculty retention, salary support, research and travel opportunities and the opportunity to write and publish.

- Scholarships, based on academic merit, financial need, or other criteria, which have been instrumental in attracting and retaining talented students. The scholarship endowments include:
  
  - Mickelson – $250,000
  - Presidential Alumni – $150,000
  - Graduate Student Fellowship – $50,000
  - Athletic Scholarship – $50,000
  - Coyote Commitment Scholarship – $25,000
  - Named Scholarship – $25,000

- Building and renovation projects.

Private funds have been critical to completing several University building projects, including:

- The $7.7 million Slagle Auditorium Renovation and Restoration is expected to be completed in 2011. Funding included $3.3 from South Dakota’s Higher Education Facilities Fund and the remainder from the Foundation, including funding to restore the Skinner Opus 548.

- A $19.5 million Beacom School of Business signature building in the heart of campus was completed in 2009 and dedicated in the fall of 2009. USD has the only business school in South Dakota and one of a few in the region accredited by the highly regarded AACSB International. An anonymous $5 million gift in 2005 anchored the private portion of the funding.

- The $37 million Lee Medical Building of the Sanford School of Medicine was completed in 2008. Campaign South Dakota Funding raised $12.5 million to match $12.5 million from state funds. Funding also included $10.2 million in federal appropriations and $1.8 million from the South Dakota Legislature.

- The 70,000-square-foot Theodore and Karen K. Muenster University Center was completed in 2009. It houses a multi-level campus dining area, a 500 capacity multipurpose ballroom, state-of-the-art conference rooms, meeting areas, a multi-cultural center and offices.
• Coyote Village, a four-story, 195,708 square foot, 175-unit residence hall, was completed in summer 2010. It offers students multiple lobbies and lounges, a mail room, laundry, gaming room, café, multi-purpose room, convenience store, and office area.

• The 61,000-square-foot Wellness Center, completed in January 2011, includes state-of-the art workout equipment, a climbing wall, multi-purpose activity court, a large open workout space with treadmills, exercise bicycles, elliptical machines, stretching mats, and a weight room space with free weights and strength training equipment.

Source: USD Website, Foundation Reports

Figure 4-14

The University of South Dakota Foundation Funds Provided for USD Support (1996 – 2009)
14 Year Total $100,214,942
Figure 4-15

FY2009 FUNDS PROVIDED FOR USD SUPPORT
TOTAL $18,880,775

Figure 4-16

**Tuition Supports Higher Education**

In addition to state funding through the general fund, the University receives revenue from student tuition and fees. The Regental system has increasingly relied on student tuition and fees. In FY 2000 student support of South Dakota higher education amounted to around 42 percent while state general funds support amounted to about 58 percent. In FY 2009, the picture changed when, for the first time in recent memory, student support as a percentage increased to about 55 percent and state support decreased to about 45 percent.

*Source: FY 2010 BoR Fact Book, p 48*

**Figure 4-17**

Comparison of Student Support to General Fund Support

The Board sets tuition rates each March, and the tuition structure consists of "state-support" and "self-support" tuition rates. On-campus students, with the exception of those in remedial classes, pay the state-support rate plus required fees. Off-campus students, with the exception of those in nursing, biomedical engineering, and social work, pay the higher self-support rate but no fees. The latter three programs have BoR approval to operate off campus in South Dakota and charge state-supported tuition plus fees.

Portions of the self-support funds are allocated to the Higher Education Facilities Fund, maintenance charge, and EUC. The net of this allocation remains on campus.

On average, the cost of undergraduate education for South Dakota residents ranks third when compared to the cost in neighboring states. Graduate education costs for residents are the lowest among the neighboring states.
For the 2010–2011 academic year, tuition increased 8.8 percent for all students. The cost for on-campus undergraduate students from South Dakota increased from $91.70 per credit hour to $99.80; nonresident tuition moved from $291.25 per credit hour to $317.00. At the graduate level, resident tuition increased from $139.00 per credit hour to $151.30, and nonresident from $294.25 to $320.25.

Tuition for off-campus learning, which is called self-support tuition, increased 1.9 percent at both the undergraduate and graduate levels to $258.80 per credit hour for undergraduate students and $343.75 per credit hour for graduates. With the exception of off-campus nursing, fees do not apply to self-support tuition nor do differential tuition rates in the self-support world.

Despite the tuition and fee increases, the good news for students is that the percentage receiving financial aid in the form of scholarships and grants has remained near 90 percent for a decade. The average award in FY 2009 was $11,014.

With continuing budget challenges projected for FY 2012 and beyond, the University expects ongoing pressure on tuition. Prior to the 8.8 percent increase in student tuition for FY 2011, increases have been more moderate—in the 3 percent to 4 percent range.

*Source: Figure 4-18*

**Figure 4-18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>System Weighted Average Cost and Rank of Public Institutions: Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Resident</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Non-Resident</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Graduate Resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$14,239</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$14,937</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,823</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$18,256</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$12,515</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$13,199</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,992</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,308</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,890</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,621</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,413</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,065</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,656</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Non-Resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$26,336</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$27,346</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$24,914</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$26,506</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$24,501</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$26,026</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20,943</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$22,223</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$21,834</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$22,367</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,164</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,841</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,816</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Financial Aid by Program: Graduate and Undergraduate (FY 09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Obligation Aid</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$6,483,820</td>
<td>$25,906,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Scholarships</td>
<td>$163,828</td>
<td>$350,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Opportunity Scholarship</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$2,924,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Scholarships</td>
<td>$690,682</td>
<td>$1,606,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Funded Scholarships</td>
<td>$5,295,897</td>
<td>$17,259,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Funds</td>
<td>$672,811</td>
<td>$2,119,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Institutional Scholarships</td>
<td>$1,988,728</td>
<td>$7,199,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Obligation Aid</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,040,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,366,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation Aid</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Loans</td>
<td>$54,398,335</td>
<td>$149,394,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Loans</td>
<td>$4,447,559</td>
<td>$4,447,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>$809,711</td>
<td>$2,813,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Work Study Employment</td>
<td>$1,432,850</td>
<td>$1,432,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Obligation Aid</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,088,455</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176,307,584</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Obligation Aid refers to aid for which student repayment, either in the form of cash or equivalent work, is expected. Non-Obligation Aid refers to aid which is given without the expectation of repayment.

Source: Board of Regents Financial Aid Survey
### Average Financial Aid Award: Graduate and Undergraduate (FY 09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Received Aid</th>
<th>Total Aid Amount</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$77,129,221</td>
<td>$11,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$233,674,011</td>
<td>$9,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Fees add Revenue

USD also charges a number of fees in addition to tuition that are retained by the institution:

- **University Support Fee (USF)** supports the instructional and administrative service areas related to the institutional mission. USF, for example, funds direct instruction, libraries, computer centers, museums, admissions, registration, financial aid, administrative offices, general institutional expenses, and the payment of debt incurred for the construction, maintenance, repair, and equipping of campus buildings, except for student unions and auxiliary enterprise, athletic facilities, and wellness facilities. The University support fee is assessed on all state-support courses and remedial courses delivered on campus.

- **General Activity Fee (GAF)** supports student functions related to the co-curricular and extracurricular activities and operations and payment of debt incurred for the construction, maintenance, repair and equipping of student unions, athletic facilities and wellness facilities as approved by the Board. GAF funds activities such as student organizations, cultural events, homecoming, student government, student newspapers, campus radio and television stations, child care, student activities, athletics, intramurals, student health services, and the operational and debt expenses for student unions. The general activity fee is assessed on all state-support courses delivered on campus.

- **Special Discipline Fees** are used to purchase instructional equipment and pay other operating costs, excluding salary enhancement, for the benefit of students enrolled in the discipline.

- **Laboratory Fees** are charged in specific sections that meet BoR policy requirements and are used to purchase instructional equipment and pay other operating costs, excluding salaries, for the benefit of students enrolled in the course.

- **Salary Enhancement Fees** can be charged in specific sections that meet BoR policy requirement to enhance faculty salaries.

- **Program Delivery Fees** may be assessed to support the incremental costs of additional equipment, support staff, space or facilities, student services, business services or library and related services for courses in a program offered in an off-campus location.

- **International Student Fees** are paid once by all international students who obtain Form I-20 or Form DS-2019 from a South Dakota public university. This includes...
degree-seeking students, English as a Second Language (ESL) students, and foreign students enrolled under a cooperative agreement with a foreign institution.

- The BoR approves all room and board plans for standard semesters and the weekly summer room rates.

In addition, students pay an application fee and transcript fee. Those revenues are deposited in the Regental system’s tuition and fee fund and into the Higher Education Facilities Fund in the same proportion as tuition revenue.

**Dollars are Allocated Responsibly**

The University has tried to strategically carve out its proper niche in the state and in the region as an institution of higher education. In doing so, USD never forgets that it is by mission, by design, and by collective desire, the flagship liberal arts institution and that excellence in education is the ultimate goal.

USD’s average expenditures are generally aligned with its national peers when it comes to instruction, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation management, scholarships, research, public service, and other expenses. Expenditures for some categories such as instruction and academic support are on the higher end of the spectrum, while research, operations management, and other expenses are on the lower end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Pub Service</th>
<th>Acad Supt</th>
<th>Inst Supt</th>
<th>Open M</th>
<th>Scholarships</th>
<th>Other Expenses</th>
<th>Total Op Exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U South Dakota #</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U North Dakota #</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Montana #</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-KC #</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nebraska #</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois U Carbondale #</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Idaho #</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Montana #</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Idaho #</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.21
In the spring of 2010, results from the Self-Study survey showed that 41.5 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that USD allocates its resources effectively; 33 percent neither agreed nor disagreed; and 25.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Faculty and staff, especially those with longer tenure, tended to disagree more.

Additionally, the Self-Study survey showed that 59 percent of faculty and staff respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed (compared to 14 percent who agreed or strongly agreed) that "USD has the financial resources it needs to fulfill its mission/ vision." (Figure 4-22).

Figure 4-22
USD has the financial resources it needs to fulfill its mission/ vision.

Figure 4-23
Average Expenditures (2004–2008), USD Compared with National Peers
While USD’s expenditures are in keeping with other universities in terms of percentage of budget spent on each category, based on the results the Self-Study survey, concerns remain about the overall level of funding to support its mission.

**Composite Financial Index**

One tool USD uses to monitor its fiscal health is the Composite Financial Index (CFI), which is also the calculator the Higher Learning Commission uses for the fiscal section of the Annual Institutional Data Update. The CFI is a risk measurement indicating financial viability based on ratios of resources, expenses, income, assets, and debt. In general, CFI scores range from -1 (Can the school survive) to more than 9 (Deploy resources to achieve a robust mission).

USD uses the analysis of CFI’s four key ratio to answer four financial questions:

1. Are resources sufficient and flexible enough to support the mission?
2. Are resources, including debt, managed strategically to advance the mission?
3. Does asset performance and management support the strategic direction?
4. Do operating results indicate the institution is living with available resources?

USD’s projected CFI for FY 2010 is 3.2, indicating a need to direct resources to allow for transformation of the institution, and the University has been proactive in that regard. Construction and renewal of facilities and technology has been on a robust schedule.

It should be noted that USD’s fiscal data reported for the 2010 Annual Institutional Data Update were in error (HLC Annual Institution Update - Non-Financial [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A – 7). USD submitted corrections in the spring of 2010, and those updates are available in the virtual resource room (HLC Annual Institution Date Update – Non-Financial (Corrections) [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 8). The previously reported CFI of 1.7 was in fact 2.4, with a FY 2010 projection of 3.2. Ratings are expected to increase as revenue is received from housing and other fees to support debt service.

While the correction improved USD’s CFI rating, the fact remains that it dropped significantly for FY 2009, partly because of the drop in the stock market and unrealized losses in the USD Foundation’s endowment and other investments. The University also issued an additional $45 million in debt in the last six weeks of FY 2009 for construction of two new revenue producing facilities: Coyote Village, a residential housing unit, and the Wellness Center, funded by student fees. The construction of these two facilities aligns with Goal 5 of the university’s strategic plan, and the revenue they produce will support the debt service.

(A note: Research for this Self-Study revealed the CFI rating error and prompted the correction. The University has since taken measures to strengthen its data integrity by improving its survey reporting process.)

The 2010 document, (Ratio Analysis Explained-Are Resources Sufficient and Flexible Enough to Support the Mission [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See B - 2), shows that USD has invested significant funds in physical assets and has undertaken a major program of capital expansion/replacement.
Balancing National, Local Budget Goals

USD’s budget structure is based on the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) organization of higher education functional programs. This structure dictates generic categories of expenses that are not linked to the University’s strategic plan. To reconcile the two, the University created a cross-walk (Figure 4-24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan Goal — Proposed Budget Program</th>
<th>Current Budget Structure Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 - Academic Excellence</td>
<td>Program 01 – Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program 04 – Academic Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 - Research and Creative Activity</td>
<td>Program 02 – Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3 - Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Program 05 – Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program 08 – Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4 - Institutional Positioning</td>
<td>Program 03 – Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5 - Funding and Resource Development</td>
<td>Program 09 – Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6 - Organizational Effectiveness and Change</td>
<td>Program 06 – Institutional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program 07 – Operation &amp; Maintenance of Physical Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the University continues to grapple with budget issues, the budget structure serves as a vehicle to move USD toward more cohesiveness between the plans of the University and the budget allocation and decision processes.

Budgeting for Quality

With formal input from each constituency, the University budget process is designed to achieve the long-range goals of its strategic plan and ensure compliance with BoR, state and federal mandates and laws. The process begins in September each year, culminating in June shortly before the beginning of the new fiscal year. Historically, the operating budget process incorporates all general funds appropriated by the Legislature, tuition, and the various fees approved by the Board of Regents. Beginning FY 2009, the budget process also includes budget authority for all local funds.

The Office of Budget and Finance works with the president and respective vice presidents to determine the program fees, general activity fee, user charges, and reinvestments. The University Budget Committee (UBC) has the opportunity to review the fees and make its recommendation to the president.

The University Budget Committee

The UBC is charged with establishing budgetary goals within the strategic plans of the University to guide the allocation of new funds and the reallocation of existing budgets as well as reviewing and recommending to the president:

- required and special discipline fee rates and budgets,
- reinvestment and centers of excellence budgets,
- maintenance and repair allocations,
- University fund and other essential operating budget requests, and
- Board of Regents general fund budget requests.
The UBC also provides information and education to the campus community on University financial and budget issues.

The committee includes two University Senate members, two faculty members at large appointed by the President, the president of the Student Government Association and University administrators, including the vice presidents for Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, Research, Marketing, Enrollment and Student Services and Administration and Information Technology, and the Director of Human Resources. The office of Budget and Finance serves as staff to the Committee, and establishes agendas, sets meeting times and places, and provides the reports and materials required by the Committee.

USD involves internal constituents from across campus in budget deliberations to increase the understanding of the link between budget decisions and the strategic priorities. In 2009, the president appointed members of the University community to the Budget Allocation Model Advisory Committee to develop and recommend a budget model to:

- better align University resources to the strategic plan,
- incentivize success as defined by the strategic plan,
- encourage the active management of resources,
- provide funds to invest in new initiatives,
- focus on all university resources, and
- establish a rolling 5 year budget.

This Advisory Committee is very active and meeting regularly as FY 2011 progresses.

The UBC reviews requests for university funds, including those appropriated by the Legislature, tuition allocations, University support fees, School and Public Land funds, central grants overhead, central administration other, delivery fees and the Higher Education Facilities Fund. The committee makes its final recommendations to the president in late March, and departments receive their operating budgets in June.

The Budget Process

The University’s budget process is divided into five stages to address issues and fund sources in step with the Board of Regents’ schedule.

- **In Stage I**, maintenance and repair needs and available resources are reviewed and general criteria established for matching needs to resources. It begins in September and ends in early December.
- **In Stage II**, the rates and operating budgets for all special discipline fees, required fees, salary enhancement fees, and the general activity fee are approved. It begins in October and finishes late December.
- **Stage III** provides an opportunity to budget funds that were identified as local accounts. It begins in March and is completed at the end of the month.
- **In Stage IV**, the “University Funds” operating budgets are approved and other needed information for the operating budget document compiled. It begins in November.
and is completed in March. The step also includes departmental review of all permanent appointments, salary policy recommendations for non-CSA employees and departmental review of operational expense allocations for University funds.

- **In Stage V**, the general fund base budget expansion requests for the subsequent fiscal year are developed and forwarded to the BoR. It begins in May and is completed in July with the submission of the budget request document to the Board of Regents.

The BoR approves a system budget request for the six universities and the two special schools. The recommendation goes to the governor, then the Legislature that approves funding for higher education through the General Appropriations Bill.

The General Appropriations Bill funding categories encompass a wide variety of funding sources:

- **General Funds**: Direct appropriations from the state’s general fund, which is the depository of all non-dedicated revenues to the state, including the sales tax, bank franchise tax, various gambling revenues, and other fees and taxes.

- **Federal Funds**: The amounts appropriated by the Legislature in this category are levels of expenditure authority that cannot be exceeded by the University. The legislature does not appropriate actual dollars, merely expenditure authority allowing the University to expend its federal grants and student financial aid.

- **Other Funds**: Expenditure authority allowing the University to expend all non-general, non-federal fund sources such as student tuition and fees, contracts, grants overhead, central administration other, office stores, and a multitude of other sources.

Other Funds also includes authorization for the University to expend its share of School and Public Lands (S&PL) and Higher Education Facilities Funds (HEFF). The S&PL appropriation represents earnings from the University’s share of an endowment of public lands provided by the federal government at the time South Dakota achieved statehood. HEFF is the depository for 20 percent of tuition revenues collected by higher education institutions. While it is primarily used to finance maintenance and repair projects and lease payments, a small percentage of the funds are appropriated by the legislature for use in the campus physical plants.

Within the University, however, the General Appropriations Bill funding categories are not part of the daily nomenclature. Instead, University faculty and staff use the terms University funds, federal funds and local funds (student fees, contracts, grants overhead, office stores, etc.) while conducting its daily business.

**Linking the Strategic Plan and the Budget**

With its latest strategic plan, the University has made a more consistent effort to link budget decisions to strategic priorities. In the 2009–2010 fiscal year budget, for example, the University responded to an unanticipated and significant reduction in state funds with reductions in staffing, operations and programs. Instead of across the board cuts, however, the University relied on certain strategic priorities to inform its decisions. Although most areas of the University were impacted by the cuts — that included faculty and staff reductions, defunding of programs, and administrative changes — the University continued to invest resources as outlined by the strategic plan. Listed as University–wide Strategic
Reinvestments, the following areas saw increased funding:

- Recruitment, Admissions, and Retention
- Science Positions to Support new PhD and Research Efforts
  - Chemistry Faculty positions
  - Biomedical Engineering faculty positions
  - Physics faculty position
- Faculty Development
- Student Programs
  - Health Sciences Program
  - Enhance Academic Advising and Supplemental Instruction
  - Enhance Institute of American Indian Studies
  - Enhance International Studies
- Infrastructure
  - Custodial Services — new business school (70K additional sq. ft)
  - REED Bandwidth — new allocation of cost
  - Campus Infrastructure Shortfall
- Administration Efficiencies
  - Grants Accounting
  - Assistant Comptroller
- Alumni Association

Source: University Budget Committee Recommendations Spread Sheet, April 15, 2009

**Improving the Budget Reduction Process**

In 2009, the University also established a Budget Reduction Process Committee in response to faculty and staff concerns about the previous year’s budget decisions. The committee includes students, faculty, deans and administrators.

“The Committee is charged with developing a budget reduction implementation process that provides for University-wide participation, can be clearly communicated, and is easily understood. The Committee is asked to begin its work by November 15 and complete its task by December 31, 2009. Please note the Committee is specifically charged with creating a process by which cuts will be made, not with making budget reduction decisions.” October 30, 2009 (Budget Reduction Committee Announcement http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See B - 18).

To encourage greater campus-wide understanding of the budget process, its constraints and links to the strategic plan, the committee’s meetings were public. Its decisions and budget information were placed in the myU Portal, which is accessible by all on campus.

Sources of Evidence: Committee Charge, myU Portal.
Managing the Budget

As part of the Regental system, USD helped implement a combined finance and administration system to better manage programs and resources and to link to statewide resources. The Banner system offers an integrated suite of databases and software, each spanning all major system-wide administrative functions, including accounting, budget, finance, human resources, payroll, purchasing and reporting. The benefits offered include:

- common code tables such as account, fund type and organization types;
- common codes for employee titles, salaries and benefits;
- common computer screens for access to system-wide data and information systems including students, employees and other users;
- an interactive process in which an information system manages online sessions and processes data from those sessions in a way that will be consistent across Regental institutions, and
- common training for all system users and institutions.

While the Banner system provides for consistent information systems environments across all institutions, duties and administrative responsibilities are distributed and delegated to individual universities.

CORE COMPONENT 2B: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

USD’s tuition and fees have traditionally been lower than those at comparable institutions in the region and the nation. Hence, frugal budgets have been the norm. Recent trends, however, have pushed the University towards more creative funding sources to maintain its competitive advantage, which is a high-quality, big-college education with a small-campus experience.

The University increasingly looks to the USD Foundation and to students themselves for more support to maintain the viability of the faculty, scholarships, and facilities to ensure a top quality education. While the increase in distance education has been encouraging, it does demand resources not previously considered in terms of technology enhancements and faculty skill sets. And, there have been concerns that distance education is in competition with the goal of increasing enrollment on campus; however, distance learners themselves convey their life situations would not permit them to study on campus. If USD did not have the distance learning option, the pure distance learners would not likely enroll at USD. Through it all, the University is positioning itself in comparison to other institutions to compete for students, faculty, staff and philanthropic resources to maintain its competitive advantage.

CORE COMPONENT 2C

The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Data and information are the currency of a University, and, like others, USD is trying to use data in better ways to determine how it is meeting its goals and how its programs are improving over time. Revised procedures and modified processes are allowing the University to better link data to performance and use that information to guide strategic decisions.
Measuring Effectiveness and Improvement

The University of South Dakota’s evaluation and assessment practices include strategic planning with reviews and updates (Strategic Plan of Academic Units http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 2), institutional and academic program assessment plans, program reviews, the faculty and staff performance appraisal system, IDEA teaching evaluations, NSSE, the budget process and the BoR annual reports and surveys, such as the Self-Study survey that informs this report. On December 12, 2010, the University created a snapshot of its progress to date (Progress Snapshot Through FY09 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 8). Each area of the Strategic Plan was rated on a scale of 1-5 with 1 indicating little progress on an action item and 5 indicating excellent progress. A summary of the results are noted below:

- Academic Excellence: 80 percent of the action items rated at 4 or higher.
- Research and Creative Activity: One of seven (14 percent) of the action items received a rating of 4.
- Enrollment Management: Three of four, or 75 percent, of the action items were rated at a 4.
- Institutional Positioning: Two action items (100 percent) were both rated 4.
- Funding and Resource Development: Five of six action items (83 percent) rated 4 or higher.
- Organizational Effectiveness and Change: One of three (33 percent) rated at a 4.

Several of the processes associated with institutional evaluation are discussed in other parts of this Self-Study:

- The strategic planning process (Core component 1a) involved external and internal constituents and provides for regular assessment and updates.
- The budget process (Core component 2b) ties expenses to strategic goals.
- The Diversity Plan. (Core component 1b)
- The University of South Dakota Assessment Plan provides the framework for assessing student outcomes and institutional effectiveness and disseminating results to improve learning and guide course and program revisions. (Core component 3a)

The Self-Study survey included several questions about assessment and accountability. The results were mixed:

- 61.7 percent of students and 57.8 percent of alumni agreed or strongly agreed that continuous improvement is a distinctive part of the University.
- Only 29.2 percent of faculty and 46.1 percent of staff agreed.
- 57.9 percent of faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed that assessment data are used to improve academic programs.
- only 33.2 percent of alumni, faculty, staff, and students agreed or strongly agreed that promoting accountability on campus is distinctive of USD.
Improving Student Services through Assessment

The University assesses student satisfaction through National Student Engagement Evaluation (NSEE) and Supplemental Student Instruction (SSI) and uses the results to improve programs. After students were not satisfied with academic advising, for example, USD restructured the program and saw an NSSE score increase from 2.78 in 2004 to 2.99 in 2008 for the first-year student response to “How would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution.”

When the 2008 NSSE results indicated students rated USD lower than other Carnegie Institutions for “Supportive Campus Environment,” the University remodeled the first floor of the I.D. Weeks Library for use as the Academic Commons, providing a full array of services, from the Writing Center to Academic and Career Planning. The Commons opened in January 2011.

For a full discussion of how assessment has been used to improve and expand programs, see Core components 3b and 3c.

Resources:

Interview with current Interim Director of Academic and Career Planning

NSEE reports  (http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-affairs/upload/USD-NSSE-2010-Multi-Year-Benchmark-Report.xls)

Figure 4-25 shows results of the survey data describing the “supportive campus environment“ variable.

Figure 4-25
Supportive Campus Environment:
2008 Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>USD Mean</th>
<th>South Dakota System</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USD compared with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>USD Mean</th>
<th>South Dakota System</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.00 to .19 Inconsequential
.20 to .49: Small meaningful difference
.50 to .79: Moderate meaningful difference
.80 or more: Large meaningful difference

(NSSE 2008 Benchmark Comparisons Report  Click on Institutional Research and Statistics. See E-12)
In November 2003, the University also began using an integrated student, enrollment, and financial services system to better serve students and to link with other Regental institutions. This combined student system merged the individual student systems of USD, South Dakota State University, Dakota State University, Northern State University, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, and Black Hills State University and all Regental centers such as the University Centers in Sioux Falls, Pierre, and Rapid City. The combined system allows students to perform all common student services transactions and obtain commonly needed information online at any time and place.

Faculty, student services and administrative units also benefited from the system. With access to comprehensive student data, faculty and student services professionals may assist any student from any campus in the system. Administrative units are able to access consistent, coherent administrative information needed for planning, allocating resource, monitoring resource utilization, assessing performance, supervising subordinate units, coordinating inter-unit operations, and advocating for external support.

Academic benefits for the Regental system include common course descriptions and equivalencies, course syllabi and class schedules. With a combined database, USD and the other Regental universities also are able to offer students online billing, online payment options, authorized payer options and direct deposit of refunds.

**CORE COMPONENT 2C: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION**

If there is anything USD has improved over the years, it has been its capacity and its commitment to assessment and evaluation towards continuous improvement. Data sets are robust and changes are made when appropriate. As discussed in Criterion 3, evaluation of both student learning and teacher instruction is routine and is used as measures of success and signals for areas of improvement.

In addition, the integrated student services system shows that USD and the Regental system are leveraging their resources to provide a more seamless experience for students and for those engaged in enrollment and course management to enhance its effectiveness. In today’s world, students expect such integration via technology. The system also allows University administrators to have more real-time and accurate information upon which to base student service, course management, and financial decisions to enhance the overall quality of the University experience.

Information overload is always a concern, but administrative and departmental units are learning which sets of data and assessment routines are essential for their responsibilities and are responding to the data more quickly and adeptly. Without historical and real-time data, no improvement efforts will have the certainty of growing on a solid foundation for the future. Such information is both the goal and current reality at the University.

**CORE COMPONENT 2D**

*All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.*

USD has many planning efforts across the campus, all of which are in various stages of implementation and assessment. While laudable and appropriate, the challenge is to link those planning efforts together
around a clear mission and to promote strategic action. The bigger challenge still is to link those planning efforts to budget and resource allocation decisions. It is that challenge that USD is learning to face in a more mature manner. Several University-wide plans are being implemented in conjunction with the Diversity Plan and strategic plan discussed in Criterion 1.

**Improving Technology**

Goal 5.3 of the strategic plan (Goal 5.3 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See J - 4]), for example, requires a technology master plan, and the University has made consistent progress to develop and implement the tactical, project-based plan since 2007. The master plan is guided by the need for software enhancements and support, wireless technology, network enhancements, and technology functionality for teaching both face-to-face and distance courses.

In 2009, more than 64 projects were completed. While never minimizing a teacher’s classroom skills, the IT master plan helps maximize the face-to-face teacher’s impact in the classroom and provide more opportunities for distance students to get top quality instruction.

*Source: Technology Master Plan, Goal 5.3 of Strategic Plan*

USD has developed a robust technology infrastructure, guided by the provost, vice president for administration, and ITS. The campus has a 10 Gbps wired backbone with wireless internet in all academic buildings and residence halls. About two-thirds of all classrooms are equipped with data projectors and computer equipment for innovative instruction. USD also participates in a system-wide Mobile Computing Initiative, which uses student fees to fund wireless infrastructure, classroom renovation and curricular development. One of the most exciting recent uses of this fee was the renovation of a classroom to provide USD’s first Active Learning Classroom. It serves as a prototype for future classroom design. (A full discussion of USD’s Information Technology Service can be found in Chapter 5, Core component 3d.

Technology has supported USD’s growth in distance education. From fall 2005 to fall 2010, off-campus and distance enrollment increased 61 percent, from 2,524 to 4,073. USD has a five-year plan to increase online education, as the program continues to grow with traditional campus students (about 20 percent of online registrations) and students from across the state choosing online classes. To ensure quality, the University has adopted the Quality Matters model to guide its distance learning efforts. Online courses are systematically reviewed, and students are asked to complete surveys to assess semester start-up issues and student satisfaction in online courses. (A full discussion of USD’s distance learning can be found in Chapter 8.)

**Building for the Future**

The Campus Plan, which was updated in 2005, includes principles and recommendations for campus maintenance, growth and development. It addresses access, open space and landscape, use organization, land, buildings, facilities, pedestrian and bicycle circulations, and vehicle circulation and parking. The University has implemented seven of eight of the Priority Group I goals, made significant progress on some Priority Group II goals, and is investing for completion of Priority Group III goals. Future action items will accommodate higher-tech instructional needs, environmental concerns, campus aesthetics, and the safety and well-being of students.

*Source: Campus Plan, Update 2005 (Housing Master Plan [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See L - 2])*
Assessing Impact

The Self-Study survey shows that students and alumni (59.3 percent and 53.2 percent, respectively) agreed or strongly agreed that focusing on the future is a distinctive feature of USD. While 45.7 percent of staff respondents also agreed or strongly agreed, only 28.8 percent of faculty agreed or strongly agreed.

The survey also showed that only 35.5 percent of faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that the University’s planning processes are sufficiently flexible to meet changing institutional needs. Faculty with more years of service were more likely to disagree.

Looking Toward the Future

The University is positioning the 2011 HLC Self-Study as a foundation for the next iteration of its Strategic Plan. In 2006, President Abbott said in his annual State of the University address that he looked forward to speaking to the faculty on the University’s 150th anniversary in 2012 about all that has been achieved from the 2007–2012 Strategic Plan. Implicit in that statement is the responsibility, and the University’s commitment, to continue planning efforts beyond 2012.

The virtual resource library used to prepare this Self-Study is a good beginning to future plans. The complete and accurate information prepared and made transparent because of the accreditation process will be an invaluable resource in scanning the environment and assessing current and future needs in anticipation of formal planning processes.


CORE COMPONENT 2D: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

General Eisenhower is credited with saying, before the D-Day invasion of World War II, that “the plan is nothing, planning is everything.” USD, too, recognizes that planning is a continual and evolving process. While written plans are developed and aligned across campus entities, efforts are ongoing to ensure that the right goals are being achieved at the right time by the right people. While the University struggles sometimes with focused and clear mission-directed performance, such performance remains the goal, and USD has provided numerous sources of evidence in this chapter that the institution is planning, evaluating, and allocating resources effectively.

