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The University of South Dakota
Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

Introduction

The University of South Dakota Assessment Plan provides the framework for assessment of student learning and the disposition of the assessment results for the improvement of student learning. It also describes some specific elements of assessment for the general education curriculum at The University of South Dakota. The formative bases of this plan include the South Dakota Board of Regents Mission Statement (Appendix A), the University of South Dakota Mission Statement, and the University of South Dakota Vision Statement.

This Assessment Plan emphasizes the centrality of student learning to the University, the documentation of student learning, the compilation of evidence of learning, stakeholder involvement, and the use of student learning outcome data for improving institutional effectiveness.

Faculty members shape and conduct much of the assessment activity this plan describes. They are most qualified to establish student learning outcomes in their respective academic programs. Faculty members are also best qualified to develop measurement methods, determine performance standards, and create positive change on the basis of assessment findings. Therefore, this assessment plan promotes the creation and evolution of academic standards of excellence without standardization of the means, measures and criteria.

The Assessment Committee hopes that faculty, students and administrators will find this a useful guide for assessment and improvement of student learning at the University of South Dakota.
University of South Dakota Mission

The South Dakota 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.

Curriculum
Degrees are authorized at the associate (dental hygiene, general studies, and nursing), baccalaureate (arts and sciences, business, education, fine arts, health sciences, and medicine), masters (arts and sciences, business, education, fine arts, health sciences, and medicine), education specialist, professional programs (business, education, fine arts, health sciences, law, and medicine), and doctoral (arts and sciences, education, law, and medicine) levels.

University of South Dakota Vision

The University of South Dakota provides a strong liberal arts education and an array of regionally and nationally recognized professional and graduate programs. Undergraduate programs provide a solid foundation for entry-level careers and for graduate and professional degrees at USD or other institutions of higher education. Graduate and professional programs at USD prepare students to contribute to their disciplines and professions as well as to the communities in which they live through scholarship, leadership, and service.

The University of South Dakota provides students an intellectually stimulating educational experience, in and out of the classroom, within a supportive and diverse community of active learners. The student's academic and personal growth is assured through an innovative curriculum that integrates excellence in teaching with research and service. At the University, students are inspired to become lifelong learners who will make significant contributions through leadership and service as citizens of the state, the nation, and the world.

Both to measure its success in attaining its vision and as appropriate in refining that vision, the University of South Dakota relies heavily on its planning, program review, and assessment activities.
What is Assessment of Student Learning?

Ewell and Boyer (1988, *State-Based Approaches to Assessment in Undergraduate Education: A Glossary and Selected References*) define assessment as an evaluation of curricula, institutional accountability, and the teaching and learning that takes place in the classroom. The academic assessment process described below permits organization, alignment, and comparison between mission statements, vision statements, student learning goals, and student learning outcomes (what is actually learned). The assessment of student learning outcomes also informs curricular design and revision at all levels; e.g. individual classes, degree programs, academic departments, colleges in order to improve student learning.

In academic settings, the term “assessment” is generally used to denote the evaluation of learning at the program level as distinguished from evaluation of individual students in individual courses. Assessment does occur in classes in the form of tests, papers, etc. However, this is often limited to learning within the course and is rarely used for learning improvement across entire academic programs. Academic programs do expect students to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes across these combinations of courses and experiences that make up degree programs. Assessment of student learning focuses on this “macro” level, rather than on the “micro” level of individual students in individual classes, by documenting this learning and providing information and rationale for positive change at all levels.

While the primary goal of assessment is improvement of student learning, it can also indicate how well programs support the accreditation criteria of the North Central Association of the Higher Learning Commission and other external bodies. Assessment findings might also inform non-academic changes in a program, e.g. advising, marketing/recruiting, campus organizations. Finally, assessment data can illustrate the strengths of USD graduates for other institutions and potential employers.
The Assessment Plan

Goals of the University of South Dakota Assessment Plan
The assessment activities described in this plan are designed to answer four questions:

1. What are the intended learning outcomes of students at the course, program, and institutional level and are they appropriate to the University of South Dakota mission and the degrees awarded by USD?

2. What data or evidence is being gathered at USD about student learning in courses, programs, and at the institutional level? And, by what processes is this information being gathered?

3. 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?

4. 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?

Assessment of student learning at USD is divided into two parts. In one part, assessment is directed at students’ achievement of university- and system-wide general education learning goals and outcomes. The second part involves assessment at the level of specific academic programs (majors and minors).