The Self-Study survey indicates faculty and staff would like to see a more flexible planning process with more focus on the future. The University continues to strive for greater inclusiveness in its planning and decision-making because organizations are more effective when internal stakeholders are committed to the planning process and outcomes.

CRITERION TWO: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

Evidence shows that The University of South Dakota has actively embraced strategic planning on multiple levels and has been committed to monitoring the implementation of goals and success measures inherent in those plans. USD also has been very engaged in assessment and evaluation
activities in an effort to enhance learning, teaching, and overall performance. To better understand the issues it faces, the University has surveyed its many constituents, giving special attention to persistent challenges and the constant desire to improve the campus climate to encourage diverse populations, cultures, and perspectives.

Despite a declining high school population, University enrollment has increased in recent years. While most of that increase has been in non-traditional and distance learners, fall 2010 enrollment showed promising signs of broader growth, and enrollment management strategies are expected to generate more positive results in the future.

USD increasingly relies on private support, and student tuition and fees now make up more of the funding stream than state general revenue support. The University has made great strides in centralizing administrative functions and making student services more routine, especially taking advantage of Internet-based options to improve customer service. Much of the centralizing effort has been mandated by an actively engaged Board of Regents looking at enhancing Regental system-wide improvements.

**Future Considerations**

The State of South Dakota, while in a better economic condition than some other states, still finds itself with

- a strained economy forcing difficult budgetary decisions that often negatively impact higher education and
- declining K–12 student populations and an aging population in general, which impact University recruitment strategies.

While USD faculty members are well-qualified, compensated at a rate comparable to peer institutions, and are, generally, optimistic, the Self-Study survey showed they are concerned about internal operations. USD has attempted to address these concerns of late through more transparent and robust forms of budget planning.

By strategically responding to economic and demographic trends, educational and societal trends, internal performance through assessments and evaluations, and the effectiveness of implementing University-wide plans already in place, The University of South Dakota serves the needs of the state, region, and nation by ensuring quality growth and future viability. No doubt the current challenges are both evident and significant. No doubt, too, future conditions, though difficult to predict, will present challenges and opportunities for the University. However, USD is committed to planning for those challenges and opportunities and has been continually advancing.
The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

INTRODUCTION

The University of South Dakota is dedicated to the development of extraordinary teaching and learning, and maintains a strong commitment to undergraduate, professional, and graduate education delivered on campus, off-campus, and via distance learning. The University recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching and has implemented programs to enhance learning in and out of the classroom. The assessment of student learning has become an increasingly important part of the campus culture, and, in the past three years especially, USD has seen an increase in both the breadth and depth of assessments to improve student learning outcomes.

CORE COMPONENT 3A

The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

Assessing Student Learning

The University of South Dakota relies heavily on its planning, course and program reviews, and assessment activities to measure its success in attaining student learning outcomes. The University uses these processes to guide revision at a variety of course, programmatic, and institutional levels. The University of South Dakota Assessment Plan (USD Assessment Plan – 2009 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 7]) provides the framework for assessing student learning outcomes and disseminating results to improve learning and institutional effectiveness. The Assessment Plan was developed by the University Assessment Committee, a standing committee of the University Senate, and was last revised in 2009. The plan applies to undergraduate and graduate education, regardless of delivery method, and embraces co-curricular learning.

The South Dakota Board of Regents (BoR) takes seriously the practice of assessment as evidenced by BoR policy 2:11 [http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-academic_Affairs/documents/2-11.pdf]. The policy requires South Dakota’s public universities to have in place a functioning assessment program to enhance the quality and excellence of academic programs, student learning, and teaching. At a minimum, the assessment program evaluates the general education component of the baccalaureate curriculum and each respective major. The findings of assessment are to be considered during the regular review of curriculum and related policies and procedures. Student participation in the assessment program is required, and students who do not participate are prevented from subsequent registration and graduation. The information which follows verifies the University’s robust assessment efforts to assure it is meeting its educational mission. Numerous assessment instruments are used, including:

- ACT, SAT and COMPASS Placement Exams for undergraduate applicants and matriculating students,
• GRE, GMAT, LSAT, MCAT, and numerous other program specific graduate entrance exams for graduate applicants and matriculating students,
• English Writing Assessment,
• IDEA Diagnostic Report (Kansas Form),
• National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and
• ACT-CAAP Exam, which serves as the BoR’s Proficiency Exam.

A description of each assessment instrument can be found in Appendix E of the University’s assessment plan (USD Assessment Plan – 2009 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 7 pg. 33]).

Although the University Assessment Committee is charged with encouraging assessment, faculty members shape and conduct much of the assessment activity at the University. They are uniquely qualified to establish learning outcomes in their respective academic programs and are also in the best position to develop measurement methods, determine performance standards, and create positive change on the basis of assessment findings. Faculty members are supported in their assessment efforts by the provost, the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment (OAEA), and the respective deans. The Center for Teaching and Learning also provides resources and training for faculty in course design, curricular revision, teaching improvement, and the assessment of student learning.

Assessing Programs

Academic departments/units are responsible for assessment of student learning at the program level, and the academic deans provide oversight. Assessment activities are monitored through the OAEA. The activities within the USD Assessment Plan are designed to answer the following questions:

• What are the intended learning outcomes for students at the course, program, and institutional levels and are they appropriate to The University of South Dakota’s mission and the degrees awarded by USD?
• What data or evidence is being gathered at USD about student learning in courses, programs, and at the institutional level, and by which processes is this information being gathered?
• How is the data or evidence of student learning being collectively analyzed to compare the actual to the desired student learning outcomes? What actions are being taken as a result of the findings?
• What is the evidence or data that support the presence of broad institutional engagement in and commitment to assessment of student learning and the use of assessment results to improve educational quality?

Academic assessment consists of a sequence of steps in a cyclical, ongoing process that may last a semester, a year, or longer, depending on each program’s assessment needs. When one cycle is completed, another begins, with each subsequent cycle dependent on the information gathered in the previous one. The USD assessment process, no matter the academic program or the frequency with which it is assessed, encompasses five general steps:

• Identify and articulate learning goals and outcomes.
• Select assessment methods relevant and appropriate to each of the learning outcomes.
• Systematically implement the methods and collect data.
• Analyze the data and report the findings.
• Use the findings to revise outcomes, teaching, and/or assessment methods, and to change curricula to improve student learning.

Using the information gleaned from the assessment rubric, the director of the OAEA reviews the assessment information and provides summarized feedback to the University Assessment Committee, academic deans, and unit directors, who use it to review and analyze their programs.

The deans and the assessment committee provide recommendations to individual programs to improve assessment and enhance student learning.

(USD Assessment Plan – 2009 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 7 pg. 20-30).

The assessment rubric specifically requests the following data:

• What are the learning objectives for the program?
• How, where, and when are the learning objectives assessed?
• What committee or person is responsible for assessing the learning objectives?
• What are the expectations or criteria for success?
• What are the results?
• How will those results be used or how have they been used?
• What committee or person is responsible for the needed action?

The individual program reports and plans, as well as their feedback, are available on the USD assessment website for year-to-year review, for accreditation purposes, and for documenting assessment-driven improvement in student learning. The program plans are also available in the virtual resource room (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

The documents enable academic units to revise outcomes and assessment methods, improve teaching methods and curricula, and more. The transparent process also allows departments to learn from one another, developing collaboration and parity across the University.

An assessment report submitted on or before December 10, 2010, for AY 2009-2010 involved the Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts in Biology. In this case, the results of assessment were used to redesign the biology curriculum to mirror the two-semester introductory sequence found at the majority of other universities. The change was made to better serve the large population of transfer students majoring in biology.

In Theatre, one of the undergraduate outcomes is that “Students will demonstrate a broad knowledge of Western theatre history and literature, including major periods and styles, significant individuals,
and representative plays." Success for this outcome is measured by the number of students who receive grades no lower than a C in the theatre specialization, and through an objective test on theatre history and literature, which is measured through a department rubric. The MFA in Theatre Directing builds on this, asking students to go beyond broad knowledge: "Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze, interpret, and effectively stage plays representing different historical periods and theatrical genres." This outcome is measured through performance requirements: All students must analyze and direct a 1-act play during their first year of residence, and a full-length play their second year. These performances are assessed by the student's advisor and the production team through the departmental Experiential Evaluation tool. In addition, each student must complete THEA 734 ("Playscript Analysis") and earn a B in the course.

In Counseling Education and Supervision, one of the outcomes in the MA in Counselor Education program is that "Students will demonstrate developmentally appropriate competency of professional counseling work behaviors (e.g., helping relationships, ethical practice, assessment, clinical practices) during the supervised specialization specific practicum." Success for this objective is measured by evaluating students on their competency in professional work behaviors in COUN 795 ("Practicum"). Evaluation is conducted by faculty members and doctoral level supervisors using the master's practicum rubric, which is drawn from 2001 CACREP Standards and from relevant counseling literature. The PhD program, however, states this learning outcome as "Students will demonstrate developmentally appropriate competency of advanced professional counseling work behaviors (e.g., helping relationships, ethical practice, assessment, clinical practices) during the supervised doctoral-level practicum." Success for this measure is evaluated through grades received in COUN 895 ("Practicum") and through analysis of ratings that students receive on the final counseling skills rubric.

Graduates of the Master of Science program in Computer Science are trained for positions in software design or systems development in industrial corporations, in public service, or computer service companies. Graduates are also well prepared to teach computer courses in two-year colleges or to undertake more advanced training in computer science. As part of that preparation, the Department of Computer Science has established the following learning objectives:

1) The students will demonstrate the ability to research a topic of substantial complexity, and evaluate currently known approaches;

2) The students will demonstrate the ability to organize technical material and communicate it orally.

To measure these learning objectives, all master's students are required to make a technical presentation to a public audience that is attended by at least three faculty members. Faculty members evaluate this presentation for the first objective by using a 10-point rubric that assesses the areas of research, understanding, and technical level. Faculty members rate the presentation for the second objective by using a 10-point rubric that assesses the areas of speaking, audio-visual aids, and organization. A student is expected to achieve an average of at least 6 out of 10 on these evaluations. Finally, each student's performance is evaluated and discussed, and must be deemed acceptable by a majority of the CSC faculty.

An example of program assessment can be found in the report submitted to OAEA on or before December 10, 2010, for the Master of Science in Physics, a new graduate program completing its first year of instruction. The third learning objective for the program requires graduate students to
conduct research activities on topics related to the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory (DUSEL) located in Lead, South Dakota. The program expects that at least 90 percent of the theses created will focus on a DUSEL science topic. The assessment report confirmed that 100 percent (albeit, 1/1) of the theses completed in AY 2009–2010 focused on DUSEL. The Master of Science in Physics was authorized by the BoR in response to the opportunities DUSEL provides to the state and nation. Faculty members recognize its significance and expect DUSEL-related science to remain a primary focus of the program. While the above example is small, it is a testament to the significance of assessment and its potential for contributing to the advancement of science and South Dakota’s economic development.

Again, the complete reports for the assessment results identified above and results for other University programs are available in the virtual resource room (Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

**Assessing Targeted Initiatives**

In addition to the annual assessment process for programs, numerous task forces and interdisciplinary committees have assessed targeted initiatives, general learning outcomes, or areas of special concern since USD’s last reaccreditation. In the past decade, these assessments have evaluated the effectiveness of first year programs and processes, math literacy, students’ writing abilities, and more. The initiatives, and many others at the departmental level, have resulted in significant curricular and co-curricular reforms that have had a measurable impact on student learning. The following examples highlight some of the ways USD has used assessment to effectively implement changes which advanced student learning.

**Improving Math**

Early in 2005, concern for student success in Math 102 (College Algebra) led the provost to organize a Math Task Force, which evaluated and assessed math instruction across the University (Initial Math Task Force Notification under Assessment http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III – 22).

As a result, several changes were made in a number of face-to-face Math courses (Math Task Force Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 21). Sections of Math 102 were capped at 40, Supplemental Instruction was instituted, and a mandatory attendance policy was put into place (after four absences the student is dropped). The MathXL, a Web-based computer program, was incorporated into the course, providing instant feedback on problems, step-by-step examples, show-me examples, streaming video of examples being completed, and links to the textbook that show specific examples related to the assignments.

Since these changes have been implemented, results have improved:

- The percentage of students who reported “some” or “higher” on the NSSE category “analyzing quantitative problems” has increased from 93 percent to 95 percent.
- The CAAP Math standard score has increased from 58 to 59, and the CAAP College Algebra subscale has increased from 15 to 16.
- The DFW rates (Assessment Sharepoint Site http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III – 23) in the course have dropped to 39.54 percent, below the national average of 50 percent.
The 2009 DFW report also indicated that success rates (students receiving A-C) for sections of Math 102 that were delivered online (64.18 percent) were better than those for face to face courses (61.01 percent). It should be noted that online classes were capped at 35.

The Mathematics Department also developed a new course that satisfies the same general education goals as Math 102 for some majors. Math 103 is a terminal math course for those majors who do not need calculus and do not intend to take more advanced mathematics or other analytical courses requiring knowledge of algebra. Math 103 makes mathematics directly applicable to students’ lives by using real world problems, similar to other quantitative literacy courses offered nationwide. Math 103 was offered for the first time in fall 2007. A study that ensured the class met the System Wide Graduation Requirement for math led to BoR approval in June 2010 (Math 103 report to BOR http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 20). Students pass MATH103 at a higher rate than MATH102, and such students succeed at higher rates on the mathematics section of the CAAP test, external validation of the course’s value.

Improving Writing

Prompted by concern about the quality of student writing, President Abbott launched a major effort to improve USD’s writing program. A task force formed under his leadership spent the 2003-2004 academic year evaluating the University’s writing instruction. As a result of the task force’s May 2004 final report (Writing Task Force Report & Recommendations http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III-18), significant new resources were invested and changes made:

- A tenure-track, PhD English faculty member replaced the retiring master’s-prepared coordinator of writing.
- Stipends for English teaching assistants were increased to attract a stronger pool of candidates.
- Augmented training and supervision for teaching assistants.
- Enrollment caps on composition courses were reduced and instructional staff hired to cover the additional sections.
- A new five-credit course integrating remedial composition with introductory composition (ENGL 101+) was developed.
- The introductory literature course was redesigned as a composition course and is required for all entering students except those in the Honors Program, which already had a significant writing component.
- Higher standards for all advanced composition courses were implemented.
- The Writing Center was enhanced.
- An ongoing assessment plan was put in place.

Since fall 2005, the University has continued to assess student writing through a test administered at the start and finish of ENGL 101 in the fall and, again, at the end of a required second-semester writing course. Early results from analysis by USD’s Office of Assessment showed that students with low ACT scores who were placed into the five-credit “101+” course made more progress than their
peers with higher ACT scores who were placed into a regular, three-credit ENGL 101, although the 101+ students did not entirely catch up. In the second semester, 101+ students held onto their gains but did not advance further, whereas 101 students did progress. In response to these results, the English Department placed increased emphasis on continued basic skill development in the second semester course. The most recent scores available (2008-09) suggested that this emphasis is having a positive effect as 101+ students continued to close the gap and both groups of students made further gains.

As part of an on-going analysis of writing skill, the University Writing Program Assessment Committee, including three English faculty members, was formed in 2007. During the summers of 2007 and 2008, the committee analyzed randomly selected student writing samples (from ENGL 101 and a required upper-division course with a research paper component) to determine if students were achieving BoR learning outcomes related to writing and how much progress they had made by the time they were juniors or seniors.

The committee found an unacceptably high percentage of upper-class papers included plagiarized material. Partially in response to this finding, USD purchased a university-wide site license to Turnitin.com (http://turnitin.com/static/index.php) (previously available only to lower-division English courses) and provided guidance on its use as an instructional tool through the Center for Teaching and Learning. The University Writing Program Assessment Committee was not active in the summers of 2009 and 2010, when a temporary director of writing did not have the qualifications to lead assessment efforts. The new tenure-track director will continue assessment activities in summer 2011.

**Reviewing Assessment**

The Self-Study survey showed that 76.6 percent of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed with “I consider the program goals of my department when I design my courses.” The clarity and accessibility of these goals make effective assessment possible, and allow faculty to design courses with programmatic goals in mind.” The Self-Study survey also showed that 72.2 percent of the faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed with “I am familiar with the methods USD uses to assess student learning.” The results of the Self-Study survey also indicated that 57.9 percent of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their department does a good job “using assessment data to improve academic programs.” These examples and overall assessment results indicate how assessment at USD has been, and continues to be, a positive and powerful force for change in improving student learning.

**Board of Regents’ Standards for Undergraduate Education**

The South Dakota Board of Regents and the University establish clear requirements for undergraduates that set desired outcomes for everything from effective writing and understanding the potential of diversity to applying fundamental math processes, analyzing and discussing complex issues, and demonstrating a creative and aesthetic understanding.

Effective fall 2005, the South Dakota Board of Regents (BoR) approved a set of seven system-wide goals (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-academic_Affairs/documents/2-7.pdf) and accompanying learning outcomes for the baccalaureate general education curriculum for students at every Regental institution. These system-wide general education requirements and their associated learning outcomes were developed through a collaborative process that involved faculty members.
from across the system. The BoR standards – the goals below – became effective in 2005 and have been integrated into USD’s curricular requirements. The University measures the aggregate success that students as a whole exhibit with each of these outcomes.

Following is an overview of the BoR goals for general education and the system-wide and institutional measurements for assessing them.

- **Goal 1:** Students will write effectively and responsibly and will understand and interpret the written expression of others. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria, NSSE ratings for “writing clearly and effectively,” the CAAP Writing Standard Score, the CAAP Rhetorical Subscale Standard Score, and the CAAP Usage and Mechanics Subscale Standard Score.

- **Goal 2:** Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through listening and speaking. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria for Speech/Communication101 and the NSSE rating for “speaking clearly and effectively.”

- **Goal 3:** Students will understand the organization, potential, and diversity of the human community through study of the social sciences. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria, the CAAP Social Sciences Subscale, and NSSE ratings for “understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds.”

- **Goal 4:** Students will understand the diversity and complexity of the human experience through study of the arts and humanities. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria, the NSSE rating for “working effectively with others,” and the CAAP Arts and Literature Subscale Score.

- **Goal 5:** Students will understand and apply fundamental mathematical processes and reasoning. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria, the CAAP Basic Algebra Subscale Score, the CAAP College Algebra Subscale Score, and the NSSE rating for “analyzing quantitative problems.”

- **Goal 6:** Students will understand the fundamental principles of the natural sciences and apply scientific methods of inquiry to investigate the natural world. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria and the CAAP Science Reasoning Standard Score.

- **Goal 7:** Students will recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, organize, critically evaluate, and effectively use information from a variety of sources with intellectual integrity. Measurements include Course Performance Criteria and the NSSE ratings for “thinking critically and analytically” and “solving complex real-world problems.”

Below are the summarized five-year, University assessment results (Figure 5-1) for the seven system-wide general education goals, including the specific benchmark measures and target criteria. As confirmed by the evidence, the University has met or surpassed 25 of the 31 targets and is within one percentage point of meeting three of the six remaining targets for general education goals. A more complete chart which includes the 2004 baseline year can be found at [http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-affairs/upload/USD-SGR-Summary-Table-AY09-10-Final.pdf](http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-affairs/upload/USD-SGR-Summary-Table-AY09-10-Final.pdf).
### System-Wide Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Goals Associated with Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Benchmark Measures Used</th>
<th>Target Criteria</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>AY05-06*</th>
<th>AY06-07</th>
<th>AY07-08</th>
<th>AY08-09</th>
<th>AY09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1:</strong> Students will write effectively and responsibly and will understand and interpret the written expression of others.</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CAAP Writing Standard Score</td>
<td>63 or Greater</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAAP Rhetoric Subscale Standard Score</td>
<td>16 or Greater</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAAP Usage &amp; Mechanics Subscale Standard Score</td>
<td>16 or Greater</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #2:</strong> Students will communicate effectively and responsibly through listening and speaking.</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #3:</strong> Students will understand the organization, potential, and diversity of the human community through study of the social sciences.</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 3D: The origin and evolution of human institutions.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 3E: The allocation of human or natural resources within societies.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 3F: The Impact of diverse philosophical, ethical or religious views.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CAAP Social Sciences Subscale</td>
<td>16 or Greater</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #4:</strong> Students will understand the diversity and complexity of the human experience through study of the arts and humanities.</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 4C: Identify and explain the contributions of other cultures from the perspective of the selected disciplines within the arts and humanities.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 4D: Demonstrate creative and aesthetic understanding.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 4E: Explain and interpret formal and stylistic elements of the literary or fine arts.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental 4F: Demonstrate foundational competency in reading, writing, and speaking a non-English language.</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CAAP Arts &amp; Literature Subscale</td>
<td>16 or Greater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Working effectively with others</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Aesthetic Experiences Assessment</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional USD Standards for Undergraduate Education

Beyond the seven system-wide general education goals for baccalaureate programs, The University of South Dakota additionally identifies three institution-specific graduation requirements (IGR’s discussed fully in Criterion 4). They emerge from USD’s strong foundation in liberal arts education. The institutional graduation requirements involve effective writing, working and living in a diverse world, and a greater understanding of the fine arts.

The University’s institutional graduate requirements, the benchmark measures used, target criteria, and five-year results are shared in the chart on the next page (Figure 5-2).
### Institutional Graduation Requirements Associated with Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Benchmark Measures Used</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>AY05-06*</th>
<th>AY06-07</th>
<th>AY07-08</th>
<th>AY08-09</th>
<th>AY09-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGR 1: Additional First-year Composition Course</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Students will write effective and responsible critical prose and will understand and interpret the written literary and critical expression of others.</td>
<td>2. CAAP Writing Standard Score</td>
<td>63 or Greater</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR 2: Interdisciplinary Education and Action Program (IdEA)</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Students will be successful working in, living in, and contributing to an increasingly diverse, interdependent world.</td>
<td>2. IDEA Writing Assessment</td>
<td>80% C or Higher</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Students will understand how multiple perspectives affect global issues and ideas.</td>
<td>3. NSSE: Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue</td>
<td>95% rating sometimes or higher</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Students will be able to develop and write a substantial, well-argued research paper, and to analyze and critique the arguments presented by others.</td>
<td>3. NSSE: Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective</td>
<td>95% rating sometimes or higher</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. NSSE: Institutional contribution: Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>95% rating some or higher</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR 3: Aesthetic Experience</td>
<td>1. Course Performance Criteria (Percent of Grades A, B, C and S per enrollment.)</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Students will have a greater understanding of the fine arts as an expression of human imagination and creativity, and will understand the contribution of the arts to self understanding and a more enriched life experience.</td>
<td>2. Aesthetic Experience Assessment</td>
<td>80% or Greater</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SP06 semester only.

Institutional Graduation Requirement 2 changed, effective fall 2010, the IdEA program was discontinued and replaced by a single course XDIS 310: “The Challenge: Success and Happiness.” (2011 XDIS 310 Syllabus [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See I - 76) Assessment results for XDIS 310 are not yet available.
An Extraordinary Education

In summary, USD integrates major, minor, and college/school requirements with the undergraduate general education requirements outlined by the BoR and the University’s institutional graduation requirements to deliver an “Extraordinary Education.”

A world-class education combines a broad understanding of many fields of inquiry with mastery of a specific disciplinary major. At The U, we have purposefully designed a contemporary liberal arts education that includes a solid foundation of knowledge, exposure to many different academic disciplines, immersion in interdisciplinary and diverse ways of thinking, and understanding of service and citizenship. All students at The U follow a flexible course of study that first exposes them to great ideas, but ultimately challenges them to integrate their knowledge in ways that serve their own careers and other citizens. Therefore, the students at The University of South Dakota pursue the following path to complete their college education.

Undergraduate Catalog 2010–2011 (http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=301)

Professional Assessment and Accreditation

The BoR Accreditation Status Report 2009–2010 lists 27 programs or units at USD that have earned professional accreditation. Of course, assessment is critical to professional accreditation and all programs remain in good standing.

(http://www.sdbor.edu/services/academics/ReportsAccountability/documents/accred_status_report_BOR-06.2010.pdf)

CORE COMPONENT 3A: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University has made significant progress in developing a rigorous and meaningful assessment process. Program, institutional, and state-wide learning outcomes are explicit and easily accessible. The campus has developed a framework for systematic assessment and has registered significant improvement in the collection and analysis of assessment data – from both direct and indirect measures. These measures include data from course and program performance, nationally-normed surveys, university- and departmentally-developed rubrics, faculty observation, and more. Evidence shows that the data from multiple levels and types of assessment has been used to improve student learning, both within the programmatic and the University-wide curricula.

CORE COMPONENT 3B

The organization values and supports effective teaching.

The importance of learning at USD is reflected in a wide network of policies, procedures, and resources for both students and faculty that provide a framework to develop exemplary teaching. More importantly, the University embodies a strong tradition and culture of teaching excellence that provides the foundation of the USD experience. Faculty members have access to a full range of development opportunities related to teaching and learning. The Regental Mobile Computing Initiative (MCI) also is
providing additional resources that allow faculty members to incorporate technological innovations into their teaching, as discussed below.

USD’s faculty is composed of teachers who are deeply committed to student learning and to providing an environment in which students can discover their potential and prepare for their future. More than 90 percent of the University’s tenure-track, full-time faculty members have terminal degrees, and in the Self-Study survey, almost 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed with “Of all the activities I engage in, I generally consider teaching to be a top priority.”

**Faculty Develop Curriculum**

Although the provost’s office coordinates the curricular process, faculty play the primary role in determining content and strategies for instruction. Individual faculty members initiate all undergraduate curricular proposals for new courses, and departments initiate proposals for all new programs. Proposals move to school or college curricular committees, in which faculty constitute the majority of the voting membership, and then to the University Curriculum and Instruction Committee, a standing committee of the University Senate that also is composed primarily of faculty. The provost’s office reviews committee approvals; those that require an investment of resources must be approved by the provost and president before they are forwarded to the state-wide Academic Affairs Council (AAC), the Council of Presidents and Superintendents, and the Board of Regents executive director and/or the Board for approval.

The process for graduate course or program proposals is similar. Proposals move from departments to the curriculum committee of the Graduate Council, and then the full council, which is composed primarily of faculty who hold terminal degrees and have full graduate faculty status. The remainder of the process mirrors that for undergraduate proposals.

**Teaching is Rigorously Evaluated**

Every faculty member’s teaching is evaluated through an annual performance evaluation. The Faculty Handbook and the “Expectations of the Faculty” (Faculty-Staff Policies Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See G - 5) document outline the standards used for this evaluation and for promotion and tenure reviews. Individual departments and divisions also have teaching standards specific to their disciplines described within their individual “Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty” documents.

The annual performance evaluation provides a qualitative measure of teaching performance for all faculty members. At a minimum, the evaluation tools include:

- student evaluation results using IDEA, including comments and direct input from students to the supervisor;
- classroom observation(s) by the chair or peers in a manner determined most appropriate and practicable by the unit; and
- descriptive material provided by the faculty member on part A of the Annual Evaluation form.
The IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system gives the University a nationally-normed, quantitative measure of teaching performance of every section and serves as a formative diagnostic tool and as a source for national comparisons. Dramatic increases in nationally-normed faculty IDEA scores from 2006 to 2010 show the impact of USD’s dedication to teaching improvement: (IDEA Faculty Evaluations Results 6-18-10 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 25)

- The percentage of faculty rated above the mean for “Excellent Teacher” increased by 28 points, to 70 percent.
- The percentage of courses rated above the mean for “Excellent Course” increased by 23 points, to 67 percent.
- The percentage of new faculty rated above the mean for “Excellent Teacher” increased by 23.4 points, to 65.4 percent through 2009.
- The percentage of courses taught by new faculty rated above the mean for “Excellent Course” increased by 19.1 points, to 63.2 percent through 2009.
- The Bush report also shows dramatic improvement (Bush Data Report [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - C – 6).

**Rewarding Teaching Excellence**

USD’s annual performance reviews and promotion and tenure processes use salary enhancement to reward exemplary teaching and time spent teaching. This is subject, of course, to the availability of state funding, and, unfortunately, the state allowed no salary augmentation for state employees in 2008-2009 or 2009-2010. Promotion increases, however, have been allowed.

Numerous departmental, college, and university-wide teaching awards also recognize outstanding teachers. The awards often augment faculty salaries and provide evidence the University values effective teaching. They include:

- The Belbas-Larson Awards for Excellence in Teaching are presented to one tenured and one tenure-track member of the faculty. The award consists of a $5,000 prize, a framed certificate, and a commemorative medal.
- The Richard and Sharon Cutler Awards in the Liberal Arts and Sciences honor distinguished faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Three $3,500 awards are given to faculty members who advance liberal arts education through teaching and research over a three-year span.
- Each college and school presents awards, and the provost sends a letter of recognition to all IDEA top performers.
- The Monsignor James Doyle Humanities Teaching Award was inaugurated in 2008–2009 and includes a $500 award to a faculty member in the College of Arts & Sciences.
- The School of Law annually recognizes teaching excellence with the John Wesley Jackson Outstanding Faculty Award.
Supporting Innovative Teaching

The University has invested heavily over the last 10 years in programs and services that support teaching excellence, and the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) [http://www.usd.edu/ctl](http://www.usd.edu/ctl) has been a critical component of the University’s commitment to professional development. Supported by the Bush Foundation, the CTL was established in 2007 as an expansion of the former Center for Instructional Design and Delivery. Its staff of 45 includes about 40 undergraduate Technology Fellows.

The CTL is dedicated to the development of teaching and learning excellence, and it facilitates growth for faculty and staff, from graduate teaching assistants to senior professors. Center activities are designed to help faculty and staff:

- obtain foundational knowledge about various teaching philosophies and teaching strategies and techniques and become aware of the research that supports these activities;
- learn to apply specific teaching and learning strategies in their classes, regardless of delivery mode;
- integrate teaching and learning activities to contexts outside the traditional classroom and beyond the walls of the University;
- care about teaching and their students; and
- utilize resources to continue their own self-directed research in teaching and learning.

The CTL accomplishes these goals through developmental and technical training workshops and conferences augmented by one-on-one assistance from the center’s professional staff, graduate teaching assistants, and Tech Fellows. Workshops have included Best Practices in E-Teaching, Civic Engagement in the Classroom, Problem Students and Student Problems, Fundamentals of Mobile Computing, and Evaluating and Grading Writing.

These programs have been available since 2009 to off-campus participants through the Elluminate Web conference system. The CTL also has scheduled workshops at University Center for Sioux Falls faculty. During the 2009–2010 academic year, 392 individuals from the campus community, including GTAs, faculty at all career levels (including distance faculty), staff, and community members participated in CTL events; many of them participated in multiple programs.

The CTL also has distributed more than 300 books about teaching to new faculty and graduate teaching assistants and through its semester-long reading groups. New faculty members receive Roseanne Cordell et al.’s *Quick Hits for New Faculty,* while GTAs receive *McKeachie’s Teaching Tips.* The reading group selections have included Ken Bain’s *What the Best College Teachers Do,* James Zull’s *The Art of Changing the Brain,* and Maryellen Weimer’s *Learner-Centered Teaching.*

The CTL’s Teaching Excellence Academy (2007–2010 CTL Annual Reports [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II – D – 10-12), a two-day workshop, is scheduled just prior to the start of the spring semester. Faculty members receive stipends to attend the academy, which, over the past four years, has examined topics such as course design, service-learning, mobile computing, and serving veterans with disabilities in the classroom.
Since 2007, the CTL also has awarded faculty members 125 grants totaling $168,632 to support travel, special research projects, speakers, and the scholarship of teaching and learning (2009–2010 CTL Annual Report [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D – 10). In light of the state's fiscal constraints, this level of support has been a clear investment in teaching excellence.

**Training Graduate Teaching Assistants**

USD and its departments are committed to improving the teaching abilities of the graduate teaching assistants. Every fall semester, the Graduate School hosts a two-day orientation/introduction to teaching workshop that all GTAs must attend. Individual departments supplement this with additional training. The English department, for example, organizes an eight-day August workshop for GTAs before the fall semester begins. Topics include diversity in the classroom, discussion leading, grading and commenting on student writing, grammar instruction, using Desire2Learn (the course management software), preventing and responding to plagiarism, teaching research skills, etc. The department asks all new Master of Arts GTAs and any doctoral GTAs who have not taught at the college level to also complete a two-credit “practicum” course that parallels the curriculum of the course they are assigned to teach (ENGL 101: Composition I). A similar one-credit course accompanies the second-semester freshman course (ENGL 210: Introduction to Literature). The director of writing or another faculty member observes the GTA’s classroom performance, and the graduate assistants also are expected to observe each other. All graduate teaching assistants are mentored by faculty members in their respective disciplines while they teach.

**An Active Faculty**

In the last three years, faculty members have attracted an increasing number of grants representing increased external dollars to fund activities related to teaching and learning. Those grants have included $575,582 through the NSF-funded Northern Plains Undergraduate Research Center and $599,150 from NSF for IGERT: Nanostructured Solar Cells.

Members of the faculty and academic administration are active participants in professional and disciplinary organizations on the state, regional, and national levels. Some recent examples include the following:

- Dr. Terry Robertson served as president of the Political Communication Division of the National Communication Association.
- Dr. Gera Jacobs is on the Governing Board of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and is currently a candidate for president of this organization.
- Dr. Randall Waldron serves on the Discipline Review Committee for the Fulbright Scholar Program.
- Ms. Linda Benedict is the national chair of Innovation in Curriculum Design Committee of the National League for Nursing.
- Dr. Lynne Roach serves on the Technology Committee of the National Association of Economic Educators.
- Dr. John Dudley is president of the Stephen Crane Society.
• Dr. Teri Bellis is an elected member of the Council on Academic Accreditation in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

• Dr. Judith Sebesta is the executive secretary of the National Committee for Latin and Greek and is the North Central District chair of the Phi Beta Kappa Society.

• Dr. Paul Bunger is a member of the Committee on Student Affairs of the Association of American Medical Colleges Group on Student Affairs.

• Dr. Joseph Zenel is chair of the USMLE National Board of Medical Examiners Pediatric Subinternship Task Force as well as a member of several other USMLE committees and task forces. He is vice president of the South Dakota Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics and associate editor of Pediatrics in Review, a journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

CRITERION 3B: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University of South Dakota has long valued and supported effective teaching. Over the past ten years this support has grown in a number of ways, most obviously with the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning. This center has provided numerous developmental opportunities for faculty, as well as grants to help fund teaching improvement activities. Highly qualified faculty play a determining role in creating curricular content, and teaching is evaluated through a number of processes. Good teaching is recognized and rewarded at USD, both through special awards and through the regular annual performance appraisal process. External support for pedagogical projects is growing, and faculty members at this institution perform much better than their national peers on the IDEA form. The University of South Dakota clearly supports academic excellence and the development of its faculty into extraordinary teachers. This support has been a crucial element in our students’ learning successes.

CORE COMPONENT 3C

The organization creates effective learning environments.

The University of South Dakota uses assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of its curricula, institutional resources, and student services. In addition to the assessment efforts described above for general education and programs, the University has, over the past few years, engaged in university-wide assessment activities to examine a number of university-wide programs. These efforts have informed the institution’s understanding of the effectiveness of its programs and oftentimes have resulted in significant change.

Improving the First-Year Experience

In the spring semester of 2007, more than 100 USD faculty, staff, students, and administrators completed a comprehensive study of the campus academic environment for first-year students. They did so with support from the USD Foundation, and as part of a larger national project called Foundations of Excellence® in the First Year of College. The study resulted in several significant changes: (Foundations of Excellence Report® http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 15).
• The Academic Advising Center was expanded to provide students with a professional advisor through the completion of the first 48 credit hours and to include a learning specialist (a PhD clinical psychologist) on the advising staff.

• The first year experience program was expanded, and the number of FYE courses was increased.

• Additional resources were invested in Supplemental Instruction to cover more courses.

• In the fall of 2008, the focus of the liberal arts curriculum was revised, resulting in the development of a conceptual framework for the USD liberal arts curriculum. This framework allows students to see more clearly the relevance of the general educational requirements to their future careers and the pathway of courses through which they must progress as they proceed through their degree.

• The Early Alert Program was refined and expanded, and faculty members have begun to participate more fully in this program.

**Academic Advising Restructured**

The Foundations of Excellence® Report, along with an extensive assessment of advising in 2005-2006, resulted in restructuring academic advising in 2007 to include a professional advising model. The change has been accompanied by an increase in first-year retention from 69.33 percent (2001 to 2006) to 74.33 percent for freshmen entering in 2007 and 2008. First-year student response to “how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising” also increased from 2.78 on a 4.0 scale in 2004 to 2.99 in 2008 (Figure 5-3), and USD administrators believe the positive results are partially due to the change in the advising model.

Effective with FY 2010, the Academic Advising Center and the Career Development Center also were joined under one director as the Academic and Career Planning Center. The integration of these two services is expected to engage students with the exploration of career interests and future goals earlier in their college experience.

In comparisons to other institutions, USD is now on a par with its peers for academic advising. The rating is expected to continue to increase as a result of the 2011 restructuring, which moves the consolidated Academic and Career Planning Center into the new Academic Commons (described in core component 3d).
**Figure 5-3**

**NSSE 2004 vs 2008**  
**First Year Student Responses**  
Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Question asked of first-year-students on NSSE</th>
<th>U of South Dakota</th>
<th>U of South Dakota compared with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The USD Advising Model**

New on-campus undergraduate students arrive on campus in the summer before they enroll for Fast Track, a day-long registration program or First-time students who start in the spring go through one of the 4-5 Transfer Registration days that happen between mid-December and the start of classes in January. There are relatively few of them, so this gives them maximum flexibility. They are introduced to the academic requirements of the University and meet with professional advisors or trained faculty members to create their first semester schedule. Students majoring in Business, Education, Nursing, Dental Hygiene, or one of the Fine Arts are assigned either a professional advisor in that school/college or a faculty advisor in the discipline. Students in the College of Arts and Sciences, Alcohol and Drug Studies, Social Work, Health Sciences, and those who have not yet declared a major are assigned to Academic and Career Planning Center Staff. Undergraduate students are assigned a faculty advisor in their major after they complete 48 credit hours or after they select a major, giving them time to explore...
areas of interest. During the first three semesters, advisors also introduce students to the general education and specific college requirements.

Orientation Week connects students to one another and, for the last five years, has included a formal convocation and the Academic and Career Planning Center’s program “How to Flunk Out of College.” A committee headed by the dean of students is currently assessing the effectiveness of USD’s first-year orientation.

Advising on-campus transfer students is similar to working with new first-year students, but the registration program is compressed into a half day. Students meet with professional advisors either in the Academic and Career Planning Center or in their major college/school. Those who have earned more than 48 credit hours are assigned a faculty advisor immediately after their registration program and are encouraged to meet with their major department either that day or soon after classes begin. Students with fewer than 48 credit hours are assigned professional advisors or faculty in the colleges and schools unless they have not declared a major. In the latter case, students are assigned to the Academic and Career Planning Center staff.

Likewise, undergraduate off-campus advising is managed by professional advisors at the off-campus centers who work closely with the on-campus Academic and Career Planning Center staff and professional and faculty advisors in the colleges and schools. The off-campus advising plan is summarized in the virtual resource room (Advising Structure: Off-Campus & Distance [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See I - 25).

Finally, graduate students are advised by graduate faculty in their respective academic programs.

The Academic and Career Planning Center’s website ([http://www.usd.edu/advising](http://www.usd.edu/advising)) is available to the university community, providing information to help students succeed academically and support faculty members in their advisory role. Regular Academic and Career Planning Center surveys and NSSE results have shown that its programs are effective.

- In 2008, NSSE results indicated that 75 percent of first-year students and 67 percent of seniors reported that the quality of their academic advising had been “good” or “excellent.” These scores place USD at the same level of satisfaction as that of similar Carnegie schools in the 2008 sample.

- The 2010 HLC Self-Study survey indicated that 66.5 percent of current students agree or strongly agree with the statement “Advising at USD adequately promotes student success.”

**Improving Access to Student Support**

The 2008 NSSE results indicated that students did not believe USD had the most “supportive campus environment” when compared to other institutions in its Carnegie class. In response, the University chose to consolidate services to provide students with the support they need and desire.

Previously, services were disjointed because of their geographic locations on campus. The new Academic Commons on the first floor of the I.D. Weeks Library building provides the campus community with convenient, one-stop access to academic, technical and research support. The commons includes many resources to help students conduct research, write a paper, seek technical support, get help
from a tutor, meet with an advisor, visit informally with a professor, have a cup of coffee, and see friends between classes:

- University Libraries
- Writing Center
- Presentation Center
- Math Lab
- Center for Academic Engagement: Global Learning, Service Learning, Undergraduate Research
- Information Technology Services
- Academic and Career Planning
- Learning Specialists
- Supplemental Instruction
- Tutoring

Assessing Student Satisfaction and Educational Quality

Various assessments from the past three years have indicated that USD students are generally quite positive about the quality of the educational experience at USD. The 2008 NSSE, for example, showed that 87 percent of first-year students and 81 percent of seniors reported that their educational experience has been “good” or “excellent.” The results for first-year students were higher than those for similar Carnegie schools (84 percent) and the NSSE 2008 sample (86 percent). Between 2006 and 2008, NSSE scores for seniors showed an increase of 2.5 points for the category “Level of Academic Challenge.”

The University’s 2010 Self-Study survey also showed several indicators of student satisfaction:

- 91.6 percent of alumni and 87.3 percent of current students agree or strongly agree with the statement “The overall quality of teaching at USD is good.”
- 88.1 percent of students and 91.8 percent of alumni agree or strongly agree with the statement “USD provides a quality education for its students.”
- 81.9 percent of students and 74.4 percent of alumni report that USD is “good” or “excellent” at “increasing the ability of students to write well.”
- 82.1 percent of students and 80.6 percent of alumni report that USD is “good” or “excellent” at “increasing the ability of students to demonstrate critical thought.”
- 85.1 percent of students and 87.2 percent of alumni report that USD is “good” or “excellent” at “increasing students’ breadth of knowledge.”
- 83.6 percent of students and 85.2 percent of alumni report that USD is “good” or “excellent” at “increasing the ability of students to use technology to obtain knowledge.”
• 83.4 percent of the current students and alumni agree or strongly agree with the statement “Academic programs at USD challenge students to work hard.”

When compared to national averages, USD students consistently performed as well as or better than their peers on aptitude and basic-learning tests. For example:

• During the 2009-2010 academic year, 65 percent of the USD student CAAP scores in Science and 58.60 percent of the student CAAP scores in Writing were in the top 50 percent nationally (Figure 5-4).

**Figure 5-4**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>2009–2010 CAAP Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td><strong>Percent of USD Students in Top 1 percent Nationally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Math</td>
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<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of USD Students in top 5 percent Nationally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of USD Students in Top 50 percent Nationally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
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</table>

(CAAP Results [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See E - 17-19)

• Over the past 10 semesters, Beacom School of Business students taking the ETS examination have averaged a placement in the 85th percentile (Results of ETS Major Field Test 2002–2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See B - 13).

• In 2010, students in the online MBA program taking the ETS placed in the top five percent nationally in the categories of Marketing and Management and finished in the top ten percent in categories of Finance, Managerial Accounting, and Strategic Integration. The online, Vermillion, and Sioux Falls cohorts all have placed in the top five percent overall on this test during the 2009-2010 academic year (MBA-ETS Scores Summary 2007–2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See B - 14).

• Education students taking the Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test: on reading performed 1.5 points better (on a 200 point scale) than the national average, on writing performed
1.5 points better than the national average, and on math performed 5 points better than the national average (Praxis Series I, II, III Results [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Academic Units. See C - 15-17).

• Over the past 10 years, USD students have averaged an 88.8 percent pass rate on the Audiology Section of the National Teacher’s Exam, compared to 75 percent nationally (Licensure & Certification Exam 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 38 pg. 4).

• Over the past eight years, 95 percent of the students in the Speech Pathology program have passed the National Examination in Speech Language Pathology, compared to 75 percent nationally (Licensure & Certification Exam 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 38 pg. 20).

• From 2002–2009, 95 percent of the students of USD’s Dental Hygiene have passed the National Board of Dental Hygiene Examination, compared to 95.8 nationally (Licensure & Certification Exam 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 38 pg. 6).

• Over the past five years, 98 percent of the students in USD’s Occupational Therapy program have passed the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy, compared to 83.3 percent nationally (Licensure & Certification Exam 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 38 pg. 14).

• Since 2007, the first year USD offered a Doctorate in Physical Therapy, 90.56 percent of USD students in this program have passed the National Physical Therapy Board Exam, compared to 88.36 nationally (Licensure & Certification Exam 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See B - 38 pg. 16).

The Role of Student Services in Creating an Effective Learning Environment

The Division of Student Services plays an integral role in delivering an extraordinary University education. The Division is led by the dean of students and is comprised of the following offices managed by 32 staff members and a host of graduate assistants ([http://www.usd.edu/studentservices]).

• Event Planning and Scheduling ([http://www.usd.edu/eventplanning])
• International Student Services ([http://www.usd.edu/isko])
• Muenster University Center ([http://www.usd.edu/muc])
• Native Student Services ([http://www.usd.edu/campus-life/student-services/native-student-services/index.cfm])
• Sorority and Fraternity Life ([http://www.usd.edu/greek])
• Student Counseling Center ([http://www.usd.edu/scc])
• Student Government Association ([http://www.usd.edu/sga])
• Student Health Services ([http://www.usd.edu/shs])
• Student Rights and Responsibilities (http://www.usd.edu/srr)
• U Dining (http://www.usd.edu/dining)
• University Housing (http://www.usd.edu/housing)
• Wellness Center (http://www.usd.edu/wellness)
• Bookstore (http://usd.bkstore.com)

The student service arm of the University provides a rich array of support to students and families, and learning experiences that are a component of the total educational experience at The University of South Dakota. Over one hundred student organizations (http://www.usd.edu/orgs) provide avenues for student participation and co-curricular learning. From the Accounting Club to Club Sports, students have ample opportunities to socialize, learn, and be engaged.

While each support service cannot be described in this report, the role of the Student Government Association (SGA) deserves special mention. The SGA serves as the liaison between students and the administration, faculty, staff, and the Board of Regents. The association enhances communication, understanding, and cooperation among these constituents and, each year, allocates resources to student organizations to provide cultural, recreational, social, and intellectual opportunities outside the classroom.

Other student service areas that promote and help the University create an effective and safe learning environment include:

• Admissions (http://admissions.usd.edu)
• Public Safety (http://www.usd.edu/publicsafety)
• Registrar (http://www.usd.edu/registrar)
• Marketing (http://www.usd.edu/urelations)
• Financial Aid and Scholarships (http://www.usd.edu/financial-aid)

**Athletic Competition Contributes To the Learning Environment**

Athletic competition at the Division I level contributes to the University learning environment. USD athletes, for example, bring great ethnic and regional diversity to campus. Athletes perform very similarly to non-athletes on most academic measures, with superior performances in some areas, especially in the general education core. Of course, athletics also brings great excitement to campus as a student activity.

Coyotes are members of the Great West Conference, the Summit League (beginning league play in 2011–2012), and the Missouri Valley Football Conference (2012-2013). Men's sports include basketball, cross country, football, golf, swimming and diving, and track and field. Women's sports include basketball, cross country, golf, soccer, softball, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field, and volleyball. (http://www.usdcoyotes.com)
CORE COMPONENT 3C: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University of South Dakota is committed to providing a holistic learning environment that provides its students with the opportunity to learn both in and out of the classroom and to participate in service-learning activities. This commitment is validated by the academic success of USD students. The programs and activities described above critically support excellent teaching and exceptional learning, and, in the process, help make the University’s learning environment extraordinary.

CORE COMPONENT 3D

The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

Institutional investments in both infrastructure and programmatic support reflect the University’s commitment to providing an outstanding environment in which to teach and learn. USD also is committed to encouraging student learning by limiting enrollment in key first-year courses such as English and mathematics, although the current fiscal crisis is forcing the University to increase class size in a few carefully selected courses. Overall, 73 percent of undergraduate courses and 71 percent of 100- and 200-level courses enroll fewer than 30 students. The organization’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

Enhancing Learning

The University has developed a number of distinctive programs and specialized student support programs that are designed to enhance students’ learning experiences, both inside and outside of the traditional classroom.

The Honors Program immerses academically talented and highly motivated students in smaller, discussion-oriented classes. The classes complement the work done for students’ majors and culminate in a senior thesis. From 2001 to 2010, first-to-second year retention for students who joined the Honors Program averaged just over 90 percent or 14.9 percentage points more than non-Honors students with ACT scores of 27 or higher. Honors students also graduate at a rate nearly double that of non-Honors students, even when compared to a similar cohort of talented students (ACT over 27). From 2004-2005 to 2008–2009, the Honors Program grew almost 20 percent, from 308 to 369 students. Twenty-eight faculty members representing 13 disciplines and units taught 41 sections of Honors coursework in 2008–2009, and more than 45 faculty members helped direct one or more senior theses.

The First Year Experience Program (http://www.usd.edu/fye) consists of communities of 20 students who share the same residence hall, a block schedule of classes, and a faculty mentor who teaches a first year seminar. Students participate in academic, social, and campus experiences beyond those available to most first-year students. The program, which started with 150 students (15 percent of cohort) in 2003, grew to 326 participants (34 percent of the cohort) by 2009. Assessment of the First Year Experience shows it has been remarkably successful in increasing both student success and student retention (Figure 5-5).
The Center for Academic Engagement (http://www.usd.edu/engage) enhances the learning experiences of students outside the classroom. This center engages students in hands-on opportunities to gain real-world experience, knowledge and skills. The center’s programs include:

- Global Learning (Study Abroad, Faculty-Led Study Tours, and National Student Exchange) allows students to study abroad on USD sponsored or affiliated programs; participate in an affiliated program sponsored by another university or study abroad organization, or study away at a U.S. or Canadian institution on National Student Exchange.

- Undergraduate Research operates in collaboration with the Council for Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity to foster undergraduate research opportunities. Students – including those in their first year – are encouraged to join research teams, earn mini-grants, present at national conferences, and conduct research.

During the AY 2009–2010, 277 students presented their research, creative activity, and other experiential learning projects at the 2010 IdeaFest. A USD undergraduate displayed her poster at the prestigious Council on Undergraduate Research “Posters on the Hill” event in Washington, D.C., and two others presented their research as part of a comprehensive research showcase in Pierre during the legislative session. Eleven students were funded as U Discover Scholars and spent the summer creating and researching on campus with faculty partners.

Supplemental Instruction (SI) (http://www.usd.edu/fye/supplemental-instruction.cfm) provides peer-to-peer instruction for traditionally difficult courses. SI Leaders attend class lectures and hold review sessions two or three times a week, using interactive learning techniques to help students integrate and comprehend course material. Students work together to compare notes, discuss readings, ask questions, develop organizational tools, and prepare for examinations. During spring 2009, the Academic Advising Center provided SI for students in 21 courses. Of 2,452 students who received grades in those courses, 35.4 percent (869) participated in at least one SI session. In 19 of the 21 courses, students who participated in SI had higher average course grades than students who did not participate. DFW rates averaged 13.6 percent for students who participated in SI, compared to 29 percent for students who did not, even though participants had slightly lower ACT average scores (23.40 compared to 23.86).
Students who qualify for Student Support Services (SSS), a program supported through a TRIO grant, have traditionally received free tutoring services. In 2008, the Athletics Department provided $10,000 for tutors to also assist student-athletes in a variety of classes. In 2009, Academic Affairs added funds so students who were not involved in University athletics and who did not qualify for SSS could receive tutoring at no cost. Tutoring was consolidated under the Supplemental Instruction coordinator based in the new Academic and Career Planning Center, and SI leaders were also recruited to serve as high quality tutors. Tutors also received more training, and additional resources were provided to expand tutoring services. Although the federal SSS grant ended in August 2010 and was not renewed, Academic Affairs identified additional funding and consolidated all of the university tutoring services under the Supplemental Instruction/Tutoring Coordinator.

The Writing Center (http://www.usd.edu/academics/academic-advising/writing-center.cfm) connects students, faculty, and staff with writing consultants, who help them develop their writing skills. The impact of the augmented training for writing consultants that was introduced in the fall of 2008 is evident in an increase in student satisfaction. Based on Writing Center assessments from fall 2007 to spring 2008, students reported, on a scale from 1-5 (5 being “strongly agree”) that:

• advice provided by the consultant was helpful (4.56 for fall 2007; 4.76 for spring 2008);
• writing improved as a result of attending Writing Center sessions (4.15 for fall 2007; 4.51 for spring 2008);
• papers improved as a result of their Writing Center session (4.64 for fall 2007; 4.72 for spring 2008).

The effectiveness of the Writing Center has been accompanied by an increase in its one-on-one student contacts. From fall 2006 to spring 2008, student use of the Writing Center services, including the Dakota Hall Writing Center, the Online Writing Center, and I.D. Weeks Satellite sessions, increased from 189 students attending 824 sessions to 338 students attending 939 sessions. Writing Center services are being extended to off-campus students via Elluminate. The Web conference system, first purchased and used in 2007, allows instructors to communicate with their students in a synchronous Web environment and records these interactions for students to access later. With the move to the more accessible Academic Commons and the addition of a new Presentation Center to enhance student presentations immediately adjacent to it, Writing Center use continues to increase.

Math Help, staffed by upper-division undergraduates and teaching assistants, provides assistance for all levels of mathematics courses. This resource has been widely utilized and highly rated by students taking math courses, as the indicated by the following (note that the method of assessing use changed the fall semester of 2008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mentoring Sessions Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1,104 student mentoring sessions provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>851 mentoring sessions provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>1,146 student mentoring sessions provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>668 mentoring sessions provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>487 students spent a total of 707.5 hours in the Math Help Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>199 students spent a total of 288.75 hours in the Math Help Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>603 students spent a total of 883.25 hours in the Math Help Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Math Help will join the Writing Center and other academic support services in the Academic Commons in spring 2011 as a Math Emporium in which students can work through problem sets online at their own pace with the support of on-site math instructional staff and tutors.

Disability Services (http://www.usd.edu/disabilityservices) provides services and support to ensure that all students are able to access and participate in the range of activities, programs, and services at USD. These services are available to students with a qualifying and documented learning, physical, or psychological disability. Since tracking began in 2005, 210 students, on average, have registered each year with Disability Services, and 100 students, on average, actively use the services each semester. A 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey of Disability Services (http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - E – 3) showed that, of students who had a basis to decide:

- 93.62 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The process of registering with Disability Services in order to receive academic accommodations is relatively simple and painless.”
- 93.75 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The Disability Services staff are readily available to arrange for and provide services or to deal with particular problems.”
- 93.48 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I am able to discuss my disability, academic accommodations, or other topics with the Disability Services director in a private setting.”
- 97.73 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The Disability Services director understands my concerns and involves me in the accommodation process.”
- 91.11 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The guidance and advising services provided by Disability Services are helpful and effective.”
- 91.67 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Disability Services makes reasonable efforts to coordinate my academic accommodations in a timely manner and during the semester needed.”
- 91.67 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I am comfortable contacting Disability Services with questions or concerns.”
- 97.14 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The campus buildings and grounds at The University of South Dakota are accessible to me.”
- 80 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “The University of South Dakota takes positive steps in assuring the campus is accessible.”
- 95.56 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “My academic accommodations contribute to my academic success.”
- 95.56 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Overall, my experience with Disability Services has been positive.”
Another role that Disability Services plays is that of informing faculty of their rights and responsibilities in serving students with disabilities. The 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey of Disabilities Services also found that, of students who had a basis to decide:

- 95.56 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Faculty are sensitive toward my needs and are aware of my disability’s impact in an educational setting.”
- 95.35 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Faculty are responsive and supportive in providing my academic accommodations.”
- 97.67 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I trust my professors to maintain confidentiality regarding my disability.”
- 84.78 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I am comfortable discussing my academic accommodations with the faculty.”

**Library Resources Widely Available**

The University Libraries support the University’s educational mission by assuring ready access to a wide range of information resources held locally and worldwide; by teaching information literacy, research, and critical thinking skills for academic endeavors and lifelong learning; and by providing an aesthetic, congenial and stimulating learning and working environment. The USD library system consists of the I. D. Weeks Library, the Christian P. Lommen Health Sciences Library, the McKusick Law Library, and the Karl and Mary Jo Wegner Health Science Information Center in Sioux Falls.

The combined University Libraries provide access to more than 1 million cataloged items. In cooperation with the South Dakota Library Network (SDLN), students have access to more than 5.6 million items that are shared through the Aleph online catalog. In addition, indexed access is provided to more than 9 million articles (many of them in full text) through more than 300 database subscriptions held by the four university libraries.

The University Libraries have progressively moved toward providing more online access by increasing online subscriptions for serials and books. In 2009, 83.7 percent of the serials and journals were online-only, 28 percent were print-only, and 16.3 percent were in both formats. The number of subscriptions to electronic books has grown to include reference works and access to 9,129 e-books.

Consortium agreements for journal packages and online database subscriptions provide access to additional materials. Agreements between the University and ESIG, for example, broaden coverage of Wiley/Blackwell journals beyond USD’s individual title subscriptions. Agreements with Minitex expand access to all American Chemical Society journals and to Elsevier/Science Direct journals. The South Dakota Board of Regents provides consortium agreements for Web of Knowledge databases and reports and APS/AIP journals through Scitation. Chemical Abstracts Services’ SciFinder Scholar also is partially funded by the state. USD has access to 224 databases through local subscriptions, shared consortium agreements, and free sources. By 2009, there were 58,765 unique titles of online resources, representing 50,791 journals and 7,974 e-books.

In fall 2009, the University Libraries Committee sponsored a strategic planning session. Its purpose was to invite the larger University community to participate in planning the future of USD’s libraries in light of rapid changes in information formats and types of library usage. Participants included students,
The sessions focused on identifying enduring values and developing a vision for library use based on a set of prioritized goals. Assessment of the library is ongoing, and its future development will be based on the findings of this and subsequent assessment activities (Libraries FY10 Progress in Strategic Plan [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units See K - 18).

The University Libraries’ began to develop a culture of assessment since 2008. The University Libraries participate in the annual Web-based student survey conducted by Student Services each spring to discover current student attitudes toward hours and services. Beginning in spring 2009, hours were increased per week by 20 to accommodate student desire to use the University Libraries until 2 a.m. A number of convenience services were added in the University Libraries in recent years to enhance student productivity such as food vending, office supply vending, lockers, fax machine, digital editing equipment, adaptive technology station, and video viewing.

Usage of all of the electronic resources provided to the USD population is monitored. Resources include individual journal subscriptions, journal package subscriptions, databases, individual e-books, and e-book packages. As subscriptions come up for renewal, library staff study the usage data, calculate a cost per use figure, cancel titles with low usage or high cost per use, and consider the addition of new resources. Subscriptions were shifted to the least expensive format (normally online only) by September 2010.

The University Libraries conducted the standardized LibQUAL+ web-based survey of service quality in March 2009 and intends to conduct it every three years. The University Libraries are looking forward to finding out how students, faculty, and staff perceive changes in space, collections, and services after the implementation of the Academic Commons in January 2011. The LibQUAL+ results indicated that USD undergraduate perceptions of the University Libraries were better than those for other colleges and universities that administered the survey at the same time while graduate student perceptions matched the norm. Some of the USD faculty perceptions deviated significantly from those of other schools who took the survey at the same time. The University Libraries performed much better on giving individual attention, having caring staff, and providing spaces for group learning and study. The Libraries performed lower than the norm in comparison to other schools on access to journals, books, and other library materials needed for research and learning as well as making the resources available from home or office along with a suitable website for locating information independently. The richest benefit of conducting the LibQUAL+ survey came from the free response comments supplied by the respondents. A content analysis of the 300 comments resulted in a to-do list. The University Libraries have worked diligently since this assessment to improve collections, services, spaces, and the website.

**Improving Information Technology**

Information Technology Services (ITS) manages 47 labs with 663 computers in Vermillion, Rapid City, Sioux Falls, and Yankton. By January 2011, ITS had increased to 88 the number of “smart classrooms” — rooms fully wired for computer use, including sound and projection systems, DVD/VCR playback capability, and a computer station that allows the instructor to control all the technology.

ITS supports student learning by providing:

- network and internet connectivity for access to learning and communication resources;
- personal computer and software support through the Help Desk;
ongoing relationships with vendors to provide low cost options for personal computing products and productivity software at educational pricing;

• continued support for computer labs and smart classrooms to provide the benefits of technology in the everyday learning environment; and

• technology infrastructure for the residence halls.

ITS also supports faculty with:

• network, internet connectivity, and data storage resources;

• continued development, support and training materials in new and upgraded smart classrooms and labs;

• ongoing maintenance and support for course delivery software and platforms;

• specialized resources for faculty engaged in research projects;

• personal computer and software support through the Help Desk; and

• exploration of new technologies.

The University’s Information Technology Services regularly assesses its performance in terms of user satisfaction through surveys which request respondents to rate ITS’ level of service. As confirmed by the results of the most recent survey, the majority of users give ITS high ratings for the services they perform (2010 ITS Faculty/Staff Survey http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See L - 12).

The Board of Regents established the Mobile Computing Initiative (MCI) in 2009 to support the development of a wireless infrastructure on campus and professional development for faculty related to the use of mobile technology in the classroom. The initiative, funded through student fees, enabled the University to install wireless technology for every classroom by fall 2010.

Support for the Effective Use of Technology

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers most of its face-to-face workshops online through Elluminate, and recordings of all workshops are available to faculty through the USD portal, allowing off-campus faculty members to regularly participate in them. Over the past two years, 406 individuals, including students, GTAs, faculty at all career levels (including distance faculty), staff, and community members participated in faculty development or technical training events sponsored by the CTL. In addition, 493 individual help requests were successfully resolved by the CTL staff. Undergraduate Tech Fellows provided 15,365 hours of technical support to 308 members of the faculty and teaching staff.

Teaching and learning are continually affected by the development of new technology, and the self-study survey indicated that 60.0 percent of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Classroom technology at USD effectively supports my teaching.”

Investing in Learning Resources

Despite the state’s fiscal crisis, USD continues to invest in student learning.

• The Academic Advising Center added 4 FTEs in 2007, including a Learning Specialist.
• Academic and Career Planning will add 1.5 FTEs by 2011 to support student-athletes as the University moves to Division I.

• Supplemental Instruction, which hires student mentors to hold additional, optional class sessions for traditionally difficult academic courses, has added 10 student leaders (for a total of 22) in the past three years.

• The Center for Teaching and Learning added 3 FTEs in 2010 and will add one more in 2011 to support new technologies in the classroom and better serve military veterans with disabilities.

• In addition, the CTL is the home of the Technology Fellow Program, which employs talented undergraduates to support the effective use of technology. Although the program has faced fiscal challenges, the BoR has recommitted to the program, and USD currently employs 40 Tech-fellows.