The University of South Dakota Assessment Committee was scheduled to review this plan in the spring of 2006 and revise the plan to reflect what we have learned from our experience and the assessment data gained using the current plan. This review was delayed until the fall of 2008 due to changes in assessment office personnel.
Participants in Assessment at USD and Their Responsibilities

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) is a standing committee of the USD Faculty Senate and is charged with the promotion of academic improvement through assessment at the University of South Dakota (USD Senate Bylaws), which includes:

- Simulate of ongoing institutional dialogues that enhance the understanding of the role of assessment and its relation to program improvement.
- Coordinate implementation of the University Assessment Plan through the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures relative to assessment activities.
- Monitor the effectiveness of the university assessment program, including the assessment of general education and other university-wide programs.
- Advise the VPAA and the University Senate on matters relevant to assessment and academic integrity, including recommendations for change as necessary.
- Assist individual academic units in the development and implementation of their assessment programs.
- Ensure that assessment results are communicated to faculty, students and other relevant constituencies.
- Report annually to the University Senate, the Graduate Council, and the Student Senate on the status of assessment activity at USD.

VPAA, Associate VPAA, DAEA, and the Office of Academic Affairs
- The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs promote assessment activity and compliance with South Dakota Board of Regents and University of South Dakota assessment policy.
- Director of Academic Assessment and Evaluation promotes assessment through the following:
  - Oversees administration of placement, proficiency, and information literacy exams given at the University in a manner which meets SD Board of Regents and accrediting agencies testing requirements and ensures all tests are completed in a timely manner.
  - Coordinates the development and implementation of the assessment program, develops collection strategies and monitors campus efforts, analyzes data, and prepares reports in order to ensure fulfillment of regental and accreditation requirements and to evaluate the effectiveness of the University’s assessment and proficiency testing programs.
  - Researches, prepares and publishes reports, articles, and other writings which communicate information about academic programs and provides recommendations for the continuous improvement of academic processes and programs, i.e. closes the loop.

School and College Deans
- Review program assessment plans and annual reports, providing feedback to the academic programs.
- Support and promote assessment activity within the colleges.
- Promote compliance with this assessment plan.
Departmental/Division/Program assessment and curriculum committees

- Create degree-level assessment plans (see Appendix B) that link the learning goals and outcomes of individual courses to the learning goals and outcomes of each degree program.
- Create assessment plans (see Appendix B) that link the learning goals and outcomes of courses in University-wide academic programs, e.g., General Education, IdEA, Honors.
- Departments/Academic units will be responsible for assessment in the general education courses taught by their faculty members.
- Annually report through the Academic Deans to the UAC and the VPAA on at least one of its stated education outcomes in the following format: (1) the learning outcome assessed, (2) the assessment method, (3) a description and interpretation of the results, (4) the action(s) to be undertaken, and (5) how and to whom the results were distributed. (For an example, see Appendix B). Please note that the academic unit’s entire assessment plan is presented in each annual report, thus documenting the assessment plan and the changes in the plan resulting from yearly assessment activity.

Faculty

- Clearly define intended learning goals and outcomes for courses, programs, and the institution.
- Develop assessment protocols, assess learning, and interpret assessment results.
- Improve curricula and course plans to reflect insight gained through the assessment process.
- Align the learning goals and outcomes of individual courses with the learning goals and outcomes of the curriculum, department, University and the South Dakota System.

Students

- Meet the learning goals and outcomes set forth by the South Dakota Board of Regents, the University of South Dakota, and the individual academic programs.
- Contribute to the assessment process through their honest responses to assessment instruments.
A Description of the Assessment Process

Academic assessment can be described as a sequence of steps in a cyclical, ongoing, dynamic process. When one cycle is completed, another begins, making the process recursive. Each subsequent cycle is dependent on the information gathered in the previous cycle. These cycles may be semester-long, year-long, or longer, depending on appropriateness to the program and its assessment needs. Regardless of the type of academic learning program and frequency with which it is assessed, the USD assessment process encompasses five general steps:

1. Identify and articulate learning goals and outcomes
2. Select assessment methods relevant and appropriate to each of the learning outcomes
3. Systematically implement the method and collect data
4. Analyze the data and report the findings
5. Use the findings to revise outcomes, assessment methods, teaching methods, etc. and improve curricula

Step 1: Identify student learning goals and outcomes as set forth in mission and vision statements

The South Dakota Board of Regents and the academic programs at the University of South Dakota will have clearly articulated student learning goals for their academic and degree programs. These goals are based on the mission statement of the academic unit and are broad educational targets for students, e.g., “students will write effectively and responsibly and will understand and interpret the written expression of others.” (SDBOR).