Assessing Space Needs

In the fall of 2009, a campus-wide assessment of learning spaces was begun. The Academic Building Task Force is examining current classroom facilities with the goal of developing better learning spaces throughout the institution, especially in relationship to the statewide Mobile Computing Initiative. USD recognizes that learning takes place at all times, in all parts of the university environment, and the evaluative work of this committee reinforces USD's commitment to designing and improving learning spaces throughout the campus. The committee has removed several classrooms from the active classroom inventory, recommended centralized classroom scheduling and more standardized class schedules, and continues to evaluate classroom needs.

A central scheduling process was put into place for fall 2010 to increase the efficiency of how classroom space is utilized and to focus instruction in quality classrooms.

CRITERION 3D: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University of South Dakota commits considerable resources to support student learning and effective teaching. This commitment is recognized by faculty, staff, and students, and in the budgeting of resources. Even in times of fiscal scarcity, the University has been willing to increase support for student learning and effective teaching, and the evidence above indicates that USD meets this core component.

CRITERION THREE: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

The goals for student learning are clearly stated for each educational program, for the institution, and for the Board of Regents, and faculty take these goals into consideration when they design courses and curricula. Student learning outcomes for individual educational programs are set and revised through the formal assessment process and are reported annually to the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment. Learning outcomes associated with both the institutional and system-wide graduation requirements are found in student catalogs and online.
The University engages in assessment at the program level through the Assessment Plan and uses a combination of special task forces and broad-based evaluative tools to measure success. Furthermore, instruments such as the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the general education curricula and institutional graduation requirements. Overall, assessment at The University of South Dakota results in meaningful change which improves teaching and learning.

Engagement in the plan shows that the assessment and evaluation process is becoming an integral part of teaching at USD and is an important indicator that USD’s assessment plan is effective. While there is still variability across departments in terms of the quality of their assessment plans and the investment in them, significant progress has been made toward increasing assessment. The results of the Self-Study survey indicate that 62 percent of the faculty and 64.4 percent of the students agree or strongly agree with the statement “The assessment of student learning is a priority at USD.”

The University of South Dakota has long valued and supported effective teaching. Over the past ten years this support has grown in a number of ways, most obviously with the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning. The Center has provided numerous developmental opportunities for faculty as well as grants to help fund teaching improvement activities, and external support for pedagogical projects is growing. Highly qualified faculty play a determining role in creating curricular content, and teaching is evaluated through a number of processes. Faculty members at USD perform much better than their national peers on the IDEA survey. Good teaching is recognized and rewarded at USD, both through special awards and through the annual salary process.

However, the lack of annual raises over the last two years has dampened morale to some extent and undermined recent progress in salary competitiveness. Nonetheless, The University of South Dakota clearly supports academic excellence, and the development of its faculty as teachers. This support has been a crucial element in students’ learning successes.

The University of South Dakota is committed to supporting a holistic learning environment that provides all its students with the opportunity to learn both in and out of the classroom. This commitment is validated by the academic success that USD students show when compared to their peers. Together, all the programs critically support excellent teaching and exceptional learning and, in the process, help make the University’s learning environment outstanding.

The University’s support of student learning and effective teaching is recognized by faculty, staff, and students, and manifested in resource allocations and budget priorities. Even in times of fiscal austerity, the institution has been willing to increase support for student learning and effective teaching, and the evidence indicates that USD meets this core component. While the University continually monitors how best to give students access to the resources needed to support learning and teaching, both faculty and students also indicate that they believe USD is currently meeting this core component.

**Future Considerations**

The Self-Study process has identified areas of special challenge that the University will need to address.

The fiscal downturn in the state is a threat to the resources that support effective teaching and student learning.
The fiscal climate that the State and University face has been austere, and University budget reductions have created challenges. In some program areas class sizes are expanding to save resources. The university has been forced to eliminate faculty positions, which it has done primarily by leaving retirements and vacancies unfilled. This has meant that some areas have been disproportionally affected by the cuts.

Progress in this Area:

• The budget reduction committee described in Criterion 2 is generating new ideas to save resources and provide budget updates to the University community.

• Increases in class size are being offset by innovative uses of technology, and a new interactive classroom featuring a potent combination of technological and pedagogical innovations was introduced in the fall of 2010.

• A thorough and ongoing review of learning spaces was conducted in 2009–2010 so that the University may most efficiently plan maintenance and renovation of its classrooms.

• The Mobile Computing student fee is providing resources to upgrade the technology available in classrooms.

The University community is still learning to use the assessment process to its full potential.

While implementation of the assessment process is nearly universal, some programs are still discovering how to use it effectively, learning to both implement the plan and align their procedures with the University process. The provost and other high-level administrators have made assessment a priority.

Progress is being made, especially with a new director for the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment (hired in 2008), who brings new energy and enthusiasm to the office. As a result:

• Programs have begun to more effectively utilize the concepts and language of learning objectives and to match these objectives to actual measures.

• Data is being collected and analyzed that allows the institution to track student progress toward institutional goals, and the institution now has a greater ability to track and analyze student subgroups (minorities, students from small towns, etc.).

• In collaboration with the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment, a “Best Practices of Assessment” workshop was offered in fall 2010 (and will be offered every fall) through the Center for Teaching and Learning.
Chapter 6: Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge
The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

USD supports a breadth of learning through its core curriculum, research opportunities, crosscollege integration, external evaluation, and opportunities for specialized studies and extracurricular engagement. The University provides a fertile ground for intellectual exploration by bringing together appropriate physical facilities, resources, and residential scholars and visiting experts. Students and faculty are supported for travel outside of the University and outside of the country for purposes of collaboration and the dissemination and acquisition of new ideas.

The organization demonstrates through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff that it values a life of learning.

Academic freedom is essential to any institution that fosters the pursuit of knowledge and encourages creativity. It includes the right to study, discuss, investigate, teach, and publish, and lies at the heart of teaching, research and learning. In South Dakota, the Board of Regents (BoR) sets the standard for academic inquiry and learning.

The Board recognizes academic freedom:

“...the right to study, discuss, investigate, teach and publish. Academic freedom applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of students in freedom in learning. It includes the freedom to perform one’s professional duties and to present differing and sometimes controversial points of view, free from reprisal. The faculty member is entitled to freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the performing of other assigned academic duties.” SDBoR policy 1:11 (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/1-Governance/documents/1-11.pdf)

The Board also encourages freedom to learn:

To secure student freedom in learning, faculty members in the classroom and in seminar should encourage free and orderly discussion, inquiry and expression of the course subject matter. Student performance may be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards. SDBoR policy 1:11 (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/1-Governance/documents/1-11.pdf)

Supporting Professional Development

To further encourage and stimulate intellectual growth, the University provides and supports professional development for faculty and staff through many programs, including an extensive
library collection that is increasingly available online. (http://www.usd.edu/library/services.cfm) The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), for example (discussed fully in Criterion 3) is “dedicated to the development of extraordinary teaching and learning, and facilitates growth for staff and faculty from graduate teaching assistants to senior professors.” The Center offers developmental and training workshops, one-on-one staff assistance, and competitive grants to divisions, departments, full- and part-time faculty members, and graduate teaching assistants for travel, workshops, invited speakers, and other opportunities to advance best teaching practices throughout the careers of faculty members.(http://www.usd.edu/ctl/development-and-training.cfm)

The Division of Continuing and Distance Education (CDE) (discussed fully in Chapter 8), in collaboration with the CTL, provides training and resources for course development and for instructors who are involved in online and off-site course delivery. The online support resources include an Online Faculty Handbook (Faculty-Staff Policies (http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See G - 5) and Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs (Best Practices for Distance Education (http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 26). Both CDE and CTL staff support faculty in extending courses in new delivery modes. Encouraging faculty members to enhance their technology skills and learn the art of distance instruction results in a broad community of life-long learners and a rich source of future adjunct faculty for the Division of Continuing and Distance Education. Retired faculty are commonly employed part time, providing a source of well-qualified faculty.

Sabbatical leaves also underscore the University’s commitment to professional development and scholarship. BoR policy allows sabbatical leave for up to five percent of the faculty each year, but the numbers have been lower due to fiscal and staffing constraints. The dollar value of sabbatical and other supported leaves, however, reached more than $1.4 million from 2007 to the present.

In addition, the University has supported members of the faculty and administrative team to attend the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard, various discipline-based deans’ conferences, training for chairs, and meetings of national educational organizations such as the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the Higher Learning Commission’s (HLC) annual meetings and its specialized training, and the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). All provide professional development to faculty and staff.

**Graduate School Encourages a Life of Learning**

Graduate education is another example of the University’s commitment to the continuum of learning. Students advance their learning through 16 doctoral programs, 37 master’s degrees, 3 specialist degrees, and 5 graduate certificates (61 total graduate programs). In fall 2010, USD enrolled 2,931 unduplicated graduate students or 28.8 percent of the total University student head count (Fall 2010 Final Enrollment Report (http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 65). The demand for the University’s graduate programs is strong as evidenced by a 19.73 percent (9.85 percent FTE) increase in on-campus and off-campus graduate students. The growth rate was 11.82 percent (6.69 percent FTE) for on-campus graduate students and 25 percent (16.65 percent FTE) for off-campus graduate students. In fall 2010, 24 percent of the University’s graduate enrollments were comprised of students who completed a baccalaureate program at USD and 38.5 percent were graduates of another BoR sponsored institution, confirming that USD’s Graduate School is a first choice among many South Dakota baccalaureate completers.
A thriving graduate program is essential for a highly evolved society, which needs trained and educated professionals in science, technology, education, health care, business, government, the social sciences, and numerous other fields. Graduate education at USD is designed to serve society’s needs and plays a pinnacle role in intellectual expansion.

With the exception of the law school and the medical school, graduate programs fall under the umbrella of the Graduate School led by a graduate dean who also serves as the dean for the Division of Continuing and Distance Education. The graduate dean reports to the provost and is responsible for

- articulating a vision for excellence in the graduate community,
- providing quality control for all aspects of graduate education,
- maintaining equitable standards across all disciplines,
- defining what graduate education is and is not,
- providing an institution-wide, interdisciplinary perspective, and
- serving as an advocate for graduate education.

The University of South Dakota embraces both research and practice-oriented graduate programs. The central issue in research-oriented programs is advancing true knowledge in a discipline. For practice-oriented programs, the central focus is, generally, the practice in the profession. The graduate catalog (http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?navoid=311&catoid=8) provides a description of graduate programs and the policies which govern them.

Encouraging Research

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies the undergraduate programs at The University of South Dakota as “balanced Arts & Sciences/Professions, with a high graduate coexistence.” The Carnegie Basic Classification (http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/lookup_listings/view_institution.php?unit_id=219471&start_page=institution.php&clq=%7B%22first_letter%22%3A%22U%22%7D) is given as DRU for Doctoral/Research Universities, noting that the “research activity measure is at the high category.” Ongoing research and scholarship across the campus allow faculty, staff, and students to explore new ideas and re-imagine what is possible. USD values faculty support of student research and encourages students to engage in research and scholarship during their academic careers.

In a setting that balances undergraduate and graduate programs, the University integrates discovery and practice into its programs. Through a number of grants sponsored by EPSCoR, the institution, and BRIN, undergraduate and graduate research initiatives, such as IdeaFest—a day reserved for the celebration of learning, research, and creative activities—are held (IdeaFest 2010 Program Book http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - C - 1). The University’s success in national scholarship competitions, the growth in undergraduate and graduate research, and students’ increased interest in study abroad led the institution to bring these ventures under the umbrella of a new, aptly named Center for Academic Engagement (CAE) (http://www.usd.edu/engage/study-abroad/index.cfm) in 2007.
Supporting Research

The University’s Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) (http://www.usd.edu/orsp) is an administrative point of contact for external funding agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Departments of Labor and Education, among numerous others. ORSP is led by a vice president of Research and Sponsored Programs and houses the Office of Human Subjects Protection, Technology Transfer Office, Sponsored Programs Office, Animal Welfare Program, and Government Relations. Each office provides administrative support for students and faculty who apply for external funding.

ORSP’s annual report shows an increase in grant and contract activity at the University from $28,451,707 million in 2009 to a record of $36,504,811 million for FY 2010. In FY 2009, University students and faculty submitted 352 proposals, totaling $182 million (http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/upload/USD-FY09-grants-contracts-report-SHORT-VERSION.pdf). From those, 189 grants and contracts totaling more than $36 million were awarded in FY 2010, an increase of 28 percent. (http://www.usd.edu/orsp) In FY 2010, USD submitted a record 356 proposals for $185,791,918, led by the Sanford School of Medicine and the College of Arts and Sciences. The Department of Health and Human Services was the largest source of federal dollars. Awards will be distributed in FY 2011 and beyond.

More than half of the FY 2010 awards were $500,000 or greater, and the average award was about $193,000, the highest in five years. This statistic is important because, in general, larger awards sustain activities for a longer period and cover a greater proportion of the actual cost of projects.

To sustainably integrate research into educational programs, to promote intellectual inquiry, and to reward research excellence, the University, through the ORSP, provides financial support for faculty salaries, student stipends, and research materials and supplies. In FY 2009, ORSP awarded approximately $100,000 to faculty for competitive seed grants, research excellence awards, and travel grants to confer with sponsors.

Additionally, external funds for infrastructure development were used to support and catalyze research and creative activities in select niche areas; in FY 2009 these investments totaled approximately $250,000.

While significant progress has been made in regards to increasing research and creativity, the University’s strategic plan stretches the University beyond these current levels. Goal 2 of the Strategic Plan challenges the University to conduct competitive research and creative activity comparable to that of smaller institutions with Carnegie Classifications of High Research. In terms of dollars, the goal is $60 million in awards a year.

Publishing Results

A good indicator of significant intellectual inquiry can be found in the published results of that inquiry. USD’s faculty and students have a solid history of publishing their work in books, dissertations, and scholarly journals.

- The ISI Web of Science, with a multidisciplinary coverage encompassing 11,261 journals, book series, proceedings, and published dissertations selected on the basis
of impact evaluations, shows a 10-year average publication rate of 170 articles per year from USD faculty and students.

- ISI also shows that USD scholars published 688 scholarly items between 2000 and 2004 and 947 between 2005 and 2009, a net increase of 247 items in the most recent five-year period.

- In a broader search, for the years 2001-2009, Google Scholar shows an average publication rate, including dissertations, books, and articles in scholarly journals, of 500 publications per year by USD faculty and students.

- The Google publication rate increased from an average of 360 per year in the first half of the decade to an average of 650 per year in the second half of the decade. (http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&q=%22university+of+south+dakota%22&btnG=Search&as_sdt=4000000000000&as_ylo=2009&as_yhi=2009&as_vis=1)

Celebrating Excellence

Undergraduate and graduate creativity is celebrated through the widely attended IdeaFest (IdeaFest 2010 Program Book [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - C – 1-5] – the annual University-wide showcase of student achievement in research and other scholarship, creative activity, service-learning, and international study sponsored by the Graduate School and the Center for Academic Engagement. The range and innovation of projects presented by students of all levels during the event demonstrates USD’s success at integrating student research into the curriculum and confirms that faculty set high expectations for students to conduct research on their own and provide the support needed for students to succeed. Some examples from the 2009 IdeaFest include:

- Reflections on a Wheelchair Distribution Service-Learning Project in Guatemala
- Teacher Effects on Motivation in Ability Grouped Fifth Grade Mathematics Classes
- Role of Early Life Stress on Anxiety-like and Novelty-Seeking Behavior in Adolescence

The events also annually bring in recognized researchers in the sciences, arts and humanities. Below is a list of IdeaFest Speakers:

2010
Jessica Blank & Erik Jensen, Actors, Playwrights & Novelists
“Empathy as Catalyst: Theater and the Real World”

David Frayer (Sigma Xi), professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, “Neanderthals and Us”

2009
Tyrone Hayes, professor, University of California, Berkeley
“From Silent Springs to Silent Night, What Have We Learned”

Alan Robock (Sigma Xi), distinguished professor of Climatology, Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers University; associate director, Center for Environmental Protection
“Global Warming is Real, and What You Can Do about It”
Undergraduate student research also is supported by the Council on Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity (CURCA) in collaboration with the Center for Academic Engagement. The Council offers mini-grants each year to support research efforts or travel to present research results. CURCA also oversees the U Discover program that supports up to 11 student scholars each summer.

The University is a regular participant in the National Council of Undergraduate Research. Faculty members hold leadership positions in the organization, and a significant contingent of USD students attends the annual conference. Undergraduate and graduate research students frequently are invited to show their work in the Posters on the Hill event in Washington, D.C., and in the local research day in Pierre during the annual legislative session.

Student excellence also is recognized through membership in the only Phi Beta Kappa chapter in the state. The Alpha Chapter, established in 1926, inducts students who have excelled in the traditional liberal arts. The Chapter has received national recognition for its best practices and is currently a finalist for the Exemplary Chapter Award to be presented at the 2012 Triennial Conference of the Society. The induction ceremony is paired with the annual Lifto-Amundson Lecture.
Graduate student excellence is recognized by the yearly Graduate Student Research Grants competition, sponsored by the Graduate School. Graduate students apply for funding to support their research efforts. The Graduate Council evaluates and rates the proposals on the significance of the research topic, the professionalism of the written application, the likelihood of publication or presentation at regional or national meetings, and the strength of the faculty support.

Faculty achievement is recognized at President’s Research Day, an annual celebration that recognizes three faculty members for their contribution to research or creative activity during the preceding year. The winners have represented disciplines from across the University, including music, biology, and basic biomedical sciences. They are invited to discuss their work in a public presentation during research day. A nationally-known researcher is also invited to give the keynote address, followed by a reception in honor of the speakers. The criteria for the new or mid-career faculty award is listed below:

President’s Award for Research Excellence — New or Mid-Career Faculty

1. USD faculty member at the assistant or associate professor level, with research as a significant component of workload.

2. USD faculty member for at least one year and less than eight years.

3. Demonstrated evidence of research or creative activities with emerging recognition at the national or international level. Evidence should be appropriate to the discipline and bring positive and significant attention to research or creative activity at USD. Examples of evidence include but are not limited to:
   a. published papers or literary works in refereed journals or periodicals,
   b. juried exhibitions in prestigious venues,
   c. successful grantsmanship,
   d. presentations at national and/or international meetings,
   e. service as federal or other granting agency peer reviewer,
   f. service as editor or on editorial boards of nationally-recognized research publications or comparable peer-review panels for creative works,
   g. competitive awards for research or creative activity from professional society, university, or other organization, and
   h. maintenance of active graduate and/or undergraduate programs

4. Clear potential for continued career success in research and creative activity. (http://www.usd.edu/research/research-and-sponsored-programs/presidents-research-day-2010.cfm)

Community Education—Programming for Youth through Seniors

In partnership with the Vermillion School District, Vermillion Senior Citizens Center, the Vermillion Public Library, the Clay County Extension Office, the Vermillion Chamber of Commerce, and the Vermillion Area Arts Association, the University provides opportunities for life-long learning through its Community Education program (http://www.usd.edu/cde/upload/Spring-2011-Community-
Learning opportunities exist for individuals as young as 12 months (Dance for Moms and Tots) to senior citizens (Estate Planning Basics).

Additionally, the University is the recipient of funding from the Bernard Osher Foundation to establish the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI). It is stationed at University Center in Sioux Falls but extends programming to both Brookings and Vermillion, South Dakota. OLLI offers short-term classes and single lectures designed for learners age 50 and older, but there is no age or educational requirement to become a member of OLLI. The Winter 2011 topics include Cool Math: The Electoral College and the Problem of Apportionment; Memory’s Functioning, Failings, and Fixes; and Great World Religions. (http://www.olliuc.org/files/winter%202011%20brochure.pdf)

Assessing Life-Long Learning

Respondents to the Self-Study survey indicated that they believe the University is dedicated to fostering life-long learning.

- 49.2 percent of faculty indicated USD was somewhat distinctive and 26.8 percent called it highly distinctive in creating a capacity for life-long learning.
- 40.8 percent of students indicated the University was somewhat distinctive and 51.2 percent found it highly distinctive in creating a capacity for life-long learning.
- 48.8 percent of faculty rated USD good and 13.6 percent indicated the University was excellent at helping students to become life-long learners able to adapt to an ever-changing environment.
- 56.7 percent of students responded good and 23 percent rated USD excellent in response to the same question.

Core Component 4a: Summary and Evaluation

In summary, some of the ways The University of South Dakota demonstrates its commitment to a life of learning include its:

- policies on academic freedom,
- professional development for faculty and staff,
- support of graduate education and research,
- publishing results,
- celebrations and awards,
- positive constituent responses regarding life-long learning in the Self-Study survey,
- core curriculum,
- cross-college integration,
- extracurricular engagement,
- visiting experts,
- community education, and
- Osher Life-Long Learning Institute.
CORE COMPONENT 4B

The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

Undergraduate Education

Both the Board of Regents and the University have set general education requirements for undergraduate students that lead to a breadth of learning across diverse disciplines. Every undergraduate student must complete a general education curriculum along with focused study in a major. The BoR’s seven system-wide goals, which are discussed in Criterion 3, require students to achieve competency in skills that will last a lifetime, from writing effectively to having the ability to find and use information. The University’s three institution-specific graduation requirements address life skills, including living in and contributing to a diverse, global community. (Assessment information is presented in Criterion 3).

The University of South Dakota Institutional Graduation Requirements

Institutional Graduation Requirement 1: Additional First-Year Composition Course

Goal 1: Students will write effective and responsible critical prose and will understand and interpret the written literary and critical expression of others.

Institutional Graduation Requirement 2: Interdisciplinary Education and Action (IdEA) Program/XDIS Program

IGR-2 is in transition. The current economic climate and the loss of a VISTA grant made the IdEA Program, which required faculty for 32 sections each year, unsustainable. The program placed an enormous burden on departments as faculty were taken away from disciplinary courses and reassigned into the IdEA Program. In addition, while students appreciated the quality instruction and cross-disciplinary nature of IdEA, they were not inspired by the program. Thus, IdEA strained USD’s resources for little return.

IdEA’s replacement, XDIS 310 Challenge: Success & Happiness, a three-credit course, (2011 XDIS 310 Syllabus [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 76] was inaugurated in fall 2010. It is delivered by teams of the University’s best faculty, utilizing technology and team-based problem solving to achieve its objectives. This model requires eight faculty members per semester working in two-person teams – a significant reduction from the current situation.

XDIS 310 will further develop critical thinking, communication, teamwork, and information literacy skills in a problem-based, technology-rich learning environment as students explore two issues of broad significance: success and happiness.

• The course addresses the need for a better understanding of self, decisions, behaviors, and interactions with one another in an increasingly globalized and diverse economy and society.
• The course will require intensive writing, teamwork and presentations, and will harness the power of mobile computing, allowing students to hone the skills that are sought after by employers and post-baccalaureate degree programs.

Goal 2: Students will be successful working in, living in, and contributing to an increasingly diverse, interdependent world.

Learning Outcomes:
• Students will be able to identify, read, research, analyze, and discuss complex issues from an interdisciplinary perspective.

• Students will gain concrete experience in problem solving and addressing contemporary issues through hands-on service, research, or creative activity and through working within a group of people having diverse viewpoints and academic backgrounds.

• Students will actively participate in an array of service and/or co-curricular activities and events, integrating their experiences into their education.

• Students will recognize and demonstrate their individual and collective civic and community responsibilities as educated citizens and leaders.

Goal 3: Students will understand how multiple perspectives affect global issues and ideas.

Learning Outcomes:
• Students will understand and discuss how multiple perspectives impact the global community.

• Students will analyze and evaluate issues and ideas with global impact, considering their effect on the communities involved.

Goal 4: Students will be able to develop and write a substantial, well-argued research paper, and to analyze and critique the arguments presented by others.

Learning Outcomes:
• Students will write using standard American English, including correct punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure.

• Students will complete a project that will entail research drawing from multi-disciplinary sources that are documented using a recognized style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.).

• Students will use a planning/drafting/revising process that incorporates self-assessment and/or peer review and includes instructor feedback.

• Students will be able to critique the validity and effectiveness of the arguments presented by others.
Institutional Graduate Requirement 3: Aesthetic Experience

Goal 5: Students will have a greater understanding of the fine arts as an expression of human imagination and creativity and will understand the contribution of the arts to self-understanding and a more enriched life experience.

Learning Outcomes:

- Students will be able to demonstrate creative and aesthetic understanding.
- Students will be able to explain and interpret formal and stylistic elements of the fine arts.

The University’s participation in the national Foundations of Excellence® Self-Study process, which is discussed in more detail in Criteria 1 and 3, led to a meaningful contextualization of each element of a USD baccalaureate degree. The curriculum was categorized into four sections: foundations, investigations, expertise, and integration. The USD undergraduate catalog (http://catalog.usd.edu) explicitly describes the framework, associated course requirements, and the goals and learning outcomes for both the Regental and the USD-specific graduation requirements.

Graduate Education

At the graduate level, learning is to be advanced, focused, and scholarly with an objective to deal in-depth with a specific academic discipline, field, or interdisciplinary focus. Interdisciplinary graduate programs at the University include Biomedical Engineering, Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies, and Masters in Natural Science. The graduate programs are based on an evolving knowledge base, which is developed by respected scholars and professionals in the field. Knowledge is subject to challenge and validation by generally accepted procedures. University doctoral programs require a dissertation or culminating scholarly project, and master’s programs, generally, have both thesis and non-thesis options. All graduate students are expected to know and use the respective knowledge base and all PhD students are to contribute to that knowledge base through their own research.

Commitment to Learning

An indicator of USD’s commitment to learning can be found in the mission statements and strategic plans of its academic units. They encourage a life of learning among faculty, students, staff, and the community at large.

- The College of Fine Arts, for example, seeks to “promote a sense of personal integrity and social responsibility in students and develop an intellectual basis for successful living.” (http://www.usd.edu/fine-arts/overview.cfm)
- The Graduate School strives to “allow individuals to fulfill their goals for personal and professional development throughout their lifetimes.” (Mission Statements – Colleges & Schools http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See I - 3 – pg. 14)
- The Division of Continuing and Distance Education sees its mission as: “Extending the University of South Dakota to Citizens of the State, Region, and the World.” (Mission Statements – Colleges & Schools http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See I - 3 – pg. 18-19)
• The USD School of Health Sciences empowers students “to become life-long learners who will make significant contributions through leadership and service as a citizen of the state, the nation, and the world.” (Mission Statements – Colleges & Schools http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See I - 3 – pg. 15)

• The University Honors Program provides “especially motivated, creative, and thoughtful students an enriched academic experience grounded in the liberal arts that promotes lifelong learning, responsibility in citizenship, effectiveness in vocation, and appreciation of culture, while enhancing the intellectual environment and community of the University.” (http://www.usd.edu/academics/honors-program/index.cfm)

Expanding Opportunities for Learning

USD seeks to broaden its curriculum by integrating service learning (http://www.usd.edu/academics/center-for-academic-engagement/service-learning/index.cfm) and other non-classroom enrichment activities, including study abroad (http://www.usd.edu/academics/center-for-academic-engagement/study-abroad/index.cfm), international exchange (http://www.usd.edu/academics/center-for-academic-engagement/national-student-exchange/index.cfm), community engagement, and service days (http://www.usd.edu/academics/center-for-academic-engagement/service-learning/national-days-of-service.cfm) such as Alternative Week of Off-Campus Learning (AWOL) (http://www.usd.edu/academics/center-for-academic-engagement/service-learning/alternative-service-days.cfm). The Center for Academic Engagement (CAE) coordinates these activities (2004–2005 Student Action Office Report & Student Action Office 3-year Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - B – 6-7), which enable students to engage in and develop a habit of social responsibility that will become an ongoing facet of their adult lives.

Through AWOL, students have participated in weeklong, service-learning projects in a variety of settings. Crossing the Borders took students to Agua Prieta, Mexico, to work with the Rancho Feliz Charitable Foundation, helping abused & neglected children in an orphanage, playing soccer with special needs children, and pouring concrete for a one-room house. Through Great Faces, Great Places: Great Needs, students were introduced to poverty as they worked one-on-one with children aged 4 to 18, organized a warehouse, and repaired homes on the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota. The Pursuit of Happyness focused on urban poverty, homelessness, and at-risk youth in the San Francisco Bay Area, as students worked with the St. Anthony Foundation.

The program provides six weeks of pre-departure education in preparation for a week of service-learning activity. When they return, students are challenged to find a similar issue at home and work to effect change.

The University’s Strategic Plan calls for increased study abroad. Through new investments in personnel and budget, significant gains have been made:

• In 2008, the University turned the part-time study abroad coordinator into a full-time global studies coordinator, reorganized the International Studies Committee, expanded the budget, and put finances under the control of the Division of Continuing and Distance Education as these experiences are off-campus and self-supporting.
• Over the last two years, consistent policies and procedures have been developed for faculty-led programs and outside program providers.

• Each of USD's exchange agreements underwent review by the global studies coordinator and by a subgroup of the International Studies Committee. All exchange contracts have been reviewed by the provost.

• USD and other Regental institutions have established a working group to ensure that students can benefit from shared relationships and consistent rules and policies.

• Partnership agreements with several providers have expanded the ease with which students can travel to countries outside of Western Europe.

• The number of programs in which students may use institutional scholarships has expanded from 10 to 35.

• Educational pre- and post-departure meetings help students understand important perspectives and acknowledge personal growth.

As a result, more students are choosing a study-abroad experience. See Figure 6-1.

### Figure 6-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC YEAR</th>
<th>Faculty-led programs: Student participation</th>
<th>Longer Term Study Abroad: Student participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>104 students</td>
<td>52 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>146 students</td>
<td>57 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Center for Academic Engagement data, December 2010

Faculty-led study abroad tours introduce students to new cultures and traditions. In recent years, USD students have travelled with faculty to Turkey, Russia, China, Italy, Ireland, Costa Rica, and more. The majority of the faculty-led programs include a curricular component that requires students to develop broader contextual understanding of people, places, and issues.

A small number of USD study abroad experiences integrate an internship. Business students may spend two to six months working in a European corporation and earn academic credit for their internship. In the Netherlands, students may intern with health-care organizations through the Marge Klompe Health Group and De Basis-Hilvorzorg Co. of Hilvorsum. In Germany, students may intern with Ostfalia University of Applied Sciences and Volkswagen AG (VW) in Wolfsburg.

Although it has been transitioned into XDIS, for the past decade, the Interdisciplinary Education & Action Program (IdEA) required students to engage in a community-based learning activity. The University invested significant time and money into the program to give students an intellectual and practical introduction to the 21st century world in which they will work and live. From its inception until 2010, USD students annually contributed over 10,000 hours of service-learning projects per year, and the Center for Academic Engagement was named to the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll by the Corporation for National and Community Service for three years straight (2007–2009). USD's selection to the honor roll is recognition from the highest levels of the federal government for the University's commitment to service and civic engagement both on campus and in the United States. The honor is a reflection of the hard work and dedication from
students, faculty, and staff members who make service a priority, and the University would be remiss if it were not mentioned even if the IdEA program has changed. (http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1890)

**IdEA projects made a difference in the community:**

- With the help of the IdEA students, the Civic Council was able to reorganize in time for a major renovation.
- IdEA students coordinated a health and safety fair for Head Start families and a cooperative service event between students and Head Start/daycare children to create care packages for soldiers.
- Thousands of photos were recovered from USD buildings, and a group of IdEA students helped restore and catalog them for historical reference for the I.D. Weeks Library.
- savVy! (Students Against vViolence, Yes!) trained several domestic violence responders.
- Students conducted interviews to compile biographical information of more than 50 local artists for the Vermillion Arts Council.
- An IdEA course coordinated the local Earth Day celebration with live music, children’s carnival, arts and crafts, cookout, and 5K bike/run. The event has raised nearly $4,000 for the South Dakota Wildlife Foundation.
- IdEA students taught Vermillion Middle School students about deforestation and other environmental issues, then helped them plant trees.