Student learning outcomes (often referred to as objectives in other settings) are derived from learning goals. Outcomes are specific, measurable learning components that contribute to the achievement of learning goals. Learning outcomes will be developed by the academic units from the learning goals described in their mission. Bloom’s Taxonomy can serve as a very useful guide for the creation of specific outcomes (Bloom, Mesia, & Krathwohl (1964). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: David McKay; There are several helpful websites also, e.g., http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.html).

Ultimately, student learning goals and outcomes should be appropriate to the USD Mission, academic program and degree.

Step 2: Select assessment methods appropriate to each of the learning outcomes

Assessment methods should be selected for how directly they can be used to determine whether student learning outcomes have been realized. More direct measures, e.g. exams, written work can be used to provide an objective, direct reflection of students' performance with respect to the learning outcome(s). Indirect measures of student
learning, e.g. attitude or opinion surveys, are also helpful in determining students’ learning outcome attainment. However, they are less direct assessments of learning. Therefore, it is important that indirect measures supplement, not supplant, information gathered through more direct methods. Finally, course grades often do not address each individual learning outcome specifically and should not, by themselves, be considered conclusive evidence that students have or have not demonstrated specific learning outcomes.

Designers of systematic assessment protocols should consider the following principles of evidence and characteristics of good evidence (Ewell, 2001. Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes: A Proposed Point of Departure, Council for Higher Education Accreditation Occasional Paper, Washington, DC.):

Principles of Evidence

- **Comprehensiveness** – the degree to which the assessment system is capable of providing evidence about the full range of student learning goals established by the program.

- **Multiple Judgments** – the extent to which multiple sources of evidence are used in a mutually reinforcing way to examine outcomes.

- **Multiple Dimensions** – the degree to which different facets of student performance with respect to established learning goals can be investigated so that patterns of strength and weakness can be identified and addressed.

- **Directness** – the extent to which the approach relies upon direct measures of student attainment instead of self-reports about learning or other "proxy" indicators of attainment such as graduation rates or job placement.

Characteristics of Good Evidence:

- **Relevant** – the extent to which the evidence is capable of representing the underlying learning goal, with a clear rationale for why it is related.

- **Verifiable** – the process of assembling evidence that can be documented and replicated; sufficient information is available to enable a reviewer to corroborate independently what was found.

- **Representative** – the extent to which the evidence is typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case, particularly when data are provided as trends over time.

- **Cumulative** – the use of multiple sources, methods, and approaches that provide independent corroboration for issues of importance to the program; triangulation of information from several data points.

- **Actionable** – focusing on evidence that is reflectively analyzed and interpreted so that it will reveal specific implications for the program and provide the program with guidance for action and improvement; disaggregating the evidence to reveal underlying patterns of strength and weakness, or to uncover specific opportunities for intervention and improvement.
Step 3: Systematically implement the method and collect data

Step 4: Collaborate to analyze the data, draw conclusions and report the findings. Collaborate to analyze the data, draw conclusions and report findings among faculty members, chairs, deans, university administrators, the South Dakota Board of Regents, accreditation agencies, etc. In other words, share the responsibility for analysis, interpretation, and communication of findings in multiple directions.

Step 5: Use the findings to revise curricula, outcomes, assessment methods, teaching methods, etc. and improve student learning. Responsibility for interpretation of the findings and the implementation of change lies at all levels in the University, but primarily with the faculty members of the individual academic programs. They are most qualified and able in this regard.

If students perform lower than the performance expectations, changes may be needed in curriculum or instruction such as:
- Content revision in existing courses.
- Modification of delivery methods.
- Modification of learning activities.
- Addition or elimination of courses.
- Differential course sequencing.

If students consistently or overwhelmingly meet or exceed performance expectations, faculty may need to reevaluate the learning outcomes, assessment measures, or performance standards to ensure that they are appropriate to the learning goals and outcomes.
Assessment of the General Education Programs

South Dakota Board of Regents System General Education Learning Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

The regental system-wide general education courses taught at the University of South Dakota will reflect the current goals and learning outcomes set forth in the most recent SD BOR Policy 2:7. Student proficiency with respect to the SD BOR learning goals and outcomes will be determined by faculty members teaching general education courses and with the SD BOR Proficiency Exam (see below).