At the outset, the Center for Academic Engagement was partially supported by AmeriCorps VISTA, a national service program, and by Learn and Serve America Higher Education, which supports campus-based service-learning programs that directly and demonstrably benefit both the community served and the participants who serve. USD also is a member of the Midwest Consortium (http://www.midwestconsortium.org) for Service-Learning in Higher Education, which is a grantee of Learn and Serve America through the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Although the capacity of the service-learning programs have been affected by the ending of the VISTA grant and the curricular shift to the Challenge Program

- a professional, master’s level staff member remains in place,
- the center secured its third grant from MLK National Day of Service, and
- student boards have been strengthened in order to continue the Alternative Week of Off-Campus Learning trips.

The center continues to help faculty and students identify and realize opportunities for quality experiential learning and sponsors a host of projects that bring students and community together. Through its support of service learning, undergraduate research, and global learning, the CAE ensures that all undergraduate students have the opportunity for experiences that foster a life of learning and service.
CAE also has compiled a comprehensive database of more than 1,000 community agencies in the quad-state area (www.usd.edu/volunteer) interested in partnering with USD students.

Coyoteopoly (http://orgs.usd.edu/coyoteopoly/index.cfm), a Beacom School of Business program, integrates finance, marketing, and business law principles into an interdisciplinary service-learning project to reinforce classroom learning and to meet needs identified by the local and global community. Since its inception in fall 2004, Coyoteopoly has earned net revenue of $108,006 for non-profit agencies, including the City of Vermillion and the Vermillion Food Bank.

The University also hosts numerous lectures and colloquia that bring outside experts to campus and give students access to often cutting-edge information about discoveries, inquiry, social responsibility, creativity, and practice. The events are sponsored by individual campus units or in collaboration with other colleges, schools, and departments. In addition, the Student Government Association provides funding for student organizations to sponsor lecturers.

Numerous University activities bring high profile speakers to campus, some of which include the following. A more complete list on University activities can be found in the Virtual Resource Room. (University Lectures & Symposiums http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University & Administrative Units. See F - 2)

**Sanford Health–USD Biomed Research Symposium**

This symposium, co-sponsored by Sanford Health and The University of South Dakota, provides a unique opportunity for participants to receive updates on biomedical advances occurring at two of the state's leading research institutions. Research scientists outline current research activities and emphasize pending innovations in what has become a significant growth industry in South Dakota. (http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1969)

**Farber Forum**

Named in honor of the late W.O. Farber, a legendary professor emeritus of Government, the annual Farber Forum (http://www.usd.edu/arts-and-sciences/political-science/farber-center-for-civic-education/farber-forums.cfm) hosts nationally- and internationally-renowned speakers to offer students and the community insight into national and state politics, campaigns and elections, public administration and international relations.

**Herbert S. Schell Lecture**

Sponsored by the USD Department of History, the Schell Lecture is named after Dean Herbert S. Schell (1899-1994), who served the Department of History, The University of South Dakota and the State of South Dakota for 43 years. (http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1722)

**Oscar Howe Memorial Lecture**

The Oscar Howe Memorial Lecture was established in 1989 by the Oscar Howe Memorial Association at USD. Its purpose is to perpetuate and honor Howe's message that American Indian art is a vital and contemporary cultural force in today's world. In this spirit, the Association has dedicated the annual lecture to issues relating to the American Indian Fine Arts Movement. The annual lecture is also held in conjunction with the Northern Plains Indian Art Market at the Ramkota Inn Exhibit Hall in Sioux Falls. (http://www.usd.edu/fine-arts/university-art-galleries/oscar-howe-collection.cfm)
Al Neuharth Award for Excellence in the Media and Lecture
The award, recognizing lifetime achievement, is named for USA Today and Freedom Forum founder Al Neuharth, a South Dakota native and 1950 USD graduate. Awardees' speech is also typically broadcast on SD Public Television.

The Arthur A. Volk Symposium
The Arthur A. Volk Symposium is sponsored annually by the Beacom School of Business to bring together students, academicians and business leaders for discussion of current topics of interest. (http://www.usd.edu/press/news/news.cfm?nid=1897)

CORE COMPONENT 4B: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION
Undergraduate and graduate programs and co-curricular experiences at The University of South Dakota have the breadth of knowledge and skill and the expectation for intellectual inquiry at their very core. Both knowledge and intellectual inquiry are enhanced through

- the undergraduate and graduate programs,
- study abroad,
- faculty led international and domestic study tours,
- service-learning,
- civic engagement, and
- conferences, symposiums, and lecture series.

CORE COMPONENT 4C
The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

Evaluation of academic programs is an essential element of any university’s ongoing quality improvement plan. At The University of South Dakota, curricular assessment is achieved through the combined use of internal degree program assessments, academic program reviews, specialized external accreditation evaluations, and the results of the overall University assessment. USD strives to be responsive to alumni and employers in curriculum design and reform. As a result, curricular assessment is performed at several levels at The University of South Dakota.

Programs often rely on advisory committees of professionals from outside the University to inform curriculum. The Bachelor in Health Sciences and addiction studies programs, for example, rely upon such committees (Health Sciences Advisory Committee Members http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See F - 52). Once the design of the curriculum is drafted, proposals travel through numerous internal and system-level committees to assure programs are sound and meet the needs of society. In fact, the proposal forms require information about the relevancy of the curriculum
When existing academic programs are reviewed, those with professional licensure or accreditation are regularly evaluated for the relevance, content, and quality of educational experience using regional or national standards. University programs annually provide Self-Study reports of how the program is fulfilling key outcome measures of program quality. Programs in Law, Medicine, Business, Health Sciences, and Education have been reviewed and fully accredited within the past five calendar years. [Accreditation Maintenance Report (Beacom School of Business) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See B - 2] [NCATE Accreditation Report (School of Education) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See C - 9-14] [Music Accreditation – NASM Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See D - 33] [School of Law Self Study http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See G - 2-44] [Self-Study Summary Report (Medical School) http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See H - 9] [Chemistry-Reaccreditation Site Visit Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See A - 9] [Political Science-Reaccreditation Site Visit Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See A - 24].

The program accreditation process for select programs at the University provides an external measure of quality and relevance compared to regional/national/international standards of excellence. USD has 27 schools, departments, or units that obtain professional accreditation or recognition from organizations external to the University and the Board of Regents, which provides another measure of program quality and relevancy.

Moreover, student performance on annual licensure and certification exams confirms student preparedness for their professions. Students in USD's audiology, clinical psychology, dental hygiene, occupational therapy, and physical therapy programs achieved a pass rate of 100 percent on the most recent tests. As evidenced below, USD graduates in these and other programs have an excellent record of success on these examinations:

- From 2003–2010, 92 percent of USD students pursuing the MS in Audiology have passed the Audiology Section of the National Teacher’s Exam, compared to a 75 percent national pass rate.
- From 2002–2010, 97.92 percent of USD students pursuing a PhD in Clinical Psychology have passed the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology. National Pass rates are unavailable.
- From 2003–2010, 99.58 percent of the students of USD's Dental Hygiene program have passed the National Board of Dental Hygiene Examination, compared to a 95.78 percent national pass rate.
- From 2002–2010, 80.52 percent of the writers taking the Bar Exam passed. Each state establishes its own passing scores, so no national average is available.
- From 2004–2011, 91 percent of the writers at USD taking the Step 1 United States Medical Licensing Examination passed their first time, compared to a 93 percent national average, and 81 percent of re-testers passed the same test, compared to a 70 percent national average.
- From 2004–2011, 98 percent of the writers at USD taking the Step 2-CK United States Medical Licensing Examination passed their first time, compared to a 95 percent
national average, and 100 percent of re-testers passed the same test, compared to an 86 percent national average.

• From 2002–2009, 85.35 percent of the USD writers taking the National Council Licensure Examination of Registered Nurses have passed, compared to an 86.83 percent national average and an 86.12 percent statewide average.

• From 2003–2010, 98.98 percent of the writers in USD’s Occupational Therapy program have passed the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy, compared to an 83.87 percent national pass rate.

• Since 2007, the first year USD offered a Doctorate in Physical Therapy, 92.86 percent of USD students in this program have passed the National Physical Therapy Board Exam, compared to an 87.99 percent national pass rate.

• From 2002–2009, 91.8 percent of writers in USD’s Physician Assistant program taking the Physician Assistant National Certifying Exam for the first time have passed, compared to a national average of 92.14 percent. In the same time period, 92 percent of re-testers passed that same exam, compared to an 84.25 percent national average.

• From 2003–2010, 94.78 percent of the students in the Speech Pathology program have passed the National Examination in Speech Language Pathology, compared to a 75 percent national average pass rate.

For those programs without professional program accreditation or external student licensure and certification, the University’s academic program review is intended to assess the usefulness and relevancy of the curriculum. (Academic Program Review [link to USD website] Academic Program Review was extensively conducted in preparation for strategic planning, but is not embedded into a continuous process. As a result, the Academic Affairs Committee of the BoR recently (July 2010) developed institutional program guidelines primarily to assure the timely and complete review of programs not subject to specialized accreditation or nationally recognized review processes (BoR Program Review Guidelines July 2010 [link to USD website] These guidelines are initially being piloted using select programs before they are formally adopted as BoR policy.

Perceptions of Preparedness

Based on the Self-Study survey, students and alumni agree that USD’s educational programs prepare students to participate as responsible members of society. In a widely distributed survey (2,789 respondents), 81 percent of alumni and 80 percent of students responded good or excellent when asked to “rate USD’s educational programs with regard to how well they address the goal of preparing students to participate as responsible members of society.”

CORE COMPONENT 4C: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

In summary, the University assures its curricula prepares students to live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society through its

• involvement of external members of curriculum advisory committees;
• curriculum approval processes which requires information about the market place and the relevancy and need for the program;
• passage rates on external licensure and certification exams;
• successful history of program accreditation;
• alumni and employer surveys; and
• internal academic program reviews.

CORE COMPONENT 4D

The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

The University is committed to academic honesty and ethical exploration, and it supports ongoing efforts to inform faculty, staff, and students of its expectations.

Ensuring Ethical Research

The University’s research programs fully comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, the USD Human Subjects Protection Program has achieved the distinction of maintaining full accreditation from Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs since 2005. It is the only South Dakota institution so accredited.

The Office of Research & Sponsored Programs (ORSP) maintains policies, procedures, and publicly available information for areas such as animal care, environmental health and safety, and technology transfer.

To ensure students, faculty and staff are aware of accepted standards and federal regulations for responsible research, ORSP presents annual workshops for those engaged in grant-funded research. (USD Grants & Contracts Report 2010 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See U - 13) This practice complies with federal regulations described in the Federal Register / Vol. 74, No. 160 / Thursday, August 20, 2009 / Notices. Faculty and students engaged in research involving human subjects receive additional Web-based training organized by the USD Internal Review Board. The University also maintains an effective policy ensuring against conflicts of interest in its research programs.

Promoting Academic Honesty

First time undergraduate students are introduced to USD’s expectation of academic honesty when the provost leads them in the academic integrity pledge during the convocation ceremony that opens the academic year. At the graduate level, academic honesty is embedded in the onsite and virtual graduate student orientation sessions.

Both undergraduate and graduate students have many opportunities to enroll in courses that provide ethical training. The Undergraduate Catalog lists 18 courses in nine different disciplines that refer to ethics either in course title or description. The Department of Philosophy, for example, sought and received funding (NSF-IGERT) to develop a
new graduate ethics course for research in the Physical Sciences. It will be offered as an elective for all students participating in the multi-institutional, interdisciplinary, Integrative Graduate Education and Training Program centered at USD.

Additionally, course syllabi also are required to include a statement regarding academic honesty:

- In the College of Arts & Sciences, all class syllabi include: “The College of Arts & Sciences considers plagiarism, cheating, and other forms of academic dishonesty inimical to the objectives of higher education. The College supports the imposition of penalties on students who engage in academic dishonesty, as defined in the “Conduct” section of the University of South Dakota Student Handbook (Student Handbook http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See E - 16).

- The Beacom School of Business has developed and prominently publishes a code of ethics for both students and faculty on its website. (http://www.usd.edu/business/code-of-ethics.cfm)

- The School of Law posts its Honor Policy and Disciplinary Procedure on the University portal. At each final exam, law students also are required to sign the Final Exam Honor Code Statement: I have read the USD School of Law Honor Code and understand what is expected of me as a student, including my obligation to report violations of which I am aware. I pledge that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this examination. Law Honor Code http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See G – 45)

- In the Sanford School of Medicine, the Department of Neurosciences’ section on Ethics and Humanities (http://www.usd.edu/med/neurosciences/ethics-and-humanities-section.cfm) introduces a bioethics curriculum that is integrated throughout the medical school MD and MD/PhD experience. The courses provide awareness of standards and best practices in responsible conduct of research and delivery of patient care as well as the intellectual tools for analyzing new situations for ethical implications. Nine of the 35 neuroscience faculty members list ethics a primary area of specialization. (http://www.usd.edu/med/neurosciences/faculty-and-staff.cfm)

The University also invests in tools to help students learn how to communicate original work within the context of previous contributions, using appropriate citations and avoiding plagiarism and unintentional misappropriation of credit. The University makes software (http://turnitin.com/static/index.php) available to all instructors, particularly those in writing intensive classes, that assists students and faculty in ensuring originality and appropriate citation in submitted work.

Finally, each year, faculty and non-faculty appointment notices are accompanied by reference to the BoR intellectual property policy and each employee must sign a written agreement to confirm understanding of, and agreement with, the policy at the time of contract renewal. The BoR and the University also advise employees of conflict of interest policies and the necessary disclosures.

**Assessing Values**

A sense of values and priorities encourages the responsible application of knowledge and decision making for faculty, staff, and students. In the recent Self-Study survey, alumni and students who responded to the Self-Study survey indicated that USD provides an educational environment that helps students develop a sense of values and priorities in life:
• 61 percent of alumni and 63 percent of students responded quite a bit or very much when asked "To what extent does a USD education contribute to students' growth in identifying a sense of values and priorities in life?"

• 29 percent of alumni and 28 percent of students, however, responded that the USD education contributed to growth in identifying a sense of values and priorities in life "a little bit."

• More than 90 percent of student respondents felt that their USD education contributed to their development of a sense of values and priorities in life. This opinion was retained in alumni responses.

CRITERION 4D: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University is committed to academic honesty and exploration, and it keeps faculty, staff, and students informed of its expectations through

• policies and procedures which span the areas of animal care, environmental health and safety, technology transfer, intellectual property, conflict of interest and conflict of commitment;

• internal workshops on federal, state, BoR, and University policies;

• Web-based training;

• technology such as Turnitin, which is widely subscribed and used;

• intellectual property and conflict of interest policies;

• academic honesty statements on each course syllabus;

• numerous undergraduate and graduate ethics courses, and

• an academic integrity pledge for new undergraduate freshman.

CRITERION FOUR: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

Acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge are fundamental to the mission of The University of South Dakota. The University provides both philosophical and practical support for original research and other creative activities by creating an intellectually stimulating environment and by providing the resources required to pursue these activities. Ethical behavior, including social responsibility in discovery and application is fostered through formal course work, interactive workshops, rigorously enforced academic integrity policies, and faculty and peer review of creative products. Graduate education and research remain at the core of promoting and supporting intellectual inquiry and the advancement of University learning. Breadth and depth of knowledge and skill are curricular requirements for both undergraduate and graduate programs and, as verified by student learning, academic programs at USD do prepare students to live and work in professions and a global, diverse, and technical society.
In conclusion, as evidenced by its professional development, continuing education programs, and University practices and policies, the USD demonstrates it truly values life-long learning, which fosters rich interactions between the community and the University.

**Future Directions**

The greatest challenge that faces the University in trying to achieve its mission with respect to acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge arises from limitations in financial resources to optimally support these activities. USD seeks to meet this challenge through increased external support and through maintaining awareness, at the level of local governance and the administrative level, of the importance of creative activities and the high priority they should receive in decisions regarding funding allocation. Per the University's Strategic Plan, a higher level of research activity remains the goal.

A second challenge is maintaining an intellectual environment that fosters continued recruitment of the best students and faculty who themselves thrive on creative activity and whose combined efforts serve to enhance that same environment.

A third challenge lies in ensuring that the intellectual and practical benefits of creative activities and social responsibility reaches students at all levels and faculty and staff across all disciplines. As detailed in this chapter, the University has made great strides in this regard over the last ten years, promoting undergraduate and graduate research and service learning, providing training in ethics as explicit components of curricula, supporting travel for students and faculty, and making formal recognition of instances of excellence in research on an annual basis.

The Board of Regents and The University of South Dakota administration have demonstrated an acute awareness of these challenges and actions over the last decade and an intent to meet them, overcoming barriers presented by budget cuts and the inertia of tradition. The overarching challenge is to maintain this intent and the energy to pursue it in the face of continued economic stress and the natural and consequent flagging morale.
CHAPTER 7: CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE
CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

The University of South Dakota serves students, faculty and staff, citizens of the state and region, businesses and organizations, state and local governments, and the occasional national or global entity. The scope and depth of the University’s academic and service programs and the financial and human resources committed to on- and off- campus efforts provide rich evidence that The University of South Dakota fulfills its mission’s call.

All students have access to multiple and varied opportunities to achieve academic excellence and serve the common good through a combination of academic and social experiences. Through the exceptional leadership provided by units such as the School of Education, School of Law, the Center for Academic Engagement, the Government Research Bureau, the Division of Continuing and Distance Education, and the Sanford School of Medicine, community partnerships have grown in depth and breadth over the last decade. In partnership, USD provides expertise, human power and access to shared resources, and it gains opportunity for applied research and faculty and student engagement.

CORE COMPONENT 5A

The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

The University’s mission statement declares, “The University of South Dakota is the comprehensive university within the South Dakota System of Higher Education.” As a liberal arts university meeting the needs of the state and region, the institution is committed to effective external engagement with:

- public schools,
- health-care providers,
- economic development efforts,
- governing bodies, and
- the legal system, among many others.

Of course, the institution balances external commitments with the needs of its primary mission to provide excellence in teaching and learning to the students enrolled in its academic programs.

Assessing Student Needs to Meet Their Expectations

The University has used the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) since 2000 to measure student engagement. Early on, the survey was administered annually. Now, it is administered every two years, on even years. The NSSE, IDEA and CAAP all provide external reference points and allow tracking over time. These data are used, along with changes in student performance over time, to monitor changing student attitudes and skills in various domains. (NSSE 2010 Multi-Year Benchmark Report [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See E - 24)
The Foundations of Excellence® Self-Study process included a student survey, which asked performance indicator questions and allowed the committee to measure USD’s effectiveness in recruiting, admitting, orienting, supporting, advising, and teaching new students. The University-wide study instrumentally informed the final action plan for enhancing student learning and retention. (Foundations of Excellence Final Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 15)

In its annual survey, the Academic and Career Planning Center asks students who are ready to graduate about career planning. A diversity survey was used to complete the University’s diversity report. As discussed in Criterion 1, as the University began developing its strategic planning process, it hired Williams and Company (with assistance from the campus Office of Institutional Research) to conduct a comprehensive environmental scan. The scan was used as a foundation for the strategic planning process.

College, Department and Unit Surveys

Other groups such as IT conduct student surveys of computer and technology use; these surveys also include external reference groups. The Honors Program annually surveys all of its incoming students with questions about their college decision-making process. The results of the surveys have led to the design and delivery of a ‘small town’ Honors First Year Experience course and to refined recruiting materials. The Earth Science Department surveys its alumni, and the library administers a nationally-normed LIBQual survey. Exit surveys are conducted by the majority of programs, and follow-up and employer surveys are common or required for accredited schools and programs. The Division of Continuing and Distance Education regularly surveys its online learners to assess their start-up experience and to help identify issues early in each term.

Less formal environmental scanning techniques can also lead to change. The Law School, for example, recently introduced its Fundamental Legal Skills (FLS) program in response to a growing national perception—echoed by South Dakota judges and attorneys—that new attorneys have poor legal writing skills. A full-time faculty member coordinates FLS and integrates writing throughout the curriculum. The student-to-faculty ratio is lower in FLS classes, and students have more one-on-one time with their instructors.

Responding to Community Needs

Economics

In 2003, the governor announced the 2010 Initiative that outlined a series of goals to increase economic growth and visitor spending in the state by the year 2010. It included the goal of developing “research and technology infrastructure at our universities and with the private sector,” in part by further developing university research niches and coordinating cooperative research efforts between private businesses, universities, health-care providers, and other public institutions. (http://www.2010initiative.com/2010initiative.asp#three) With input from the Board of Regents, USD
invested in and hosts the Center for Research and Development of Light-activated Materials and is a principal investigator at the Center for Ultra-Low Background Experiments at the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory. The centers also are committed to student engagement and developing a scientific workforce for the state.

Public Administration

In response to demand from government employees unable to travel to the campus in Vermillion, the Masters in Public Administration (MPA) program recently added an Executive Masters in Public Administration. The online degree-granting program serves experienced public and nonprofit administrators. In addition, a USD professor is helping the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration construct and field test an exit examination for Masters in Public Administration programs. The process includes regular interactions with external audiences to identify learning competencies, which inform faculty what employers are looking for in their MPA graduates.

Health

Health-care agencies and social work and related professionals demonstrated a need and provided data to support implementing a Master’s of Social Work degree at USD. The community members also led USD’s negotiations with the Board of Regents to obtain approval and funding for the degree that was established in fall 2010 in Sioux Falls with future plans to also offer it online.

National trends and alumni feedback caused the University to expand its Physician Assistant Program from a certification to a graduate program. Until 2003, the Physician Assistant Program was a certification program. Advisory board members and preceptors in the field provided feedback that led to case-based learning, greater infectious disease content, more classroom time on sutures, coding and billing, and additional lab time.

In 2008, the Physical Therapy program worked in tandem with the Division of Continuing and Distance Education to develop and deliver an online transitional doctorate of physical therapy in response to a need expressed by certified physical therapists who needed the higher credential.

Treatment/prevention providers, certified professionals, and Alcohol and Drug Studies alumni who responded to a 2005 Alcohol and Drug Studies Department survey provided strong support and evidence of need to make several program changes: The academic program changed its name from Alcohol and Drug Abuse Studies to Alcohol and Drug Studies (ADS), created an online undergraduate degree option, deployed an online master’s degree, and added an online 15 credit hour graduate certificate and an online 27 credit hour undergraduate certificate. A new survey will be sent to constituents early in 2011 to assess the need for two additional post-graduate online certificate programs and other educational and training needs.

Since alcoholism is a critical health concern among the state’s Indian residents, ADS works closely with a variety of groups and organizations to recruit American Indian students to the ADS major. ADS online opportunities allowed four addiction counselors at the Four Bands Healing Center in Eagle Butte, S.D., to successfully complete coursework to be eligible to test for state alcohol/drug certification. Tribal Community Health Representatives like these are a critical link to health care in the reservation communities and a constituency which holds an interest in professional advancement. With a career development model for advising, ADS also has a nearly 85 percent retention and degree completion rate among its American Indian students.
ADS also is working with the Army’s international substance abuse coordinator, who hires USD undergraduate and graduate students, helps place student interns into substance abuse treatment and prevention programs, and facilitates access to USD’s online certificate programs, undergraduate degree, and MA degree for current Army personnel who need addiction-specific courses.

Faced with a growing national nursing shortage, the Nursing Department:

- developed the Good Samaritan Society—Growing Our Own Program (http://www.careerlattice.com/education/LTCert.asp), an online distance associate degree nursing program for employees of the Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society, the largest non-profit long-term care organization in the nation;

- began admitting an additional 196 students a year after the governor, in 2001, asked the nursing program to double its enrollment across the multi-site program. Admitting both fall and spring cohorts ensures employers of the opportunity to hire new graduates two times each year;

- developed and received approval for a BSN completion program in May 2010 (to be implemented in 2011) as a result of national nursing and health-care trends and feedback from nursing leaders and alumni. This completion option allows USD associate of science nursing alumni to complete the bachelor’s degree in nursing at their alma mater. It also will be readily accessible to any nurse educated at other associate degree programs through Web-based coursework. (http://www.usd.edu/cde/upload/RN-to-BSN-Brochure.pdf)

**Funding New Initiatives to Respond to Needs**

The University regularly and aggressively pursues grants and contracts to expand its capacity to meet the needs of both internal and external constituents. In FY 2010, 53.1 percent ($19.3 million) of these dollars were for research and 28 percent ($10.1 million) were for public service projects (Figure 7-2). In recent years, the number of research awards has remained relatively steady, but the average dollar size of research grants has increased 60 percent since FY 2004, the earliest year in which complete data were recorded. In FY 2010, the average research grant was $268,246, compared to $164,852 in FY 2004. (USD Grants-Contracts Report Fall 10 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University & Administrative Units. See U - 13)

The size of service awards to USD has increased an average of 16 percent since 2004. The Schools of Health Sciences and Education and administrative units have seen significant growth in outside awards, while the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Fine Arts, and Beacom School of Business have seen incremental increases. (Figure 7-1).
Figure 7-1

Five Year History of Awarded Dollars by School and College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>$4,345,053</td>
<td>$4,223,251</td>
<td>$4,878,391</td>
<td>$8,432,939</td>
<td>$8,571,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,675,769</td>
<td>$5,922,659</td>
<td>$1,798,287</td>
<td>$1,574,765</td>
<td>$3,184,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$2,290,348</td>
<td>$1,532,249</td>
<td>$1,391,317</td>
<td>$1,432,062</td>
<td>$1,991,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$2,728,177</td>
<td>$1,796,078</td>
<td>$2,209,302</td>
<td>$1,974,798</td>
<td>$2,920,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad School</td>
<td>$1,675,769</td>
<td>$5,922,659</td>
<td>$1,798,287</td>
<td>$1,574,765</td>
<td>$3,184,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>$2,290,348</td>
<td>$1,532,249</td>
<td>$1,391,317</td>
<td>$1,432,062</td>
<td>$1,991,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$396,345</td>
<td>$763,013</td>
<td>$674,044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>$24,784,481</td>
<td>$16,230,173</td>
<td>$16,323,474</td>
<td>$13,910,765</td>
<td>$13,536,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$35,824,328</td>
<td>$29,728,410</td>
<td>$27,047,866</td>
<td>$28,451,707</td>
<td>$36,504,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following table identifies the grant dollars awarded by project type in FY10:

Figure 7-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project</th>
<th>Total Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$870,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$19,313,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>$10,147,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$5,810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$138,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Services</td>
<td>$172,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>$51,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$36,504,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although USD aggressively pursues outside funding, resource limitations have prevented the University from fully responding to constituent needs. Constituents, for example, periodically request a Masters and/or Doctorate in Public Health. This request has been carefully considered by USD’s leaders, who have concluded that the University does not have the necessary fiscal or human resources to establish the program, although they agree it would be desirable. Ongoing articulation discussions with universities in the region that have a school of Public Health have also not reached a satisfactory solution.

Serving Diverse Constituencies

As a public university, USD’s constituencies are diverse in ways of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation and/or gender identity, disability, socioeconomic status, and age. The communities
served by the institution vary just as widely. Some USD students require remedial math and English while others enter with upwards of 40 college credits and are prepared to enroll in Calculus III. Communities make requests that vary from a water rate analysis to help addressing the intractable issues associated with poverty. The University houses a number of centers, programs, committees, student organizations, support services, and conferences to serve and build bridges among these diverse constituencies.

American Indian

As fully discussed in Criterion 1, the Office of Institutional Diversity is responsible for creating a university that values an inclusive and welcoming environment, conducive to the exploration and discovery of diversity. The Campus Diversity Enhancement Group is charged with planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating diversity initiatives across campus. The group completed a comprehensive inventory of diversity activities and recommended additions, including that the University make long-term fiscal commitments that ensure diversity is an integral part of USD’s culture.

The Institute of American Indian Studies was established in 1955 by the Board of Regents and formally recognized by the South Dakota Legislature in 1974. It is among the country’s oldest academic research- and policy- oriented centers focused on tribal governance and contemporary issues in American Indian affairs. The Institute and a Department of American Indian Studies had been merged, but a 2008 reorganization restored the Institute to its original mission as an independent institution within the University, dedicated to the research and study of American Indian history and culture, to strengthening relationships with tribal governments and colleges, to promoting scholarly publications, and to supporting Indian educational opportunities. One of the Institute’s primary goals is to create connections and facilitate contact between on-campus constituents (the University’s various colleges and schools, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, the Government Research Bureau, the Northern Plains Undergraduate Research Center, and the South Dakota Biomedical Research Infrastructure Network, for example) and off-campus entities.

The Native American Cultural Center is discussed fully in Core Component 1b.

Tiospaye U. (http://orgs.usd.edu/tiospaye) is a student-run organization dedicated to making Native American students, as well as others, feel at home and with family while they are away at college. “Tiospaye” translates to “extended family.” The group provides one-on-one social, cultural, and emotional support; talking circles; assistance in connecting with the university, family, community, and students; and referrals to appropriate USD and external services.

Local residents and students, staff and faculty who are members of regional American Indian tribes are invited to the Wase Wakpa Community. The community serves as a source of support, mentoring, and inspiration for American Indian high school and college students choosing to pursue higher education at USD. Through a variety of activities, members work to build strong networks between students’ home communities, the University, and the Wase Wakpa (Vermillion) community.

Other Diverse Groups

Returning veterans from Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom will find enhanced learning experiences through Fides: The Student Veterans with Disabilities Quality Education Initiative (Fides Quick Summary http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D – 19). The Center for
Teaching and Learning (CTL), in collaboration with the Center for Disabilities, launched the program in 2010 with a $500,000 Congressionally-directed FIPSE grant that is strongly expected to grow into a three-year, $1.5 million project with national outreach. Fides, which is Latin for promise, will phase in over three years, high-quality, evidence-based development opportunities specifically designed to enable key University constituencies—faculty, staff, and administration—to understand their role in providing an extraordinary learning experience for veterans. These robust and comprehensive training programs will provide participants with the knowledge, skills, and resources they need to ensure that student-veterans with disabilities have full access to a quality post-secondary education.

Disability Services (http://www.usd.edu/disabilityservices), discussed fully in Core Component 3d, is committed to ensuring that students and campus visitors with disabilities have equal access to all programs and activities the University offers.

USD’s 10 percent Society (formerly Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance) promotes awareness and understanding of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender issues on campus and in the surrounding communities. The organization works to provide a positive campus environment for GLBT students by providing a place where group members can confidentially discuss personal, school and social issues; promoting personal growth and a sense of identity among group members; providing emotional support for members; and fostering a sense of pride in being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender.

The International Student Services Office helps foreign students make a smooth transition, academically and socially, to life in Vermillion, and educates the community about international cultures. The International Student Advisor handles student visa registrations and also works with incoming exchange students.

The Department of English ESL Program’s Summer Institute attracts students from around the world for an intensive four-week course designed to improve English communication skills. Under the guidance of a professional staff, classes are held Monday through Friday for non-native English-speakers who want to strengthen their English language skills. The Institute also helps university-bound students prepare for the TOEFL exam. (http://www.usd.edu/esl/summer-institute.cfm)

**Prairie People**

Researchers and tribal entities look to the South Dakota Oral History Center, which is dedicated to preserving the region’s past for the people of South Dakota, the Northern Plains region, and the world. The collection contains almost 5,500 interviews that were conducted from the 1960s to the present day, including:

- more than 2,200 taped interviews that preserve indigenous memories and experiences from the 1890s to the present, and
- 3,200 interviews from every county in South Dakota and from across the Northern Plains region.

This collection preserves the events, thoughts, and cultural practices from the region’s past. Digitization and cataloguing of these interviews is already underway and will be completed in 2013. The Center’s combination of technical skills and cultural understanding makes it an attractive partner for tribal entities that are just beginning to explore the preservation of their own past and current records.
The newly approved Bachelor of General Studies is a flexible degree program designed to serve individuals who have significant number of college credits and now desire to complete their degrees. Students work closely with an advisor who helps them develop a plan of study that will meet their needs and result in a degree. The program serves state workforce needs.

USD also responds to state workforce needs through its Division of Continuing and Distance Education (CDE), which offers a number of customized educational learning opportunities, including USD/LERN Master of Arts degree in Educational Administration - Adult & Higher Education emphasis (http://www.usd.edu/cde/usd-lern-master-of-arts-degree-in-edad.cfm), the Beacom School of Business/ Sioux Falls School District/Citibank - Academy of Finance (http://www.usd.edu/business/academy-of-finance.cfm), and the Political Science Department’s State Government Leadership Certificate (http://www.usd.edu/cde/state-government-leadership-certificate.cfm) designed for state government officials. A new student’s guide to online learning at the university has been developed by CDE faculty and staff and is available online at (http://www.usd.edu/cde/upload/Online-Orientation-Guide.pdf).

Learners throughout the state can connect with the CDE through regional centers that allow remote delivery of select academic programs. CDE is discussed fully in Chapter 8.

**K–12 Schools**

USD’s summer Kid’s University, for grade school and middle school students, is among the programs that foster curiosity and life-long learning through Statistical Thinking and Reasoning Summer Camp, Lawrence Brothers Science Camp, and the Upper Midwest Music Camp. Several of the camps associated with Kid’s University have a long history on the USD campus and all continue to be administered by individual academic and program units in tandem with CDE. The Early Scholars program encourages eligible high school students to earn college credit while in high school and promotes and cultivates a college-bound culture. Consolidating the marketing efforts for these programs and developing a central website have made them more visible and easier to access for parents and educators. (http://www.usd.edu/summer-school/kids-university.cfm)

When the Sioux Falls School District experienced a large and rapid influx of minority students, the School of Education’s Counseling Program provided diversity training for 1,200 incoming Sioux Falls high school students.

### SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5A

The University employs a variety of processes to acquire both quantitative and qualitative information about its constituencies and their communities. The University’s engagement activities provide substantial evidence of a dynamic response to the needs of constituents. In fulfillment of its mission, extensive University resources, partnerships, outreach, and responsive curricular efforts are directed toward serving the state and meeting the human and educational needs of individual constituencies.

### CORE COMPONENT 5B

The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.
Effective Communications

The Department of Marketing and University Relations is primarily responsible for supporting and promoting the image and mission of the University. The campus media relations officer:

- prepares press releases for print and electronic media about opportunities, achievements and change at the University;
- distributes a monthly, electronic newsletter, the Aviso, to all faculty and staff on campus. Administrative staff and faculty members are regularly featured in the “Five Minutes With” column and information is included about upcoming lectures, policy notices, and individual achievements; and
- manages crisis information in response to health or weather emergencies.

Marketing and University Relations also manages trademarks and licensing agreements, in conjunction with Licensing Resource Group (LRG), a national company specializing in university licensing, that USD hires to provide licensing services. All vendors and manufacturers producing goods with the name, the marks and the logos of The University of South Dakota must be licensed with USD through LRG.

The USD Alumni Association, established in 1922, enables communication with alumni around the world through an online community, Facebook, a monthly newsletter, and an alumni magazine, The South Dakotan.

The Athletics Department also is in regular contact with alumni through annual golf tournaments held throughout the state, fundraising dinners, and weekly social functions designed to engage and inform the alumni/fan base.

The USD Foundation, fully discussed in Core Component 2b, in conjunction with President Abbott has communicated the University’s vision to alumni, resulting in the successful Campaign South Dakota.

Co-Curricular Activities Engage Community

Most of the more than 100 active, recognized student organizations on campus include service to others in their mission statements. The organizations cover an array of interests from politics and sign language to professions, languages and sports.

USD groups are especially vital to The Welcome Table, Vermillion’s weekly community meal, at which participants share food, fellowship, service, and a sense of community. From September 2009 to April 2010, campus entities or student organizations sponsored 16 of the 25 Monday meals. Sponsoring groups plan a menu for up to 250 people, buy and cook the food (or cater it), serve the meal restaurant-style, eat with the guests, and clean up. The process requires teamwork and cooperation, and it demands that participants engage with community members.

In 2010 USD students, including some athletes, visited the impoverished Cheyenne Indian Reservation to help repair damage from a violent winter ice storm that toppled trees and electric poles, leaving most residents without electricity or water. “A group of USD students were helping out on the reservation, and they saw many individuals were wandering around with only socks,” said the president of the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (SAAC). “If they were lucky, there were no holes in them.”
When asked why no one wore shoes, the reply was they have none.” SAAC quickly organized a “Share Your Sole” campaign to collect shoes during a February basketball double header, which caught the attention of MSNBC’s Keith Olbermann. Fans brought more than 1,000 pairs of shoes to the basketball game, and the widespread publicity generated by the shoe drive drew in thousands of dollars of donations. [http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3036677/vp/35321529#35321529 – Countdown with Keith Olbermann and http://www.usdcoyotes.com/sports/news/release.asp?release_id=5526]

In the Beacom School of Business, Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE) leverages the resources of local businesses to improve quality of life. Real-life, service-learning projects must meet at least one of six judged criteria, including market economics, ethics, environmental sustainability, financial literacy, and entrepreneurship and success skills. Students have spent as many as 6,000 activity hours in a year in service, and in 2009-2010, they completed 15 projects and won the regional competition, the eighth consecutive year SIFE students qualified for nationals.

Law School student volunteers offer free federal income tax preparation and e-filing to low-income, elderly, and non-English speaking taxpayers through the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program (VITA). VITA services are scheduled at the Vermillion Public Library two evenings a week over a period of two months, allowing student-volunteers to use their talents and resources to help the Vermillion community.

Students Enhancing Resources for Vermillion Enrichment (SERVE) is a student run co-curricular umbrella organization for seven committees that, together, engage more than 200 USD students:

- Big Pal Little Pal partners USD students and Vermillion elementary schoolchildren for a year-long, one-on-one relationship. School counselors identify the children, and big pals are required to spend at least one hour a week with their little pals.

- Heroes plans group events for middle school students who are struggling with behavior problems.

- Adopt-a-Grandparent pairs residents of Vermillion’s nursing home and care center with students who commit to spending at least an hour a week with their “grandparent.”

- Adopt-a-School is a tutoring program with the Vermillion Public School District.

- Variations of Volunteering identifies single day community projects for Vermillion’s nonprofit organization and coordinates the necessary volunteers. The Food Pantry, Civic Council, Sharing the Dream, Center for Domestic Violence, Welcome Table, and SESDAC, Inc., a center that provides services to individuals with physical and mental challenges, have benefitted.

- Cultural Connections pairs USD’s international students with students from the United States for individual and group activities that help new students acclimate to the school and community.

- RecycleMania, organized in conjunction with the College and University Recycling Council, allows campus teams to work with Facilities Management and SESDAC to engage the campus in an annual 10-week competition to collect the most recyclables. [http://www.recyclemaniacs.org/overview.htm]
In fall 2010, the women’s track team initiated a Vermillion Girls on the Run program for girls aged 8-11 and committed themselves as the sponsors. Lessons on making good decisions, being a good friend, gossiping and bullying issues, healthy eating, positive thinking, setting goals, and team building were designed to prepare girls for a lifetime of self-respect and healthy living. Two days a week, for ten weeks, the track volunteers mentored the participating girls who were brought to the DakotaDome by bus. The season ended with a non-competitive 5K run/walk.

For the past two years, University organizations also have challenged the community to commit to “a day on, not a day off” on Martin Luther King, Jr., Day. The Day of Service is supported in part by a competitive grant from the North Carolina Campus Compact and coordinated by USD’s Center for Academic Engagement in collaboration with SERVE and the Campus Diversity Enhancement Group. More than 150 students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community members responded to the second year’s challenge as they spent more than 600 hours completing multiple service projects in the community. The Center for Academic Engagement has secured a third year of funding for a 2011 MLK Day of Service.

**Academic Activities Connect with Community**

- Faculty members in the upper-division Spanish language classes regularly take students to help government agencies in Sioux Falls with translation services. In addition, all language faculty members respond to translation requests from community individuals and government agencies.

- The University’s band, orchestra and choirs travel at least once a year to showcase their programs and to bring live music into schools and communities without the resources or population to support large ensembles.

- Students act as docents in the campus art galleries, and the Department of Theatre brings area K–12 students to campus for one or more of its productions each year.

- A number of First Year Experience classes also incorporate community based service-learning by, for example, asking students to provide a meal for the Red Road state conference, coordinate a special interest day for Vermillion school children, or volunteer at a teen shelter in Sioux Falls.

**Health Services**

The Sanford School of Medicine’s Sophomore Preceptorship Program sends second-year students to clinics in rural, underserved areas in hope they will choose to return to primary care after graduation. The Coyote Clinic is a student-run free clinic in Sioux Falls, operated in collaboration with Avera Health at the Sioux River Community Health Center to provide health-care for underserved populations. In collaboration with health programs from South Dakota State University and Dakota State University, students will now provide diabetes screening and education with referrals to primary care providers.

Third-semester nursing students provide a variety of services to meet the needs of diverse clients and develop culturally sensitive communications skills and a sense of authentic presence in a service-learning experience at the Union Gospel Mission in Sioux Falls. The mission cares for those who are homeless and needy.
Dental Hygiene students provide free dental hygiene screening, consultation, and services to Marty Indian School on the Yankton Sioux reservation, the State Penitentiary, the Redfield Development Center, and the Sioux Falls School District. After Dental Hygiene’s clinical experiences in Indian Health Service (IHS) facilities, faculty members met with IHS officials to discuss their satisfaction with the clinical affiliation. Dental Hygiene also runs a dental clinics with discounted services on the University campus and at the Sioux River Community Health Center in Sioux Falls that are open to the general public, and students provide oral health screenings at the Sister James Nursing Homes in Yankton. They also received grant funding to provide free dental varnishing for five days to anyone in need in the State.

The Clinical Psychology program collaborates with many South Dakota mental health agencies as supervised training sites, and students also provide free services. Clinical Psychology collaborates with the Winnebago Youth Facility on the Winnebago Indian Reservation in Nebraska that serves youth from birth to age 18 who have been placed there for many reasons, including court orders or case worker referrals.

**Assessing Service**

Although the IdEA program has been restructured, it is worth mentioning the positive impact it had for students, faculty, and the community.

- Both student and faculty surveys show that community-based activities enhanced the teaching/learning process (HLC Survey Results [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University & Administrative Units. See A - 9-14]).

- Students indicated service-learning helps connect them to other students, faculty or staff.

- Students also indicated that they learned more about a social issue in the community.

- Faculty indicated they believed that the community work helped students better understand course lectures and reading assignments, and that community-based learning resulted in improved teaching strategies and/or approaches.

The benefits of the IdEA program continue today as numerous programs and organizations across campus are involved in activities of service that were first realized as important through the IdEA courses.

NSSE data also supported the positive impact of the junior/senior based IdEA Program on campus (See Figure 7-3).

**National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

The breakdowns for First Year respondents and Senior respondents are provided. The items are reported in percent of responses per level (i.e., combined, First Year or Senior).
The results show positive gains as students move through USD. In all areas except Supportive Campus Environment, Senior respondents were on average higher than First Year respondents. Senior respondents reported a large increase over First Year respondents on Enriching Educational Experiences. Seniors reported moderate increases on Student Faculty Interaction and Active and Collaborative Learning compared to First Year respondents. Seniors reported a small increase in Academic Challenge compared to First Year respondents (NSSE 2010 Multi-Year Benchmark Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See E - 24).

Supporting Engagement and Service

Although budgets are tight and grants always finite, human resources are truly the cornerstone of the programs and services that positively affect students and communities. The dedication that it takes to establish trusted relationships, for example, allows law students to work with Dakota Plains Legal Services, the primary legal assistance entity in the state; enables psychology disaster mental health students to assist the American Red Cross and the World Health Organization at disaster locations, and opens doors for chemistry professors to take undergraduate students to the Oak Ridge and Argonne National Laboratories for summer-long research experiences.

The talents and skills of USD’s faculty and staff directly impact Vermillion and surrounding communities through alumni. The current mayor of Vermillion is an emeritus faculty member, and four of the eight city council members work for the University, including an associate dean and the director of the Academic and Career Planning Center. Still other members of the USD faculty and staff serve on boards or committees of the public library, historic commission, community theatre, Welcome Table, United Way, Vermillion Area Arts Council, School Board, booster clubs and much more.
Assessing Service

The Self-Study survey showed that 75 percent to 90 percent of faculty, staff, alumni and student respondents found USD distinctive or highly distinctive for creating a culture of service, serving the common good, and collaborating with partner organizations. Results also showed that development of a cohesive service commitment by the campus has been hampered by lack of reward or emphasis on this element.

- 62.8 percent of the faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that USDs’ activities contribute meaningfully to a higher quality of life for people and or groups external to the university (only 6 percent disagreed);
- About half of the faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that USD does a good job responding to the needs of the community and region;
- Less than half of faculty respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service is a top priority for them, and this percentage diminishes with years of service at USD;
- 52 percent of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that the “rewards for external service and community engagement are sufficient at USD;” and
- Only 27.5 percent of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that USD provides adequate support to enable faculty to engage in effective external service and community engagement.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5B

As evidenced by the activities and services above, the University reaches out to its numerous constituents and engages with them regularly, thereby meaningfully contributing to them. However, the University could improve in communicating its story including its many successes to audiences both inside and outside the University.

CORE COMPONENT 5C

The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

Collaborating to Educate

Higher Education

USD is the only school in the Regental system that offers many of its specific majors and degrees. In certain cases, faculty members take these programs on the road to students in Sioux Falls, Pierre, and Rapid City – which is 400 miles and a time zone away. Students enrolled at any center may enroll in courses taught by faculty from other Regental schools but remain USD degree-seekers. Access to courses/programs is also provided through alternative delivery methods, such as the online environment. A full explanation of USD’s off-campus and distance education services is provided in Chapter 8.
Numerous collaborative ventures help to prepare K-12 students to successfully enter and complete higher education, including Math Days for Women, the Science Olympiad contest, and the Creative Writing Camp, among many others. In addition, the Admissions Office organizes programs for high school counselors about the expectations and rigors of college work.

- The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) is a federally funded grant to increase student achievement in K-12 schools by developing highly qualified teachers. The grant is designed to place and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need South Dakota schools and to implement an innovative collaboration between USD, high-need schools, and the rural communities served by these schools. Members of the South Dakota Partnership for Teacher Quality include USD, the Mid-Central Educational Cooperative, the South Dakota Department of Education’s Office of Indian Education, the Rural Learning Center, the American Indian Institute for Innovation, and BC Kuhn Evaluation, LLC.

- A Bush Grant is funding a unique partnership between USD’s Teacher Education program and the Sioux Falls New Technology High School that opened in fall 2010 with 100 freshmen and will grow to 400 students. Based on an interdisciplinary project-based learning approach, courses are combined and instruction is centered around real-life projects that integrate the state standards into the curriculum. The partnership allows USD secondary teacher education candidates to rotate through the school to learn project-based learning as a practical classroom methodology. The University also plans to study the academic impact of the new high school’s approach. The Bush grant gives the Sioux Falls School District funding for project-based learning training and to hire classroom teachers who have been trained in project-based learning.

- The School of Education’s Reading Recovery Program is one of 24 national training centers that offer graduate coursework in Reading Recovery techniques. It operates as a regional training site, training Teacher Leaders and Reading Recovery Teachers and providing institutes for reading teachers throughout the State and region.

- The University serves as the center for Head Start for a four county area, creating numerous opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to serve enrolled children and families with educational programs and recreational activities. The Head Start Pre-Birth through Five Program is run by a Policy Council that involves parents in policy decisions.

- The School of Education’s Professional Development Center (PDC) program has worked closely with 14 public school districts and more than 400 teachers in the past 17 years to develop the teaching skills of novice teachers. The PDC establishes partnerships between novice and experienced teachers, enabling veteran teachers to renew their own professional development and assume new roles as mentors and teacher leaders. Both beginning and mentor teachers earn graduate degrees through the program.
• When the Vermillion School District began planning an addition to one of its elementary schools, the superintendent approached the University about establishing a viewing room for teacher training. The School of Education helped fund the project, and it is used regularly to give University students a window into a live classroom without disruption. It is also used with the after school tutoring program to model instruction for the elementary pre-service teachers.

• With funding from a Teaching American History Grant, the Department of History provides instruction for secondary school teachers to ensure they develop the knowledge and skills necessary to teach traditional American history in an exciting and engaging way. (http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teachinghistory/index.html) The program is designed to raise student achievement by improving teachers’ knowledge and understanding of and appreciation for traditional U.S. history. In order to receive a grant, a local educational agency must agree to carry out the proposed activities in partnership with one or more of the following: institutions of higher education, nonprofit history or humanities organizations, libraries, or museums.

• Mental health counseling and school psychological services are provided through the Counseling and School Psychological Services Center on campus. Approximately 2,000 hours of free services are provided each year. Faculty and students also present mental health workshops for students, professionals and community members. A biannual School Psychology Symposium offers professional development opportunities for school and mental health professionals.

Health Education

Through the Department of Family Medicine, the Sanford School of Medicine received federal funding in September 2009 and again in 2010 to establish the South Dakota Area Health Education Center (AHEC). The center collaborates with a network of community, state, health-care, and academic partners to meet the health-care workforce needs of the state. The Yankton Rural AHEC Center establishes and coordinates programs that broadly support the health-care workforce goals of the entire state. The Yankton motto is “Connecting students to careers, professionals to communities, communities to better health.” Activities and target audiences include, but are not limited to, K-12 education, diversity promotion, medical students, resident physicians, and rural practice support. The Yankton Rural AHEC is actively involved in a number of projects, and consideration for a second AHEC Center is underway.

Building Bridges

The rural nature of the region and the prominence of the indigenous Native American culture dominate USD’s bridge building efforts.

The Red Road Gathering brings Native Americans from across the country to campus for a two-day event that provides a compassionate and supportive healing environment through culturally-based information and activities. Indigenous and mainstream chemical recovery centers and mental health institutions around the world are using Red Road, a therapeutic holistic healing method. It combines the modern medical model of addressing disease with the traditional Lakota healing methods that address the diseases of personhood and social structure. The Department of Alcohol and Drug Studies
in collaboration with the Wase Wakpa Lakota members in Vermillion host the annual gathering, and several campus programs, including Social Work and Psychology, are integrally involved.

The Tribal Research Coordinator and Cultural Liaison for Disparities Research Center/Sanford Healthcare System contribute to the event, and the wider Vermillion community including local churches and the Welcome Table also support it. Affiliated partners include Building Bridges, the Institute of American Indian Studies, the Office of Institutional Diversity, the Office of Student Life, Prairielands Addiction Technology Transfer Center, Student Counseling Center, TRIO Programs, and Native Student Services.

The Building Bridges Conference and American Indian Visit Day is one of the University’s primary recruitment events for Native American students. A joint effort between the Department of Alcohol and Drug Studies, the Office of Admissions, and the Clinical Psychology Training Program, the conference theme for the 2010 was O’yate O’kiciyapi: People Helping One Another. In spring 2010, more than 700 conference brochures were sent to middle and high school students, counselors and college students and educators in our region, inviting them to the event.

Graduate students in Clinical Psychology help develop and implement Building Bridges through their knowledge of the psychological principles at work in learning, adapting (to change and to new environments), relationship building, decision making, and cultural responsiveness. Many USD academic programs set up recruiting booths during the conference to introduce Native students to programs and give them an opportunity to meet with faculty.

The Center for Disabilities has collaborated with tribal entities to establish developmental clinics on the state’s reservations. The first opened on the Rosebud Reservation in 1990 and continued until 2008, when the Rosebud Sioux Tribe was able to successfully fund and self-administer the clinic. From 2008 to 2010, the center along with several collaborators operated a clinic on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

The center and other agencies currently operate the Cheyenne River Developmental Clinic in a remote, medically underserved area of north central South Dakota. While the education system offers early intervention services, children from birth to five-years-old need to be diagnosed before they are eligible. With no local pediatric specialists, many children who would be eligible to receive early intervention were not identified. Working together, the tribe, the Cheyenne River Health Service Unit, Indian Health Services, Prairie Community Health, Inc., Birth To 3 Connections, Northwest Area Schools, Cheyenne River Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Exceptional Education Program, and the USD Center for Disabilities formed an interdisciplinary health team to work with local health and educational services.

The collaborators organized a comprehensive developmental evaluation clinic. Professionals from Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy and students from Leadership Education in Neurodevelopment and Related Disabilities visit the clinic each month to provide free PT and OT services for children, to provide early intervention and other needed services, and to track children not eligible for services but considered at-risk.

From January 1, 2007, to December 31, 2010, 232 children were seen at the Cheyenne River Developmental Clinic:

- 144 (62 percent) were eligible for services.
- An additional 95 children qualified for tracking that may lead to services later.
• 131 audiological evaluations were completed to identify developmental delay, communication delay, motor delay, and at-risk or normal development.

• Referrals were made for early intervention; physical, speech, and occupational therapy; Head Start, genetics/medical, vision, and hearing evaluation; dental exams; nutrition; parent education; mental health, and other services.

• Through networking and sharing existing resources, a public awareness campaign promoting the positive benefits of developmental health and wellness for young children has been developed and implemented in all the local reservation communities.

• A reservation-wide system for developmental screening was created and maintained with appropriate referral networks established.

**Partners for Progress**

Faculty members from across the University participate in community projects and programs to advance shared educational, economic and social goals.

• The Department of Political Science faculty engage in consulting and service activities with a wide variety of public and nonprofit organizations, including the American Coalition for Ethanol, the City of Vermillion and the Vermillion Planning Commission, the Clay County Commission, the Chamber Development Company, and the Human Services Center.

• The Nursing Program shares positions with the Lake Area Technical Institute’s Practical Nursing Program, including a shared director.

• Since 1939, the Graduate Research Bureau (GRB) has worked with and advised state and private agencies throughout South Dakota and the Siouxland community. It has established a long list of potential sources for access to data in almost any field of public policy that may need to be studied or evaluated. The research teams employed by the GRB work with clients to help them cultivate and sustain organizational leaders, create visions for their organizations and set goals, create programs to achieve them, and understand the degree to which those goals have been met. Services begin at ordinance revision and end with large-scale community assessment survey.

• The Beacom School of Business invested in prime building space to house and staff the South Dakota Small Business Development Center (SBDC) with a network of six offices across the state that are part of a 1,100-office SBDC network around the country. The SBDC provides professional, confidential, and no-cost business consulting services, including one-on-one counseling and training, to individuals starting a business or looking for ways to improve an existing business. Since 1985, the South Dakota SBDC has helped clients obtain more than $747 million in financing, creating or preserving more than 13,101 jobs within the state.

• The Division of Continuing and Distance Education has partnered with the Vermillion School District to offer a collaborative Community Education Program, linking community needs to resources and providing an opportunity for Vermillion area
community members, individuals, schools, businesses, and public and private organizations to be active partners in creating and participating in lifelong learning. Community Education courses have included everything from financial management and health-care to fitness and children’s drawing. Several non-credit career training courses also are offered online. The Vermillion Senior Citizens Center, the Vermillion Public Library, the Clay County Extension Office, the Vermillion Chamber of Commerce, and the Vermillion Area Arts Council also cooperate in the program.

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The examples of services and programs provided above demonstrate the University is responsive to those whom depend on it: namely, students, faculty, the higher education community, K-12 Schools, health organizations and providers, Native populations, businesses and industries. The University regularly evaluates the needs of these constituents and then strives to respond to those needs through academic programs, research, and service.

CORE COMPONENT 5D

Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

As the flagship university in the state with a broad mission to serve a number of communities, USD collaborates with business, education, cultural groups, governmental, and other nonprofit partners to achieve mutual goals. The University regularly seeks feedback from external groups through surveys, advisory panels, and focus groups. Nearly all departments are involved in one or more of these activities, especially through participation on external advisory groups or boards. Varied academic programs such as Addiction Studies and Health Sciences, for example, have robust advisory boards that keep the University and its curriculum aware of changes in the field.

In a fall 2009 survey, the Vermillion community noted the following outcomes from the Center for Academic Engagement’s service-learning projects: maintenance or increase in quality of services offered, improved awareness of a community agency, and increased leveraging of financial resources.

Those served regularly by USD’s Government Research Bureau acknowledge the value of its work:

• “The staff took the time to research and analyze our needs. The survey was helpful in crafting our legislative message and how best to meet the needs of our diverse small business membership.” —Shawn Lyons, executive director, South Dakota Retailers Association.

• “The Vermillion Area Arts Council very much appreciates the GRB’s generous assistance during the past year. Your survey will help us to plan for the future as we move forward to nurture the arts in our community by building a stronger base of support.” —Norma Wilson, president, Vermillion Area Arts Council.

“The general environment of having USD as the center of the community elevates all that we do — there is a higher level of thinking in the community.”

—Mark Froke, Superintendent of Vermillion Schools
• “It was a pleasure to work with the USD Government Research Bureau team. Their knowledge base of how a local government functions and (the) professional staff was key to delivering an end product that has served our City well. If you are considering a survey of your community, I recommend you consider the resources the GRB team can bring to the table.” —Leon Schochenmeier, City Administrator, Pierre, S.D.

The Government Research Bureau provides strategic planning, program evaluation, economic development assistance, and other support to governments, nonprofits, and businesses across the state. In addition to its numerous other collaborations, it functions as the unofficial research arm of the State of South Dakota executive branch – providing services to support a number of critical areas and departments.

The Beacom School of Business provides workforce support and development to the region, placing students in internships; organizing speakers, events, and networking opportunities for the business community; sharing faculty expertise, and expanding research through the South Dakota Small Business Development Center, which has focused support for American Indian business ownership. The value the business sector in the region and Beacom alumni place on the Beacom School of Business's service and education can be measured in the private dollars raised to complete the new Beacom Hall.

Inviting the Community to USD

The public schools, local health-care organization, and the city of Vermillion use campus buildings on a regular basis. Numerous City Hall meetings have been held on campus, with meetings broadcast on the local television station. Special city events, such as Celebrate Vermillion, a New Year's Eve activity to provide a non-alcoholic celebration activity, have been held in the student center.

The community turns to the DakotaDome for everything from the state football championship playoffs to children's activities and Vermillion's 2010 high school graduation. DakotaDome records show that more than 20,000 K-12 students, teachers, and administrators from the area attend various annual events. In addition, 22,000 people attend the winter Farm Show in the Dome. (http://www.usd.edu/campus-life/student-services/wellness-center/facility.cfm) lists community user policies and open hours for the DakotaDome.

The Athletic Department provides discounted tickets for athletic events to individuals with disabilities, and memberships are available to community members for a fee. Athletics also connects the community to the University through summer youth camps. In 2010, more than 2,500 youth attended athletic camps and clinics in football, men's and women's basketball, soccer, volleyball, softball and swimming.

Galleries, theaters and traveling shows from the state's only College of Fine Arts offer USD students opportunities to exhibit and perform in a wide variety of mediums as well as providing outstanding access to cultural opportunities.

• More than 19,800 listeners attended 109 Department of Music recitals, concerts, master classes, youth activities, and competitions, most of them free to the public. More than 50 were publicly advertised; 20 were specifically offered to K-12 students in the region.
Since 1977, the University Art Galleries (UAG) has presented more than 735 on-campus contemporary and historical exhibitions featuring works by international, national, regional, and local artists; produced more than 350 educational programs; and established a permanent collection of over 1,600 pieces of art. The UAG also has provided more than 300 works of art annually for public spaces, sponsored more than 50 touring art exhibitions, and served an audience of nearly 400,000 people. In addition, it plays a significant role in connecting USD to regional and national visual arts projects such as Save Outdoor Sculpture and the Northern Plains Tribal Arts projects. The UAG also has been directly involved in the development and exhibition of the Oscar Howe Collection, the largest single collection of works by Dr. Howe, an internationally-noted American Indian artist who served on the USD faculty for 25 years. UAG operates the Oscar Howe Memorial Association, which promotes research and educational projects in American Indian art. About 160 artists participate in the annual Frogman's Print and Paper Workshops held annually in July.

An active Theater Program produces six shows and 30 performances in 2009-2010 that attracted 5,376 patrons and 1,046 (K–12) youth, many of whom participated in post-show discussions of “Peter Pan” with the artistic team.

Since 1973, more than 80,000 visitors from around the world visited the National Music Museum (NMM) & Center for Study of the History of Musical Instruments. Founded in 1973 on the USD campus, the museum’s renowned collections (http://orgs.usd.edu/nmm/collect.html) include more than 14,800 American, European, and non-Western instruments from virtually all cultures and historical periods and are the most inclusive anywhere.

In 2009, the city of Vermillion celebrated its Sesquicentennial with the grand opening in Old Main and the Sesquicentennial Ball in the Muenster University Center Ballroom. Campus buildings and grounds were used throughout the year’s festivities.

Finally, Disability Services developed a referral guide to accessible events for departments and offices to use when planning campus events. It includes examples of accommodations provided to external constituents, including sign language interpreters, accessible seating, loaner wheelchairs, etc.

**Continuing Education for Professionals**

Given that the University maintains the largest graduate school in the state and the only law and medical schools, as well as many undergraduate professional programs, it regularly works collaboratively with professional groups to provide continuing education.

- The School of Education hosts a biannual School Psychology Symposium that offers professional development opportunities for school and mental health professionals.

- The School of Education also provides an outlet for those supporting gifted youth and the youth themselves through the South Dakota Governors Gifted Camp, the Ambassadors of Excellence Program, and the Institute for Teachers of Gifted Youth. With fewer than 50 teachers for gifted youth in the state, these programs are especially essential because support for talented and gifted educators is otherwise minimal.
• The Dental Hygiene faculty provides workshops for dental hygienists throughout the state, awarding continuing education (CE) credits. CE is required for licensure, as mandated by the South Dakota Board of Dentistry.

• Alcohol and Drugs Studies provides professional development seminars in various communities across South Dakota and also in Iowa.

• The School of Law’s dean and faculty provide continuing education opportunities for practicing lawyers in the state and region. Recently the dean co-presented a seminar on ethics for the South Dakota State Bar. Informally, the law faculty acts as a sounding board for many members of the South Dakota bar on specific cases and topics.

• The Sanford School of Medicine operates a Department of Continuing Medical Education to provide the medical community with training and education via lecture and discussion, case studies, simulations, and interactive internet activities. A current calendar and online registration is maintained on the school’s website. (http://www.usd.edu/med/continuing-medical-education/)

• The Division of Continuing and Distance Education regularly hosts community workshops on a variety of topics. (http://www.usd.edu/cde/upload/Spring-2011-Community-Education-Inside-Pages.pdf)

CORE COMPONENT 5D: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The University of South Dakota, through its academic and administrative units, has established a significant service mission and developed a robust relationship with the community, characterized by joint planning efforts and inclusive programming. Evidence shows that USD:

• learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations,

• responds to the diversity of its constituencies with a demonstrated commitment to serve, and

• responds to constituencies that depend on it for service. Those constituencies value the services provided.

Effective organizational structures and processes enable effective connections and provide the capacity to engage with communities and all constituencies.

CRITERION FIVE: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

While the University gives high priority to engagement and considerable engagement activities do occur through University efforts, there is no strategic cohesive plan for these activities nor is there a central repository of all engagement activities provided by the University community.