Placement Testing:
Incoming students must possess the skills necessary to succeed in the regental and institutional general education coursework. Evaluation of student competence and appropriate placement in courses are based on ACT Math and English scores or ACT COMPASS Math and English scores. These scores, together with scores from the South Dakota Proficiency Examination (see next section) are used to assess academic gains. The South Dakota System Academic Gains Report is used by all institutions in the System to observe and improve the quality of the general education offered by each institution.

South Dakota Board of Regents Proficiency Examination Requirement:
Standardized assessment of students’ competency in all seven of the regental system-wide general education learning goals is through four sections of the ACT CAAP Exam: Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning. All undergraduate students enrolled in any of the South Dakota System institutions must score at minimum one-half of one standard deviation below the mean in each section of the ACT CAAP exam after completing their 48th credit hour (32nd credit hour for Associate’s degree). Students who do not successfully pass the CAAP proficiency exam within one year of their first attempt are not allowed to continue their education in the South Dakota System.

Results from the CAAP exams administered at USD are being collected and analyzed for trends over time, for differences between academic units, and for other relevant research questions posed by Deans and Academic Chairs. Further, methods are being developed at USD and by the SD BOR for using ACT and CAAP results for “value added” assessment. Results will be made available to the academic programs for consideration in curricular revisions. These results will also be given to the South Dakota Board of Regents, the USD President, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for similar purposes.
University of South Dakota Learning Objectives, Goals and Outcomes

I. Interdisciplinary Education and Action Program (IdEA, 6 credits)

The IdEA Program reflects the liberal arts mission of The University of South Dakota. It emphasizes problem solving in an interdisciplinary context and active, engaged learning. Students select one of a number of interdisciplinary, team-taught themes by taking a foundation course in the sophomore year that introduces both the thematic content and the nature of interdisciplinary problem solving. The requirement is completed with a capstone course in the senior year that incorporates an Action component of service, research or creative activity, as well as a significant, interdisciplinary written project. Students create portfolios to reflect upon and link their experiences. The IdEA Program satisfies the Globalization and Writing Intensive requirements.

Globalization and Writing

IdEA Program Advanced Writing and Globalization Assessment. Student learning outcomes concerning Globalization are assessed each semester in the IdEA Foundation class by asking questions concerning the construct on the midterm and final tests as well as one of the 750 word essay assignments congruent to each class. It is expected that at least 80 percent of the students correctly answer the test questions and that 90 percent of the students pass the essay. This data will be gathered and utilized to assess the teaching of Globalization by IdEA Foundation faculty at the end of each academic year. Under this assessment the following SDBOR goals and outcomes are addressed.

Goal 1: Students will be successful working in, living in, and contributing to an increasingly diverse, interdependent world.

Learning Outcomes:
1. Students will be able to read, research, analyze, and discuss complex issues from an interdisciplinary perspective.
2. 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.
3. Students will actively participate in an array of service and/or co-curricular activities and events, integrating their experiences into their education.
4. Students will recognize and demonstrate their individual and collective civic and community responsibilities as educated citizens and leaders.

Goal 2: Students will understand how multiple perspectives affect global issues and ideas.

Learning Outcomes:
1. Students will understand and discuss how multiple perspectives impact the global community.
2. Students will analyze and evaluate issues and ideas with global impact, considering their effect on the communities involved.
Goal 3: 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:
1. Students will write using standard American English, including correct punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure.
2. Students will complete a project that will entail research drawing from multidisciplinary sources that are documented using a recognized style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.).
3. Students will use a planning/drafting/revising process that incorporates self-assessment and/or peer review and includes instructor feedback.
4. Students will be able to critique the validity and effectiveness of the arguments presented by others.

II. Aesthetic Experience (3 credits)

Aesthetic Experiences Assessment

The Aesthetic Experiences Assessment is an assessment being developed (SP09) and will be implemented starting the FA09 addressing the outcomes for the SDBOR Aesthetic Experiences requirements. It will be administered each semester and collected as part of the fine arts courses approved to be used to meet the Aesthetic Experiences requirement at USD. These data will be collected by the Fine Arts area but transferred and archived in the OAEA.

The Aesthetic Experience requirement furthers the liberal arts mission of the University and capitalizes on its unique resource—the College of Fine Arts. There is an assessment of the student progress on these goals which is in the process of being developed (SP09) and implemented for following years.

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

Learning Outcomes:
1. Students will be able to demonstrate creative and aesthetic understanding.
2. Students will be able to explain and interpret formal and stylistic elements of the fine arts.

III. Information Literacy (0-3 credits)

Students must deal intelligently both with the rapid increase in information and the constantly evolving technologies that allow one to create, store, access, manipulate, and transmit information; and to use information in thoughtful, creative ways. The Information Literacy competency is integrated into multiple parts of the curriculum.
Other Assessment Activity Across the University of South Dakota.

There are several assessment surveys and tests being used by the South Dakota System and University of South Dakota. These assessments collect both direct and indirect information about student learning and guide improvement in student learning at USD. The Office of Academic Assessment assists with the analysis, synthesis, and reporting of these results, providing evidence that learning goals and outcomes are being met and to what extent these goals are being met. See Appendix E for a list and descriptions of the university-wide assessment instruments being used at USD.

Assessment of USD’s Academic Programs (Majors and Minors)

Annual Reporting.

The academic departments/units are responsible for assessment of student learning at the program level. Oversight is provided by the academic deans. The departments/units and colleges may organize their assessment programs in the manner they determine will best improve student learning. Some departments, for example, may have a special committee for assessment of student learning. Other departments may include assessment as part of the responsibilities of the curriculum committee. Regardless of the assessment structure in the academic units, faculty must ultimately be the owners of assessment. They, themselves, are best able to develop learning goals and outcomes, develop assessment methods, and use the assessment data to improve student learning in their own discipline.

Each academic program will submit an annual assessment plan/report for each major offered (see Appendix B). This report will describe (1) the learning outcomes/objectives of the program, (2) the assessment method, (3) who is responsible for the assessment, (4) the expectations or criteria for the demonstration of proficiency, (5) the results, and (6) how the results have or will be used. These reports will contain a section in which the respondent summarizes the changes and improvement in the curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from their implementation of the assessment program.

To facilitate these processes, the AVPAA and the Director of the OAEA have developed a form and a web-based protocol for annual departmental assessment reports (see example in Appendix B). These forms are reviewed and updated periodically to ensure they maintain relevancy. An example of an earlier version and the AY08-09 revisions are included here.

The reports and the feedback information are made available through the OAEA using the USD Assessment website (protected area) for review and use in the improvement of each department’s assessment plan. A primary goal of this activity is transparency--so that departments may learn from one another, developing collaboration and parity across the university. These reports can also be presented in summary form, e.g., as part of a progress report on assessment to be given to the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.
Annual assessment plans/reports are reviewed by the Director of the OAEA, Academic Deans and the University Assessment Committee using a standardized rubric as the basis (see Appendix C). Using the assessment rubric as a base, the DOEA will provide summarized feedback to the University Assessment Committee and the Academic Deans or Unit Directors for review and analysis. Feedback will be provided to the programs through the Deans and Assessment Committee with recommendations for improving assessment to align with Higher Learning Commission Level 3. The program reports/plans and feedback will be available on the USD assessment website for year-to-year review, for accreditation purposes, and as documentation of each program’s assessment-driven improvement in student learning.

**Success Indices for the Current Plan**

Success of the present plan will be evident when every department/unit/level has its own assessment plan and assessment activity that are aligned with Higher Learning Commission Assessment Implementation Level 3, South Dakota Board of Regents policy, and University of South Dakota mission. These plans will be based on clear learning goals, will be designed to improve student learning, and will include all of the following elements:

1. **Student learning goals and outcomes** which aligns with program, University and SD BOR Missions
2. **Assessment measures** which are appropriate to the goals and outcomes
3. **Assessment procedures** which yield increasingly better assessment information
4. **Analysis and reporting of assessment data** to all relevant constituencies
5. **Use of the assessment data to improve student learning**

Another important indication of success will be the growth and maturation of assessment activity across the university. The aim for the next 5 years has two parts: (1) to have an ongoing current of recursive, iterative assessment activity throughout all academic units/levels of the institution; and (2) to attain parity in academic assessment activity across all academic units/levels by attaining Higher Learning Commission Level Three (Maturing stages of continuous improvement) in each.

Many of the academic units at USD have developed assessment plans and are functioning at least at Implementation Level 2 of the Higher Learning Commission scale. Most of these academic units have answered three or even four of the questions presented earlier in this plan. However, the programmatic assessment activity at USD varies widely across academic units, thus creating uneven implementation and disposition of the data at multiple levels.