• Engagement activities are often the result of soft money or individual faculty/staff interests, rather than conscious prioritization.
• Community engagement is typically managed at the college or unit level, and the result is a very active and rich set of programs, but programs that sometimes lack strategic intent, strategic direction, and strategic support at the institutional level.

• While the Self-Study process indicated that all constituents are well served, a prioritized plan for University engagement with constituencies is recommended.

• Because engagement activities are so numerous and diffused throughout the institution, it is difficult to collect data or assess the collective impact of such activities.

• There is also evidence that development of a cohesive service commitment by the University community has been hampered by the faculty’s perceived lack of an adequate reward system or emphasis on this element. This concern was identified by the Self-Study survey.

• The University can improve in communicating its story and its many successes to audiences outside the institution.

• The Self-Study process identified a shortcoming within the University in that there is no central repository to document the rich service and engagement activities that are hallmarks of this University. Thus, the process of reviewing the many and varied activities has led to a desire to establish a location where these activities could be summarized.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

To address the challenges and build upon the strengths identified through this Self-Study process, USD should progress from an organization that undertakes engagement at a “unit-based” level to one that undertakes engagement at an “institution-based” level by clarifying strategic intent, strategic directions, and the required strategic support.

• Use the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Community Engagement 2008 Documentation Framework to assess and plan USD’s advancement as an engaged institution.

• Continue the emphasis on engagement in the next institutional strategic plan; prioritize engagement commitments, and link unit plans, reporting structures, personnel decisions, and budget planning to priorities.

• Develop and expand reward structures for faculty, students, and staff who serve external constituencies in their professional roles.

• Improve institutional management of engagement through better coordination, data collection, and assessment.

• Identify means of development of and recognition for faculty who are ambassadors of service-learning and engagement activities.

• Create a website to showcase USD’s engagement/service-learning and provide a central repository of all university activities.
Chapter 8: Off-Campus Centers, Distance Education and Correspondence Study
Off-campus, distance-learning, and correspondence courses are a significant component in how The University of South Dakota fulfills its mission to provide educational services to the citizens of South Dakota, the region, and beyond. In fall 2010, 39 percent (3,930 of 10,151 students) of the University’s unduplicated student headcount enrolled at off-campus Centers and in distance and correspondence courses. (See the category Not in Vermillion in Figure 8-1 highlighted below.)

These off-campus learners are diverse: They are full-time, part-time, pursuing degrees, not pursuing degrees, graduate, and undergraduate. They reside across the United States with the majority from the region. The fall 2010 enrollment report (Fall 2010 Final Enrollment Report Self-Support http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 65) confirms:

- 67 percent of the self-support, off-campus students are female, and 33 percent are male.
- 69 percent are undergraduate students, and 31 percent are graduate students.
- 88 percent are white, 3 percent are Native American, 2 percent are Hispanic, and 2 percent are Black/Non-Hispanic.
- 78 percent are South Dakota citizens, and 22 percent are not residents of South Dakota.

The fall 2010 enrollment report for off-campus programs at USD can be found in the Virtual Resource Room (Fall 2010 Final Enrollment Report Self-Support http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 65). It confirms that in addition to the 3,930 students not in Vermillion, an additional 424 on-campus students were also enrolled in off-campus, distance, or correspondence courses, bringing the total to 4,354 learners.

These off-campus learners are diverse: They are full-time, part-time, pursuing degrees, not pursuing degrees, graduate, and undergraduate. They reside across the United States with the majority from the region. The fall 2010 enrollment report (Fall 2010 Final Enrollment Report Self-Support http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 65) confirms:

- 67 percent of the self-support, off-campus students are female, and 33 percent are male.
- 69 percent are undergraduate students, and 31 percent are graduate students.
- 88 percent are white, 3 percent are Native American, 2 percent are Hispanic, and 2 percent are Black/Non-Hispanic.
- 78 percent are South Dakota citizens, and 22 percent are not residents of South Dakota.
• Of the non-residents, the majority reside in states other than South Dakota’s immediate neighbors (389) and in Iowa (274), Minnesota (167), and Nebraska (123).
• 36 percent are not pursuing degrees.
• The majority of the degree pursuant students are from the Beacom School of Business (537 or 12 percent of total), School of Education (415 or 9.5 percent of total), and School of Health Sciences (374 or 8.5 percent of total).

Student tracking data also shows that an increasing number of on-campus students are enrolling in off-campus classes, especially in online and correspondence study modalities. The service site for those students is determined by where they receive the most face-to-face instruction. For a student enrolled in one or more on-campus courses in Vermillion, the campus becomes the service site. The service site for students enrolled in one or more face-to-face courses at a remote center plus online or correspondence courses is the off-campus center. Students enrolled solely in online or correspondence courses receive student services from the CDE and University staff in Vermillion.

Enrollment in off-campus and distance education has increased by about 10 percent a year for the last three years. For the fall 2010 semester, the non-resident FTE student population grew 12.91 percent and South Dakota FTE grew 13.56 percent. These gains meet the University’s strategic goal (http://www.usd.edu/about-usd/president/upload/StrategicPlanWeb.pdf) to expand off-campus and distance offerings. The growth also contributes to meeting Goal 3B of the South Dakota’s 2010 Initiative for Education (http://www.2010education.com/GoalsAndObjectives.htm) to increase by 20 percent the number of South Dakotans with postsecondary education and training. The distance programs also speak to South Dakota’s goal of supporting postsecondary education programs to enhance the state’s economy. One goal is to increase the percentage of South Dakotans with graduate degrees, which falls below national averages. In the United States, the percentage of the population with masters, doctorate, and professional degrees is 7.1, 1.2, and 1.9 percent, respectively. In South Dakota, those same percentages are 4.6, 1, and 1.6 percent, respectively.

SUPPORTING OFF-CAMPUS LEARNING

The Division of Continuing and Distance Education (CDE) supports off-campus, distance, and correspondence education provided through the College of Arts and Sciences, Beacom School of Business, School of Education, College of Fine Arts, School of Health Sciences, and Basic Biomedical Sciences in the Sanford School of Medicine. University programs under CDE leadership include:

• online education,
• off-campus education,
• customized and contract education,
• non-credit continuing education,
• youth programs,
• on-campus and off-campus summer school,
• international study tours,
• TRIO programs, and
• testing.
In 2009, Graduate School functions were combined with CDE in an effort to reduce administrative expenses and to strengthen management of the Graduate School. In FY 2010, CDE earned $10 million in gross revenue from its operations, with an increase projected for FY 2011.

CDE has adopted an administratively centralized, academically decentralized organizational model, which is similar to nearly 80 percent of continuing education units across the country, according to the University Professional Continuing Education Association (UPCEA) (2009 Management-Marketing Survey Summary http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See A - 15).

To ensure appropriate scope of staff responsibility in an administratively centralized and academically decentralized model for off-campus instruction, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) clarify how academic and student service matters are to be managed at the Centers. These agreements and the USD/CDE schedule building process for off-campus and distance education confirm USD effectively oversees instruction including consistency of curricular expectations, academic policies, and faculty approval, appointment, and evaluation (Memo of Understanding-Sept. 2009 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I – 8), (CDE Schedule Building Process 9-2009 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I – 34), (Grad Faculty Approval Form & Process for Hiring Adjunct Faculty http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 68 & 18, respectively). Appropriately credentialed and trained academic advisors are assigned to advise off-campus and distance students through a well-crafted advising plan and all off-campus locations are represented (Policies & Procedures – Advising Structure: Off-Campus & Distance 11-10 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 25).

With assistance from UPCEA, CDE recently investigated the University’s revenue management practices and revenue sharing with colleges and schools. The results (Structure & Revenue Management Query–Dec. 2010 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I-17) showed that:

- 81.6 percent of the respondents are self-support,
- 79.6 percent reported revenue flowed to their units,
- 65 percent of the USD’s CDE units share revenue with colleges and schools, and
- 71 percent return revenue to the Central University.

The results were in keeping with the University’s expectation for CDE. The division is self-supporting, and incoming revenue is managed to meet fiscal ratios commonly adopted by self-sustaining educational endeavors. Currently, 10 percent of net revenue is shared with colleges and schools, and additional net revenue flows to University Central at the end of the fiscal year to fund indirect expenses. The University Budget Allocation Model Advisory Committee, however, is discussing modifying the revenue sharing model between CDE and the colleges and schools. Results are expected in spring 2011.

CDE’s dean reports to the USD provost and operates CDE/Graduate Education with 17 staff members in Vermillion, two in Rapid City, and several who are employed through the off-campus centers. Partner universities share the cost of staff housed at the remote sites. CDE also funds staff in academic units and administrative offices, including advisors, technology staff, and an international advisor, through its Memoranda of Understanding. It supports academic and administrative units in varied ways. Proposed changes to the revenue-sharing model intend to make these connections more transparent.

CDE compensates faculty who teach off-campus and distance courses as well as graders in the Correspondence Study Program (CDE Compensation Policy http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic
In FY 2010, faculty salaries and benefits totaled $3.3 million dollars. The faculty staffing for CDE teaching in FY 2010 was as follows:

- Full-time faculty funded through CDE = 16.40%
- Adjunct = 24.60%
- Overload = 3.3%
- Correspondence Graders = 30.48%
- Summer Contracts = 10.77%
- Graduate Assistant Teaching = 0.61%
- Independent Study = 0.86%
- Shared Faculty with Other SD Universities = 0.12%
- Inload (part of regular faculty member’s workload) = 12.86%

Off-campus and distance students are also reliant upon on campus professionals for service: some of whom include the director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, librarians, director of Disability Services, numerous academic advisors, academic department chairs, student services staff, human resources staff, accountants in academic units, and graduate program directors.

**OFF-CAMPUS LEARNING CENTERS**

USD’s Statement of Affiliation with the HLC allows it to extend face-to-face degree programs throughout South Dakota and the United States through the HLC’s Notification Program for Additional Locations. The U.S. Department of Education and the HLC have approved the following locations as off-campus centers:

- University Center in Sioux Falls, S.D. – 2 locations (North and South)
- Capital University Center in Pierre, S.D.
- Higher Education Center in Rapid City, S.D.
- Rapid City Health Sciences Building in Rapid City, S.D.
- Ellsworth Air Force Base, EAFB, S.D.
- Sanford School of Medicine to Rapid City, S.D., Yankton S.D., and Sioux Falls, S.D.
- Lake Area Technical Institute in Watertown, S.D.
- Tri-State Graduate Center in Sioux City, I.A.

A new University Center in Rapid City will open late spring of 2011 replacing the instructional location known as the Higher Education Center-West River. As a result, USD will use the HLC Notification Program to notify the HLC of its new address for University Center-Rapid City and to inactivate the Higher Education-West River and the Tri-State Graduate Center and Ellsworth Air Force Base locations. The Tri-State and Ellsworth locations do not have any remaining active face-to-face students; on-site courses are not offered at these addresses. The University also will be adding a new Sioux Falls
location beginning in FY 2012. The Sioux Falls nursing programs will be relocated to 1605 S. Euclid, Sioux Falls, S.D. Finally, as part the University’s application for state registration in Iowa, a partnership with Western Iowa Technical Institute and Community College (WITCC) and an accompanying new degree completion location at WITCC at 4647 Stone Avenue, Sioux City, Iowa, were approved by the Iowa College Student Aid Commission on January 21, 2011. Verification is available in the resource rooms. As a result, The University of South Dakota will also notify the Higher Learning Commission and the Department of Education of this additional instructional location offering 50% or more of a degree through face-to-face instruction. When approval from the HLC, United States Department of Education, and South Dakota Board of Regents is confirmed, courses will be scheduled in Sioux City at WITCC. Projected degree completion programs for Sioux City include the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences, the Bachelor of General Studies, Bachelor of Business Administration, the Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice and Bachelor of Science in Alcohol and Drug Studies. The University also extends instruction, but not degree completion, at 16 course locations throughout South Dakota and the United States.

Finally, the University extends 22 degree programs to Sioux Falls, 13 to Rapid City, one to Watertown, and three to Pierre. Medical students may earn up to 50 percent of their degrees in Rapid City, Yankton, and Sioux Falls.

The Centers’ administrative staff is responsible for facility oversight and technical assistance. With the exception of the Sanford School of Medicine locations, Center staff also manages recruitment, marketing, initial academic advising, select student and faculty support services, and course scheduling. The responsibility for teaching, curriculum oversight, and faculty appointments and evaluations remains with the leaders of the academic units on the Vermillion campus. Off-campus students are served by a core group of full-time faculty as well as part-time adjunct faculty. Face-to-face instruction at the Centers is considered equivalent to on-campus instruction, and many of the classes are taught by the same faculty.

### MEASURING QUALITY

Academic units and the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment consistently measure, document, and analyze student academic performance for degrees among all delivery modalities, on- and off-campus. University Center in Sioux Falls leads the way in terms of employing regular student surveys to acquire student opinions about academics, student services, facilities and marketing. (University Center - Sioux Falls Student Surveys FY 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See I - 69). Student feedback provides data that inform University Center staff and partner universities about student satisfaction and trends.

The figures below summarize enrollment at the University’s largest centers. Vermillion students who enroll in off-campus and distance classes are also tracked to keep up-to-date information about how many on-campus students enroll in off-campus classes. Nursing is recorded separately because it is both a state-supported and self-supported off-campus activity. (See Figure 8-2 for details). CE Unduplicated Headcount Report FY 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See I - 31). Effective FY 2011, distance nursing become more strategically linked to CDE.
**Figure 8-2**

**Off-Campus Programs, Fall 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>University Center</th>
<th>Sioux Falls</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Programs Offered</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Course Sections Offered</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FT Faculty</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PT faculty, Adjuncts &amp; Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total USD students enrolled at UC-Sioux Falls</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Capital University Center</th>
<th>Pierre</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Programs Offered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Course Sections Offered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FT Faculty</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PT faculty, adjuncts &amp; other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total USD students enrolled at Capital University Center</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>University Center</th>
<th>Rapid City</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Programs Offered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Course Sections Offered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of FT Faculty</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of PT faculty, adjuncts &amp; other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total USD Students enrolled at UC-Rapid City</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTANCE LEARNING**

Based on information provided through the BoR’s Electronic University Consortium, USD is the largest provider of distance degrees among the Regental institutions, has earned HLC approval to offer degrees through electronic, distance education. Of USD’s 109 degree programs, 21 (19 percent) are distance degree programs. When specializations and certificates are included, the Division of Continuing & Distance Education promotes 34 different distance programs (shown in Figure 8-3).
USD has worked with its partners in the Electronic University Consortium to develop a five year plan to deliberately and strategically extend distance programs (Future Off-Campus and Distance Five-Year Plan http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units See I – 16).

The programs included in the plan are targeted for further research. If they are deemed feasible in terms of mission fit and fiscal viability, the academic unit, working in tandem with CDE staff and partner universities, creates a proposal to extend the academic program through distance delivery. Proposals must be approved by the academic unit, CDE, relevant University councils, the provost and president, and the appropriate Board of Regents' system councils.

Based on the HLC’s July 1, 2010, approval system for distance delivery, USD operates at Level 3 because CDE operates as a separate organizational component to manage off-campus and distance education. CDE provides oversight for distance courses and programs, and its staff is responsible for recruitment, marketing, course scheduling, and providing select student and faculty support services. CDE also provides fiscal planning and management for distance and off-campus operations.

The Level 3 classification gives the University ample room to accommodate its plans for growth in distance education. For fall 2010, distance credits comprised 8.6 percent of the University’s overall credits production (8,903 of 103,856 credits), substantially below the 50 percent of total institutional credit hours (and more than 35 percent of degree programs) required to submit a HLC request to move to Level 4.

### SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMMING

Nursing is among the University’s most successful distance-learning programs. In partnership with the Evangelical Good Samaritan Society, the University in 2003 extended its Associate of Science degree through the “Grow Your Own” program. Health-care providers in six states have sponsored eligible employees.

In March of 2010, USD Distance Nursing received a $5 million U.S. Department of Labor grant to expand the “Grow Your Own” program to military personnel returning from war zones. Veterans will
be recruited and assisted with job placement in entry level nursing positions in rural acute and long-term care centers. “Grow Your Own” will provide a clear path to an associate degree in nursing.

Below (Figure 8-4) is a crosswalk of how USD’s promoted distance programs align with distance education offerings on file with the HLC. Corrections were submitted to the HLC, but corrections are not yet identified on the HLC website because they were submitted after the 2010 AIDU closed. The data will be updated in the 2011 AIDU.

**Figure 8-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aligning HLC and Promoted Distance Program for USD 12/6/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HLC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate — General Studies (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate—Nursing (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor—Substance Abuse/Addiction Counseling (Alcohol and Drug Studies) (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor—Physical Therapy/Therapist (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master—Computer and Information Sciences, General (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master—Educational Administration and Supervision (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master—Educational/Instructional Media Design (Technology for Education and Training) (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master—Human Services, General (Administration) (Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master — Communication Disorders, General (Speech Language Pathology) (Closed circuit, Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master - Business Administration and Management, General (Internet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLC</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist—Educational Administration and Supervision (Internet)</td>
<td>✓ Education Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) Educational Administration/Elementary School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Education Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) Educational Administration/Secondary School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Education Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) Educational Administration/Pre-K–12 School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Education Specialist Degree (Ed.S.) Educational Administration/School District Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate—Reading Teacher Education (Literacy Leadership and Coaching) (Internet)</td>
<td>✓ Graduate Certificate in Literacy Leadership and Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate—Substance Abuse/Addiction Counseling (Alcohol and Drug Studies) (Internet)</td>
<td>✓ Undergraduate Certificate in Alcohol and Drug Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate—Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences, Other (Long-term Care Management) (Internet)</td>
<td>✓ Graduate Certificate in Long-Term Care Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additions after AIDU deadline:
Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.)
Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Health Sciences
Executive Master of Public Administration (EMPA)
Master of Arts (M.A.) in Addiction Studies
Graduate Certificate in Alcohol and Drug Studies
Graduate Certificate in Disaster Mental Health
RN to BSN Degree Completion

**SUPPORTING FACULTY AND STAFF**

Staff at the Center for Teaching and Learning, which is discussed thoroughly in Criterion 3, and CDE program managers provide a strong system of support for faculty who teach online and through Web conferencing. The center regularly offers professional development opportunities in Vermillion and to faculty anywhere (Fall 2010 QA Review Status Sheet 11-19-2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D – 15).

Authors of online classes are compensated at a rate of $500 or $1000 per credit hour as referenced in the authorship agreement (Online Course Authorship Agreement 2-10 [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See I - 77). In some cases, faculty members develop courses as part of their institutional duties. Authors are not compensated until a successful quality assurance review has been documented.

Faculty members who teach online follow the Board of Regent’s (BoR) policy on intellectual property ([http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/4-Personnel/documents/4-34.pdf](http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/4-Personnel/documents/4-34.pdf)). Intellectual property developed for an online program is considered a no-cost, non-exclusive, world-wide license to the BoR to use instructional material for educational and research purposes.
ENSURING QUALITY

USD and its partners in the Electronic University Consortium adopted the “Quality Matters” program as a continuous improvement model for ensuring the quality of online courses. The rubric, developed by Maryland Online through a U.S. Department of Education Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant, provided a replicable pathway for quality assurance in online learning. Under USD’s Quality Assurance model, all essential standards of the rubric need to be met at an 80 percent or greater threshold (Quality Assurance Rubric http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I-29). This standard is in keeping with the original Quality Matters standard. Course review also must satisfy enough of the Very Important and Important standards to garner a minimum of 85 percent of the total points available in the rubric (65 out of the 76 points). Quality Assurance also requires a quality assurance review for:

- all newly authored courses (Quality Assurance Rubric http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 29), (The appropriate department chair approves academic content and learning objectives, and the eLearning Coordinator reviews design. The CDE assistant dean provides overall approval for the University),
- faculty teaching previously authored courses for the first time, and
- all courses every three years if course changes or new faculty appointments have not prompted a review.

The Board of Regents also conducts its own statewide reviews using peer evaluators, and courses are also considered through the University’s regular systems of course and faculty evaluation, namely, department chair reviews and student evaluations using IDEA.

A status report on faculty training and the Quality Assurance process is shared weekly with CDE online program managers, the eLearning coordinator, and the CDE assistant dean and dean. This report ensures organized progress on scheduled quality assurance reviews (Fall 2010 QA Review Status Sheet 11-19-2010 http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D - 15). The Virtual Resource Room showcases results of several reviews over the last three years (2010FA AHED 735 Review & 2006FA ENGL201 Review http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D – 16 & 17). The team has been provided access to select online courses as noted in the cover letter.

EVALUATING RESULTS

Every online course is evaluated using the IDEA student evaluation process, and the Spring 2009–Summer 2010 results show students are satisfied and believe they are learning online (Cumulative IDEA Evaluation Data – Summaries http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Affairs. See II - D - 18). Expected IDEA evaluation results were compared to actual results for 458 courses. The percentage of increase or decrease from the expectation is assessed. Between the spring term of 2009 and summer term 2010, USD online classes rated:

- (-25.76) percent, or lower than the IDEA expectation in the Much Higher Group (needs work),
- 5.90% above the IDEA expectation in the Higher Group (good),
• 21.72% higher than the IDEA expectation in the Similar Group (good),
• (-37.77) percent, or lower than the IDEA expectation in the Low Group (good), and
• 2.62% higher than the IDEA expectation in the Much Lower Group (needs work).

Academic leaders in schools, colleges, CDE and CTL review the IDEA evaluations; and academic deans reference results during performance appraisals of faculty. If results are below average, referrals may be made to the University’s Center for Teaching and Learning for formative improvement. Such referrals have proven to be positive in regards to teaching performance in online classes.

Academic units also assess student learning and program outcomes in distance learning as part of the University’s overall assessment effort. Those unit-specific assessments have shown online learning is equivalent to face-to-face learning. The Master of Business Administration and the Educational Administration MA are USD’s largest online programs, and evidence shows that online results are similar to classroom achievement. (See Figures 8-5 and 8-6)

**Figure 8-5**
National Assessment Test Results of MBA Scores: Online vs. F2F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Summer 2009)</td>
<td>(Fall 2009)</td>
<td>(Spring 2010)</td>
<td>(Summer 2010)</td>
<td>(Fall 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>n=25</td>
<td>n=16</td>
<td>n=38</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Integration</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8-6**
Average Comprehensive Exam Scores for MA Educational Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Educational Administration Average Comprehensive Exam Scores Sorted by Vermillion and Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–12 Master’s Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–12 Specialist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHED Master’s Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USD also tracks the Grade of D, Failing and Withdrawal (DFW) rates of students and grade distribution to determine if CDE course outcomes are aligned with trends in on-campus classes. Online delivery
has the highest DFW rates of USD’s courses delivery types followed by correspondence study, and f2f off-campus. This is not unusual as these delivery methods primarily serve non-traditional students, who may not be as prepared for university learning or must study while balancing work and family responsibilities. Although the rate of DFW is higher for off-campus, distance and correspondence study, it is not unreasonably so. In terms of grades, correspondence study awards the highest percent of A’s and F’s, which requires the University to analyze further the factors which lead to these results. (See Figures 8-7 and 8-8)

**Figure 8-7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion Campus</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1495.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4327.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Off Campus</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3336.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion Campus</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1495.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4327.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Off Campus</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3336.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORTING ONLINE LEARNING**

Robust technical support is essential for online learning, and the University benefits from a technical infrastructure shared among South Dakota’s public universities. Technology management is centralized under the University’s Information Technology Services (Memo of Understanding-ITS [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83)). Click on Academic Units. See I - 10) with staff assigned to serve CDE and University Center in Sioux Falls.

Desire-2-Learn (D2L) is the adopted learning management system. Elluminate Web-conference technology allows faculty members to host real-time chats in which students and the faculty member can be seen and heard. Faculty also video stream lectures using Elluminate, and these lectures are archived for repeated student viewing.
Technology also assists USD in meeting the federal requirement for student verification in distance education. Elluminate, D2L logins and passwords, and online proctored testing are instrumental in assuring that the students who are enrolled in distance classes are, in fact, the ones who complete the academic work.

The University Help Desk is open for students, staff, and faculty with extended hours into the evening and on weekends. CDE provides funding for additional Help Desk support and for an Online Advocate whose responsibility it is to provide extra support to the University’s distance education programs.

Many other student services for distance learners are Web-based, including recruitment services, applications for admission, acceptance notification, registration, financial aid, bill payment, advising, and library services. Online library resources are robust for online learners with remote access to its databases, online journals, full-text resources, document delivery services, information literacy instruction, reserve materials, and institutional agreements with state and regional libraries. Reference and research assistance is available during regular working hours as well as in the evening and on the weekend. The University employs a distance learning librarian.

**CORRESPONDENCE STUDY**

Although the University is investing more in online instruction than the self-paced correspondence study, self-guided learning remains a viable option for many students. The University extends over 70 correspondence courses each term, primarily undergraduate classes from the College of Arts and Sciences. Degrees are not offered through correspondence study, and faculty members, who are approved by department chairs, are employed as graders instead of instructors and are compensated per student.

The appropriate academic units evaluate correspondence course content for quality, and department chairs review and approve self-study guides for the courses. Administratively, the correspondence study program is led by the CDE assistant dean. Assessment systems are not as fully developed for correspondence work as they are for other distance learning. CDE’s semester-by-semester correspondence course evaluation, however, shows a 94.25 percent completion rate (Figure 8-9), which is quite high in the industry.

**Figure 8-9**

*Retention Rate of Correspondence Classes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADS 116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS 117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS 320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS 412</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS 415</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS 251</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 210</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 280</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTE 310</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 211</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 401</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 403</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 412</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 201</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 203</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 351</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 419</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 426</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 452</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 455</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 456</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 460</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELED 162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 201</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 203</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 205</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 210</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 222</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 283</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 469</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 427</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 210</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA 101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 122</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 151</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 152</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 103</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>115.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED 411</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 021</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 101</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 151</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 243</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a summary of correspondence study enrollments (Figure 8-10):

**Figure 8-10**

**Correspondence Program, Fall 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 2010</th>
<th>Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Programs Offered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Course Sections Offered</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FT Faculty</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PT Faculty, Adjuncts &amp; Other</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total correspondence enrollments</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure correspondence students</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Correspondence &amp; on-campus students</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Correspondence &amp; off-campus students</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th># of Programs Offered</th>
<th># of Course Sections Offered</th>
<th>% FT Faculty</th>
<th>% PT Faculty, Adjuncts &amp; Other</th>
<th>Total correspondence enrollments</th>
<th>Pure correspondence students</th>
<th># of Correspondence &amp; on-campus students</th>
<th># of Correspondence &amp; off-campus students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 370</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 250</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>128.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL 371</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>116.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 351</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>109.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 410</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 440</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 450</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 452</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 455</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 456</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 458</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 460</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 480</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 490 Woman Criminal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 281</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA 201</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>731</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>94.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFF-CAMPUS CENTERS, DISTANCE EDUCATION, AND CORRESPONDENCE STUDY: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES

The Division of Continuing and Distance Education rests upon a strong tradition of partnering with the University’s colleges and schools to extend academic programs to students in the region and beyond. The Division of Continuing and Distance Education has been operational at USD since 1916. This tradition and new efforts give off-campus students the opportunity to increase their knowledge and advance their careers through the latest technologies and learning theories – often from the comfort of their own homes or offices. The CDE Annual Reports for FY 2009 and FY 2010 (Annual Report FY 2009 & Annual Report FY 2010 [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 13 & 12, respectively) provide a historical view of efforts and the progressive growth the Division has experienced.

CDE’s mission is to extend The University of South Dakota to the citizens of the state, region, and beyond. The organization embraces the following guiding principles:

• To offer educational experiences that provide true student learning advancing knowledge and skill through high quality off-campus and distance education programs.

• To be known as an organization that gets things done and gets them done well.

• To provide support so faculty can focus on teaching and learning versus administrative and technical concerns.

• To provide student support in keeping with the best practices in distance education.

• To create a work culture in which every staff member has the expectation and opportunity to develop professionally to the best of his/her abilities.

CDE has become an integral and successful component of the University with goals for continued growth through stronger alliances with colleges and schools. The Division’s efforts help the University fulfill its mission and Strategic Plan goals. CDE supports academic excellence and diversity, increases enrollment, helps to position and promote the University in the region, and models organizational effectiveness and change. CDE and its partnering units also help USD meet the HLC criteria for accreditation through its mission-driven, future-focused actions and partnerships.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

The Self-Study revealed the following future needs and directions:

• Conversations about the revenue sharing model should reach closure soon, and changes should foster an even stronger alliance between CDE, academic units, and colleges and schools.

• CDE has an immediate need to create a code to identify hybrid courses which meet the 75 percent distance threshold under the new definition of a distance course, while still making clear which courses are 100 percent distance. While this seems like
a simple request, it impacts data systems statewide and is under discussion at the BoR level.

• The University and CDE must develop a mechanism to track when a program meets the 50 percent distance bar in order to effectively monitor and record distance education under the new HLC and federal definitions. The University has considered providing distance availability (50 percent or more) for all degree programs, but that could significantly change the nature of USD.

• Managing the state registrations in which USD has presence is a continual challenge. CDE has central oversight of off-campus instruction, and new federal regulations on state authorization of face-to-face and distance education are being proactively addressed. As this report is written, approval has been received from Nebraska, North Dakota, Iowa and Wisconsin (Nebraska Approval Letter, North Dakota Approval Letter, Wisconsin Approval Letter [http://link.usd.edu/83](http://link.usd.edu/83) Click on Academic Units. See 1 - 70, 71, 72). USD also received approval from the Kansas Postsecondary Advisory Commission to extend its nursing program to Kansas. Approvals are in progress for the states of Arizona, Idaho, Minnesota, and New Mexico.

• CDE should continue to grapple with creating meaningful data reports that identify a student’s service site through degree progression.

• CDE must identify student demand through more sophisticated forms of market research, determine how to meet that demand, and provide the necessary professional development for faculty and staff to deliver the instruction and manage the systems.

• Advancements are needed in online student tutoring and academic support. The University purchased PLATO to provide virtual supplemental instruction in math, English, the sciences, and remediation for the CAAP exam, and will collect data to assess usage by students and their subsequent success.

• The Correspondence Study program needs to strengthen its assessment practices and further explore grade distribution and DWF rates.

• New policies are needed to address the growing trend of on-campus students enrolling in distance education courses when the Division’s true purpose is to serve an off-campus market. On-campus students also desire the flexibility and convenience provided by distance learning, and restrictions may not serve the University well. The key question for the University is how does this trend impact the efforts to build a vibrant home campus in Vermillion?

• The Division needs to continually research emerging technologies and trends and to embed the necessary changes to improve quality in distance learning.

• CDE must continue to develop and strengthen systems to ensure quality is maintained in distance, off-campus, and correspondence courses and programs. CDE needs to provide strong evidence regularly and systematically that student learning is equivalent to face-to-face courses in Vermillion.

• CDE in tandem with the academic units and the Center for Teaching and Learning should continually strive to strengthen adjunct faculty orientation and training.
The University of South Dakota has a rich history; outstanding faculty, alumni, students, and staff; and a strong commitment to and record of responding to needs and assessing results, which leads to the continued improvement of programs, processes, and student learning. The University's reach is statewide and beyond, providing service through South Dakota's University Centers, the Sanford School of Medicine's off-campus locations, and distance and correspondence education.

This Self-Study for reaccreditation through the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association verified the significant strengths of the University:

• High quality academic programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
• Continued improvement in the retention and graduation rates of students;
• Increased student enrollment both on and off-campus;
• Increased freshmen enrollments, especially of those students with ACT scores of 24 or more;
• Progress in assessment, including using results to effect positive change and program quality;
• Progress in enhancing diversity initiatives, especially in serving Native American students and faculty;
• The expansion of graduate programs;
• The expansion of off-campus and distance programs;
• Progress in research, grants, and contracts and a strengthened research agenda for the University;
• The development of research centers, the Center for Research and Development of Light-activated Materials and the Center for Ultra-low Background Experiments at DUSEL;
• Success in private fundraising and the resulting revitalization and renewal of the physical campus in Vermillion;
• Success in establishing facilities for Centers which serve learners throughout the state;
• The development of the infrastructure to effectively manage off-campus, distance, and correspondence education;
• Contribution to economic and workforce development through numerous initiatives;
• The growth of service to the Sioux Falls community;
• Student and faculty support services to sustain and strengthen teaching, student learning, faculty scholarship, and creative activities;
• A commitment to service-learning and the activities of the Center for Academic Engagement;

• Successful admission to new sports leagues and the transition to Division I Athletics;

• The technology infrastructure and a commitment to regular user evaluations and keeping systems up-to-date;

• Actual performance measures of the goals in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan;

• Managing University resources despite economic hardship;

• Working effectively with the BoR to achieve the Board’s goals of increasing the educational attainment of South Dakota citizens, improving academic quality, and strengthening economic development through research and degree programs and workforce development initiatives;

• Qualified staffing; and

• University administration, faculty, staff, and students who have the ability to band together towards a common vision to effectively and strategically address challenges.

The information in this Self-Study and the following three sources substantiate the above identified strengths:


3. The University’s Institutional Snapshot Document accompanying the self-study (HLC Institutional Snapshot Documents http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units See A – 6 - 8)

Moreover, the University has met or surpassed the Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation through the data presented in this Self-Study, well beyond the Commission’s minimum expectations within the criteria.

Below is a summary of the conclusion of each criterion.

**CRITERION ONE**

The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff and students.

The University operates with integrity consistent with its mission through structures and policies that govern and inform its administration, faculty, staff, students, and the public.

The BoR actively oversees the University’s mission, programs, and services. Its governance is implemented through regular meetings, committees, extensive planning, and frequent reporting.
The Board adopts a statewide perspective that is consistent with its constitutional responsibility for operating the public higher educational institutions in the state.

The University’s integrity and reputation, both maintained in furtherance of its mission, are ensured through policies and procedures that are well defined and consistently administered through many area-specific offices and programs. These policies and procedures are implemented with the ultimate goal of complying with federal, state, and local laws as well as students’, employees’, and the public’s expectations for the University. The Self-Study process and other planning initiatives help to identify further steps to be taken to ensure the University continues to operate consistently with its mission and with integrity and accountability.

**Future Considerations**

Given the breadth of the University’s mission and the fact that it is state-mandated, the University’s mission will be further refined during the next strategic planning process so it can serve as a stronger base for strategic planning, communication about the mission, and the programmatic decisions that flow from sound planning. The University’s planning should continue to focus on a clear statement of vision that is consistent with the mission but also sets forth the University’s desired direction beyond 2012. This Self-Study can be used as a foundational document in the next phase of strategic planning.

Because conditions outside the University’s control change rapidly, strategic plans should not be so detailed as to impede flexibility in implementation, and the strategic goals will continue to be evaluated annually.

The University’s commitment to diversity, which is substantial, is not articulated in the mission as effectively as it should be. In addition to the emphasis on diversity in the general education goals and key documents of various units, there needs to be a strong central statement in the mission or vision. Recruiting and retaining a diverse student body, faculty, and staff are significant challenges in South Dakota. Critical to the state will be success in recruiting and retaining Native American students so that a population that is economically and educationally challenged can improve its condition. The University will play an important role in this social change, but it must partner with other educational, social, and economic entities to effect significant change.

Communication within a complex organization is always difficult, and the various technological options for communication can exacerbate the situation. While recognizing the difficulty in communicating effectively with constituents, the University should give more attention to communication about governance and policy matters. The president’s updates on 2010 legislative actions related to funding are an example of increased communication that seemed to be effective and well-received. Recent addition of the Senate Faculty chair to the Provost Council is another move that should enhance communication.

**CRITERION TWO**

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.
Evidence also shows that The University of South Dakota has actively embraced strategic planning on
multiple levels and has been committed to efforts to monitor the implementation goals and success
measures inherent in those plans. USD also has been very engaged in assessment and evaluation
activities in an effort to enhance learning, teaching, and overall performance. To better understand
the issues it faces, the University has surveyed its many constituents, giving special attention to
persistent challenges and the constant desire to improve the campus climate to encourage diverse
populations, cultures, and perspectives.

Despite a declining high school population, University enrollment has increased in recent years.
While most of that increase has been in non-traditional and distance learners, fall 2010 enrollment
showed promising signs of broader growth, and enrollment management strategies are expected to
generate more positive results in the future.

USD increasingly relies on private support, and student tuition and fees now make up more of
the funding stream for state higher education than state general revenue support. The University
has made great strides in centralizing administrative functions and making student services more
routine, especially taking advantage of Internet-based options to improve customer service. Much
of the centralizing effort has been mandated by an actively engaged Board of Regents looking at
enhancing Regental system-wide improvements.

**Future Considerations**

The State of South Dakota, while in a better economic condition than some other states, still finds
itself with:

- a strained economy forcing difficult budgetary decisions that often negatively impact
  higher education, and
- declining K–12 student populations and an aging population in general, which
  impact University recruitment strategies.

While USD faculty members are well-qualified, compensated at a rate comparable to peer institutions,
and are, generally, optimistic, the Self-Study overall revealed that they are concerned about the state’s
economic conditions. USD has attempted to address these concerns of late through more robust
budget planning and communication.

The University serves the needs of the state, region, and nation by ensuring quality growth and future
viability by strategically responding to:

- economic and demographic trends,
- educational and societal trends,
- internal performance through assessments and evaluations, and
- the effectiveness of implementing University-wide plans already in place.

No doubt the current challenges are both evident and significant. No doubt, too, future conditions,
though hard to predict, will present challenges and opportunities for the University. Nevertheless,
USD is committed to planning for those challenges and opportunities and has proven it has the
ability to address such challenges.
The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

The goals for student learning are clearly stated by each educational program, by the institution, and by the Board of Regents. The faculty takes these goals into consideration to design courses and curricula. Student learning outcomes for individual educational programs and the general education curricula are set and revised through the formal assessment process and are reported annually to the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment. Learning outcomes associated with both the institutional and system-wide graduation requirements are found in student catalogs and online.

The University engages in assessment at the program level through the Assessment Plan and uses a combination of special task forces and broad-based evaluative tools. Moreover, evaluative instruments such as the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) are used to evaluate the learning objectives of the general education core and the institutional graduation requirements and student experience. The University provides evidence in its assessment reports that assessment results in meaningful change to improve teaching and learning.

In 2010, all of USD’s departments and programs participated in the assessment process. Engagement in the plan shows that the assessment and evaluation process is becoming an integral part of teaching at USD and is an important indicator that USD’s assessment plan is effective. While there is still variability across departments in terms of the quality of their assessment plans and the investment in them, significant progress has been made toward building a culture of assessment.

The University of South Dakota has long valued and supported effective teaching. Over the past ten years this support has grown in a number of ways, most obviously with the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning. The Center has provided numerous developmental opportunities for faculty as well as grants to help fund teaching improvement activities. External support for pedagogical projects also is growing. Highly qualified faculty play a determining role in creating curricular content, and teaching is evaluated through a number of processes. USD faculty members perform much better than their national peers on the IDEA survey. Good teaching is recognized and rewarded at USD, both through special awards and through the annual salary process. The University of South Dakota clearly supports academic excellence and the development of its faculty as teachers. This support has been a crucial element in students’ learning successes.

The University of South Dakota is committed to providing a holistic learning environment that provides all of its students with the opportunity to learn both in and out of the classroom. This commitment is validated by the academic success that USD students show when compared to their peers. Together, all the programs critically support excellent teaching and exceptional learning and, in the process, help make the University’s learning environment extraordinary.

The University’s support of student learning and effective teaching is recognized by faculty, staff, and students, and manifested in resource allocations and budget priorities. Even in times of fiscal austerity, the institution has been willing to increase support for student learning and effective teaching, and the evidence indicates that USD meets this core component. While the University continually monitors how best to give students access to the resources needed to support learning.
and teaching, both faculty and students also indicate that they believe USD is currently meeting this core component.

**Future Considerations**

The Self-Study process has identified two areas of special challenge that the University will need to address.

*The fiscal downturn is a threat to the resources that support effective teaching and student learning.*

The fiscal climate that the University faces has been austere, and budget reductions have created challenges. In some program areas, class sizes are expanding to save resources. The Technology Fellows program, which provides vital technological support for faculty, was reduced. The University has been forced to eliminate faculty positions, which it has done primarily by leaving retirements and vacancies unfilled. This has meant that some areas have been disproportionately affected by the cuts. If required to make significant additional cuts, USD will continue to take advantage of opportunities such as retirements but has reached the point at which it would have to extensively prioritize programs while preserving the strength of remaining programs to respond to decreased funding.

Most of the rewards for excellent teaching are tied directly to salary policy, so when there are no increases in salaries, there is no significant reward for teaching.

**Progress in this Area:**

- The budget reduction committee described in Core Component 2b provided new ideas to save resources and provide budget updates to the University community.
- Increases in class size are being offset by innovative uses of technology, and a new interactive classroom featuring a potent combination of technological and pedagogical innovations was introduced in the fall of 2010.
- A thorough and ongoing review of learning spaces was conducted in 2009-2010 so that the University may most efficiently make use of existing space and plan maintenance and renovation of its classrooms.
- The Mobile Computing student fee is providing resources to upgrade and expand the technology available in classrooms.

*The University community is still learning to use the assessment process to its full potential.*

While implementation of the assessment process is nearly universal, some programs are still discovering how to use it effectively, learning to both implement the plan and align their procedures with the University process. The provost and other high-level administrators have made assessment a priority.

Significant progress has been made, which raises progress in assessment to the level of a University strength:

- Programs use more effectively the concepts and language of learning objectives and match these objectives to actual measures.
Data are being collected and analyzed that allow the institution to track student progress toward institutional goals, and the institution now has a greater ability to track and analyze student subgroups (minorities, students from small towns, etc.).

In collaboration with the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment, a “Best Practices of Assessment” workshop was offered in fall 2010 (and will be offered every fall) through the Center for Teaching and Learning.

CRITERION FOUR

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

Acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge are fundamental to the mission of The University of South Dakota. The University provides both philosophical and practical support for original research and other creative activities by developing an intellectually stimulating environment and by providing the resources required to pursue these activities. Ethical behavior, including social responsibility in discovery and application, is fostered through formal course work, interactive workshops, rigorously enforced academic integrity policies, and faculty and peer review of creative products. Graduate education and research remain at the core of promoting and supporting intellectual inquiry and the advancement of University learning. Breadth and depth of knowledge and skill are curricular requirements for both undergraduate and graduate programs and, as verified by student learning, academic programs at USD prepare students to live and work in professions and a global, diverse, and technical society.

In conclusion, as evidenced by its professional development, continuing education programs, and University practices and policies, USD demonstrates it truly values life-long learning, which encourages rich interactions between the community and the University.

Future Considerations

A challenge that faces the University in trying to achieve its mission with respect to acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge arises from limitations in financial resources to optimally support these activities. USD seeks to meet this challenge through increased external support and through maintaining an awareness—at the local governance and administrative levels—of the importance of creative activities and the high priority they should receive in decisions regarding funding allocation. Per the University’s Strategic Plan, a higher level of research activity remains the goal.

A second challenge common to universities and colleges is maintaining an intellectual environment that fosters continued recruitment of the best students and faculty who themselves thrive on research and creative activity and whose combined efforts serve to enhance that same environment.

A third challenge lies in ensuring that the intellectual and practical benefits of creative activities and social responsibility reach students at all levels and faculty and staff across all disciplines. The University has made great strides in this regard over the last ten years, promoting undergraduate and graduate research and service-learning, providing training in ethics as explicit components of...
curricula, supporting travel for students and faculty, and formally recognizing excellence in research on an annual basis.

The Board of Regents and The University of South Dakota administration have demonstrated an acute awareness of these challenges and actions over the last decade as well as an intent to meet them, overcoming barriers presented by budget challenges. The overarching challenge is to maintain this intent and the energy to pursue it in the face of continued economic stress.

**CRITERION FIVE:**

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

While the University gives high priority to engagement, and considerable engagement activities do occur through University efforts, the University would benefit from a cohesive plan for these activities and a central repository of all engagement activities provided by the University community.

Engagement activities are numerous and diffused throughout the institution, and collecting data or assessing the collective impact of such activities is challenging. Many engagement activities are the result of soft money or individual faculty/staff interests, rather than conscious prioritization. Community engagement is typically managed by the college or unit level, the Center for Academic Engagement, and the Division of Continuing and Distance Education. The result is a very active and rich set of programs, but these programs sometimes lack strategic intent, direction, and support at the institutional level. While the Self-Study process indicated that all constituents are well served, a prioritized plan for strengthened University engagement with constituencies and more cohesive coordination is recommended. The University can improve in communicating its story and its many successes to audiences outside the university through such a model.

**Future Considerations**

To address the challenges and build upon the strengths identified through this Self-Study process, USD should take steps to ensure engagement is more fully guided at the institutional level by clarifying strategic intent, strategic directions, and providing the required strategic support.

- Use the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s Community Engagement 2008 Documentation Framework to assess and plan USD’s advancement as an engaged institution.
- Continue the emphasis on engagement in the next institutional strategic plan.
- Prioritize engagement commitments, and link unit plans, reporting structures, personnel decisions, and budget planning to priorities.
- Develop and expand reward structures for faculty, students, and staff who serve external constituencies.
- Improve institutional management of engagement through better coordination, data collection, and assessment.
- Identify means of development and recognition for faculty and staff who are
ambassadors of service-learning and engagement activities.

- Create a website as a central repository to showcase USD's extensive engagement/service-learning activity.

**OFF-CAMPUS, DISTANCE, AND CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION**

The University has developed a sound infrastructure for the management of off-campus, distance, and correspondence education, relying upon strong alliances with colleges and schools in an administratively centralized, academically decentralized organizational model. The administration is aware of state, federal, and accreditation requirements and is proactive in compliance. Enrollment growth and academic and student support successes in the past several years provide a strong base from which to grow. The Division of Continuing and Distance Education will continue to be a significant part of the University’s future strategies in meeting its mission to serve citizens of the state, region, and beyond. Some technical and manageable challenges were identified in the chapter, all of which the University is committed to addressing.

**SPECIAL THANKS**

In summary, The University of South Dakota has the fiduciary responsibility and the programs and instruction, staff, faculty, student support services, and resources to continue to effectively fulfill its mission and serve its numerous constituents. The University wishes to thank the visiting team for their review of this Self-Study, and the University community looks forward to the April visit.
Chapter 10: Federal Compliance
The University of South Dakota complies with federal requirements related to credits, program lengths, tuition, student complaints, transfer policies, verification of student identity, the Title IV program, institutional disclosures, advertising and recruitment materials, relationships with other accrediting agencies and state regulatory bodies, and public notification inviting third party comments. The information below will demonstrate to the visiting team and the Higher Learning Commission that The University of South Dakota is in compliance. Complete information is available in the virtual and physical resource rooms.

1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

The University extends its curriculum through three 15-week semesters including summer, fall, and spring terms. Compressed schedules featuring two 7.5 to 8 week blocks during the fall and spring semesters and numerous blocks during the summer are common. The three semesters comprise a year-long academic calendar with modified start dates for the Sanford School of Medicine, School of Health Sciences, and School of Law (http://www.usd.edu/registrar/schedules.cfm). All credit bearing courses are allocated semester credit hours and are within the range of good practice in higher education. Regardless of the course delivery mode, one credit hour equates to 15 hours of instruction, which is a commonly accepted ascription for traditional classroom learning, distance learning, hybrid programs, and compressed schedules.

The University of South Dakota conforms to commonly accepted minimum program lengths including 64 semester credits for associate degrees, 120-128 semester credits for bachelor’s degrees, 30 semester credits or more beyond the bachelor’s for master’s degrees, and 30 semester credits beyond the master’s degrees for doctorates. While all programs meet these minimums, some programs exceed these levels.

Tuition and fees (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/5_FinanceBusiness/documents/5-5.pdf) are set yearly by the Board of Regents at its March meeting with changes implemented each year at the beginning of the summer semester. The FY 2011 tuition and fee rates (http://www.usd.edu/businessoffice/tuition-and-fees.cfm) are prominently placed on the USD Business Office website to which other departments link. Moreover, refund policies are clear and publicly shared on the Business Office’s website (http://www.usd.edu/businessoffice/refunds.cfm). In regards to distance education, the refund policies and deadlines are reported on the website of the Division of Continuing and Distance Education (http://www.usd.edu/cde/student-resources.cfm). Additionally, upon registration, each distance student receives via email a registration confirmation informing the student of the 100 percent refund deadline and drop, withdrawal, and add deadlines for every course in which he/she registered (CDE Registration Confirmation http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 66).

2. Student Complaints

The South Dakota Board of Regents (BoR) and The University of South Dakota have clear policies for dealing with formal student complaints. BoR policy 2.9 (http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-academic_Affairs/documents/2-9.pdf) and the accompanying undergraduate and graduate academic appeal forms are relevant. Moreover, students accused and sanctioned for student misconduct under BoR
Policy 3.4 \(\text{(http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/3-Student_Affairs/documents/3-4.pdf)}\) have appeal rights to an institutional appellate board. Typical student complaints under 2.9 involve grade disputes and academic program dismissals. These policies allow the University to receive, address, and systematically process and resolve complaints in a timely manner. The Office of Academic Affairs tracks and aggregates student complaint information. The University’s three year summary reporting the number, type, and resolution of complaints can be found in the virtual resource room (Student Academic Complaint Log 2007–2010 \(\text{http://link.usd.edu/83}\) Click on Institutional Research & Statistics. See E - 23).

3. Verification of Student Identity in Distance or Correspondence Education

The University of South Dakota offers both distance and correspondence education courses. Correspondence education involves self-directed study with assignments submitted and returned through the University’s learning management system (D2L).

The University uses the following student identity verifications:

- Individual student logins and passwords are needed to access the learning management system, which requires responses to security questions.
- Proctored testing at state-wide professionally managed and supervised test centers is also used to verify student identity. Students are asked to submit photo identification upon check in and personal belongings are secured. Testers are supervised by proctors.
- Proctors outside of state-wide testing centers are managed through a proctor application and evaluation process. Proctor applicants are individually evaluated and screened before being appointed (Proctor Application Form \(\text{http://link.usd.edu/83}\) Click on Academic Units. See I - 67). Student tests are sent directly to approved proctors by the Division of Continuing and Distance Education (CDE) staff.
- CDE testing center staff access a secure electronic site and download and administer a paper copy of the tests or access a password to open electronic tests for students testing at state-wide centers. Conversely, CDE staff send other approved proctors a paper or electronic copy of the test to distribute to students. All proctors are trained to check and verify student identification before a test is given. Students are not charged an additionally fee for this service.
- Web-conferencing is often embedded in online classes allowing for visual face and voice recognition of students.
- Timed random quizzes and writing assignments are used in some classes, which familiarize the professor with the abilities and writing style of the student.

4. Transfer Policies

The University of South Dakota discloses its transfer policies to both undergraduate \(\text{(http://admissions.usd.edu/transfer/transferring-credit.cfm)}\) and graduate \(\text{(http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?coid=8&navoid=340&returnto=search#tran_cred)}\) students on the website, including in the respective catalogs. Information is readily accessible to the public on the Web. The relevant BoR policy is 2.5 \(\text{(http://www.sdbor.edu/policy/2-Academic_Affairs/documents/2-5.pdf)}\). In summary, undergraduate
academic and technical courses received from United States colleges and universities accredited by United States regional accrediting agencies transfer to USD, but University discretion is permitted. The University may also consider academic courses from a college not accredited by a regional accrediting association but accredited by a national specialized accrediting agency recognized by the Department of Education. Credits from post secondary technical institutes not regionally accredited are not transferable. Per policy, graduate students may transfer up to nine graduate credits earned at regionally accredited colleges and universities. The University also recognizes credits through validation and may accept, at its discretion, graduate and undergraduate credits from post secondary institutions outside the United States.

The policies clearly explain the number of credits the University will accept and, if transferring credit course-for-course, transfer coursework is reviewed for equivalency by qualified academic professionals.

The University recently strengthened the transcript evaluation services that is available for non-traditional students returning to college. A transfer credit evaluation informs the development of a degree completion plan for transfer students. The degree completion plan outlines which previous courses and credits transfer to USD and the general education, major, and elective credits needed to complete a degree. An example of the report a student receives can be found in the virtual resource room (Degree Completion Plan-Transfer Credit Evaluation [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on Academic Units. See I - 75]).

5. Title IV Program and Related Responsibilities

5A. Campus Crime Information and Disclosure of Consumer Information

Title IV responsibilities include the legal responsibility to disclose information to students and the public. On September 29, 2010, an all-USD faculty, students, and staff e-mail was sent to announce the availability of the most recent annual Clery Report (2010–2011), providing evidence of compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Annual Report – Email Notice [http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See T – 4]). The findings of the most recent annual Clery Report included statistics for the previous three years concerning reported crimes that occurred on campus; in off-campus buildings or property owned or controlled by the University; and on public property within, or immediately adjacent to and accessible from, the campus. The annual Clery Reports are found in the virtual and physical resource rooms.

5B. Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies

The University’s undergraduate catalog includes requirements for continued enrollment and student progression standards posted under Academic Policies ([http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=291#requ_cont_enro](http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=291#requ_cont_enro)). Standards are based on the student’s cumulative grade point average and system term grade point average. In order to remain in good standing and meet minimum progression standards, undergraduate students must maintain a least a 2.0 cumulative grade point average. Likewise, the graduate catalog has standards for progress ([http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=8&navoid=340#acad_stan_prog](http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=8&navoid=340#acad_stan_prog)). Graduate students must make satisfactory academic progress each term toward completion of the degree being sought; the minimum standard is a 3.0 cumulative grade point average.
Attendance and/or participation is required of all students regardless of the delivery modality for the course. In online, correspondence, and off-campus courses, Continuing and Distance Education and off-campus staff regularly check classes to assure student attendance during the 100 percent refund period. If students are reported as “no shows,” staff contacts the students to offer assistance and to inquire about their plans. Students who continue to be absent from classes at the 100 percent refund deadline (approximately two weeks into the semester) receive registration cancellations and are not charged for the class or classes.

The University also employs an early alert system through which faculty report student issues such as lack of attendance. And, at midterm, faculty assign students who are not attending courses a deficiency grade as a method of informing students that greater attention is needed.

5C. Contractual and Consortial relationships

The University of South Dakota did not report any Contractual and Consortial relationships that met the thresholds in its 2010 Annual Institutional Data Update.

In terms of consortial relationships, by the nature of agreements for the University Centers in Sioux Falls, Rapid City, Pierre, and distance education through the State’s Electronic University Consortium, a student may complete beyond 50 percent of an educational program from a partner state university. Students, however, must complete 50 percent of their major hours from USD. Partner universities include South Dakota State University, Dakota State University, Northern State University, Black Hills State University, and South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. All degree granting institutions named above are regionally accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, and those offering distance education and off-campus instruction at the Centers have the necessary approvals to do so.

The information in this section of Chapter 10 of the Self-Study is intended to serve as Commission notification and request for approval through the University’s 2011 reaccreditation process for the consortial arrangements with South Dakota public universities as described above and per the Commission Policies and Procedures on Institutional Changes effective July 1, 2010. The BoR’s Financial Aid Consortium Agreement, designed to meet the needs of students seeking degrees from Regental institutions is found in the virtual resource room. The Consortium permits combining enrollments from all Regental universities to determine a student’s enrollment status for a term, and academic policies and practices allow course completion from a Regental institution beyond 50 percent of a program (Financial Aid Consortium Agreement http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units See P - 2).

The University of South Dakota does not have contractual arrangements meeting the tenets of Commission Notification or Approval (less than 25% of educational program for Commission Notification and 25-50% of an educational program for Commission Approval). While the Division of Continuing and Distance Education provides customized education for select organizations, the curriculum extended is approved through University systems and the classes carry USD credit.

5D. Default Rates

The University of South Dakota’s Cohort Default Rates for 2006, 2007, and 2008 were 1.5, 2.6, and 2.6, respectively. These rates can be validated through the University’s Official Cohort Default Rate Notification Letters found in both the virtual and physical resource rooms. (Cohort Default Rate Notification Letters 06’-08’ http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative
Units. See H – 4). The U.S. Department of Education includes the following types of loans in calculating
the University's rate: Federal Stafford Subsidized and Federal Stafford Unsubsidized Loans, Federal Direct
Subsidized and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Loans, and Federal Supplemental Loans for Students.

5E. Financial Responsibility Requirements

South Dakota’s higher education system and the Board of Regents’ central office are part of the South
Dakota reporting entity. Audit procedures are performed annually at the campuses as needed to
inform and complete the Statewide Single Audit.

The Statewide Single Audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government
auditing standards; the Single Audit Act of 1996; and provisions of the Office of Management and
Budget, Circular A-133; and Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations. The
State’s Single Audit report for fiscal year ended June 2009 was dated May 17, 2010. (FY 09’ http://link.
usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative Units. See B - 9)

One material weakness in internal control over financial reporting was identified, which impacted
USD and other state universities, and one significant deficiency not considered to be a material
weakness was identified in the Board of Regents’ central office. The BoR recognizes the importance of
accurate and complete financial statements for external use, and as a result a Financial Compliance
Officer was hired in October 2009 to assist in improving written policies and procedures to improve
management oversight over the external financial reporting process. As evidenced in the report, the
Board has taken actions that are in keeping with the recommendations resulting from the audit.

In terms of federal awards and the A-133 portion of the audit, no material weaknesses were identified
in the state audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

Regarding the University’s Composite Financial Indicator (CFI) scores, the Self-Study process revealed
errors in previously reported CFI scores. Reported scores were 4.5 in 2006, 3.7 in 2007, 4.1 in 2008, and
1.7 in 2009. The corrected scores are 7.4, 5.5, 3.9, and 2.4 from 2006 to 2009 respectively. The University
of South Dakota has invested significant funds in physical assets over these years and implemented
a major capital expansion/replacement effort. These decisions have been strategic to improve USD’s
competitive position. The decrease in the 2009 CFI is due to the issuance of $45 million of debt for
the construction of two new revenue-producing facilities (Coyote Village and the Wellness Center).
The drop in the stock market and unrealized losses in endowment and other investments on the USD
Foundation financial statements also contributed to the score. The CFI for FY 2010 is 3.2.

Financial ratios are one tool USD relies upon to assess its effective use of financial resources to achieve
its mission.

5F. General Title IV Program Responsibilities

The University of South Dakota’s Title IV status remains in good standing. The University was
reapproved with full certification on October 13, 2009, and its Program Participation Agreement is
in good standing with an expiration date of September 30, 2015. USD’s Eligibility and Certification
Approval Report (ECAR) is on file in the virtual and physical resource rooms (ECAR - Eligibility &
Certification Approval Report http://link.usd.edu/83 Click on University Information & Administrative
Units. See B - 17).
6. Institutional Disclosures and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

The University of South Dakota describes its affiliation with the Higher Learning Commission in its undergraduate and graduate catalogs and on its website. These listings are in appropriate form and contain the Higher Learning Commission’s website (http://catalog.usd.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=300).

The University conducts numerous advertising campaigns, each directed to different student populations (traditional freshman on-campus, online, off-campus). Online, print, radio, and direct mail advertising and recruitment materials are available to the public. While some recruitment information is available in the virtual resource room, more examples will be available for the team in the onsite resource room. The University of South Dakota contracts with a professional advertising agency, Lawrence & Schiller, to manage its advertising and select recruitment functions. Lawrence & Schiller is familiar with USD, ensuring the information is accurate and appropriate.

Marketing campaigns and promotional materials at the off-campus centers require the review and approval of the accredited university, confirming the accuracy of its advertising. Accuracy of advertising at the centers is the responsibility of the Division of Continuing and Distance Education.

7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with Static Regulatory Bodies

Many of The University of South Dakota’s academic programs hold separate program accreditation. These affiliations are listed below (Figure 10-1) and all are in good standing.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Program CIP Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Last Decision</th>
<th>Next Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration for Developmental Disabilities (Formerly SD U. Affiliated Program)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (JD)</td>
<td>22.0101</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Inter. Business</td>
<td>52.0101</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Museums</td>
<td>30.1401</td>
<td>10 year Max.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coalition for Addiction Studies Education Alcohol &amp; Drug Studies (BS)</td>
<td>51.1501</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society Chemistry (BA/BS/MA)</td>
<td>40.0501</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>42.0201</td>
<td>7 year Max.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Program CIP Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Last Decision</th>
<th>Next Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of University Programs in Health Administration&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Administration</td>
<td>51.0701</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2011&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Review Commission on Ed. for Physician Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Assistant (MSPAS)</td>
<td>51.807</td>
<td>7 year Max.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Dental &amp; Dental Auxiliary Education Program of the American Dental Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene (AS/BS)</td>
<td>18.0401</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy (DPT)</td>
<td>51.2308</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy (MS)</td>
<td>51.2306</td>
<td>10 years max</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling &amp; Related Ed. Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Social Work Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (BS)</td>
<td>44.0701</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Academic Accreditation -American Speech-Language-Hearing Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Disorders (MA)</td>
<td>18.0103</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Committee on Medical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>51.1201</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Art and Design&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art (BFA/MFA)</td>
<td>50.0701</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2010&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (MM)</td>
<td>50.0901</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools for Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre (MFA/MA)</td>
<td>50.0501</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Public Affairs &amp; Adm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (MPA)</td>
<td>44.0401</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (AS)</td>
<td>18.1101</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Board of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (AS)</td>
<td>18.1101</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> – ACS (Chemistry): Accreditation continued on a yearly basis  
<sup>b</sup> – AUPHA (Health Service Administration): Visit scheduled 2011.  
<sup>c</sup> – NASAD (Art-BFA, MFA): Site visit conducted April 2010. Final report not received as of this date.
Documents from the accreditation bodies are also located in the virtual and physical resource rooms, and the information will be available in the resource room.

(Sharepoint: Program Assessment Reports (See All) [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Academic Affairs. See III - 23 – 1-13).

USD extends select off-campus clinicals and online degree programs to other states, specifically, the Associate of Science and RN to BSN in Nursing to North Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, New Mexico, Idaho, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Arizona. Letters of approval from the respective Boards of Nursing and governing and coordinating bodies in states where USD has a presence can be reviewed in the virtual and physical resource rooms ([North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, & Wisconsin Approval Letters [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Academic Units. See I - 70-73) Registration in Minnesota, New Mexico, and Arizona remains in progress, with hard copies of the applications in the physical resource room. ([Status Report for State Registration [http://link.usd.edu/83] Click on Academic Units. See I - 74])

8. Public Notification of Comprehensive Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment

The University of South Dakota will seek public comments from its constituencies per Commission guidelines in the following ways. Announcement of the April 2011 visit was included in each posting. A sample announcement is available in the physical resource room.

- Posted notice on USD website the months of February and March of 2011.
- Posted notice in USD alumni newsletter in October 2010.
- Posted notice to USD Community in the Volante in February and March 2011.
- Posted print notices in the Sioux Falls Argus Leader, Rapid City Journal, and Pierre Capital Journal because USD has centers in each city.