**Assessment Effectiveness**

Assessment is effective only if outcomes are reported, analyzed, and used for program improvement. Therefore, it is critical that the Academic Units, the University Assessment
Committee, and the Office of Academic Affairs cooperate to promote even, consistent academic assessment within and across the academic units as an integral part of curriculum planning and program review.
The South Dakota Board of Regents has constitutional authority to govern the system of public higher education in the State of South Dakota. Supported by an Executive Director and staff, the Board provides leadership and sets policies for the programs and services delivered through its six universities and two special schools. Dynamic and progressive leadership is cultivated at the campuses through the presidents, superintendents, faculty, and staff.

The primary mission of the institutions in the Regental System is 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.

The Board affirms a commitment to the fundamental values of higher education in which programs and experiences promote curiosity; stimulate thought; encourage self-reflection; foster a genuine desire for lifelong learning; engender a global view of society which embodies a free interchange of ideas; and reflect a concern for creating a responsible, ethical society. These values include a commitment to excellence in academic programs; to excellence in teaching at all levels of instruction offered in Regental institutions; to scholarly activity, research, and creative activity appropriate to the role and mission of the individual institutions; to meaningful and productive relationships with local school systems and other appropriate public and private entities at the local, regional, state, and national levels; and to quality public service activities consistent with campus expertise and focused toward social, economic, and cultural needs of the state of South Dakota.

The Board affirms a commitment to diverse campus communities through serving the needs of all persons including minorities, handicapped, and part-time students and by seeking racial and ethnic diversity among the faculty and staff. The diversity of the campus community embodies the basic principles of an open democratic society in which free speech and thought respectful of differing opinions is encouraged among the students, faculty and staff. To maximize the potential for diversity within the campus communities, the Board affirms that access to the institutions and subsequent success once enrolled should be supported by adequate financial aid and appropriate student...
support services. Students should be expected to provide for a portion of the costs of delivering programs and services, but their share should be equitable and fair.
The Board recognizes and affirms its responsibility to serve as a catalyst for and as a resource to the economic development efforts of state and local governments. Faculty and staff expertise provides a valuable resource to various agencies of state government and to regional development efforts. Inherent within this responsibility is the desirability of expanding programs and services beyond the physical boundaries of the institutions to provide greater access to quality higher education opportunities for South Dakotans. The Board acknowledges the programs and services offered by the private and tribal institutions in the state and the desirability of cooperation with these institutions in program articulation and delivery.

The Board recognizes its responsibility for appropriate stewardship of financial resources from the state, from students, and from sources external to the institutions. While the Board recognizes the diversity of the institutions and the desirability of such diversity, the six universities function as a part of a system of higher education where the collective use of resources is focused for maximum common good. Inherent within this tenet is a commitment to inter-institutional relationships in order to maximize educational opportunities for the people of South Dakota; maximize the articulation of educational programs among the institutions; and avoid unnecessary duplication by focusing the resources of individual institutions in a cooperative fashion to deliver programs and services across the state and in the region. Consistent with the commitment to accountability and stewardship is an affirmation to seek the necessary funding from the state to enable the System's institutions to fulfill their respective missions.

SOURCE: BOR May 10, 1991
Appendix B

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
SUMMARY FORM  Academic Year 2007-2008

Degree and Program Name:  M.A. Counselor Education
School & Community Counseling

Submitted By:  James S. Korcuska, Ph. D.
Counselor Education Program Coordinator

- Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department.
- Worksheets are due to the Assessment Director by December 12, 2008.
- Worksheets should be sent electronically to Dale.Pietrzak@usd.edu. For information about assessment, visit the Assessment webpage at http://www.usd.edu/acadaffairs/academicassessment.

Program Mission Statement:  (Please type or paste your program mission statement in the text box below)

The mission of the Counseling Program at the University of South Dakota is to graduate competent and ethical professional counselors. Master's and doctoral graduates serve diverse populations and the profession locally, nationally, and internationally as counselors, counselor educators, and clinical supervisors. The doctoral program prepares graduates to become the profession’s next generation of leaders. Located in the city of Vermillion, the Counseling Program is housed within the School of Education and maintains a special commitment to preparing professional counselors to work in rural settings.

The Counseling Program is designed to graduate counselors who see themselves first and foremost as professional counselors, regardless of chosen specialization or degree program. Thus, graduate students are expected to demonstrate a commitment to professional and personal development. Moreover, graduate students demonstrate leadership by advocating for the profession, embracing diversity, and offering service to others. Graduate students will be engaged learners who meet and aspire to exceed the CACREP-based professional competencies and performance standards.

As role models, Counseling Program faculty members dedicate themselves to excellence and ethical practice in teaching, research, scholarship, clinical practice, leadership, and service. The curriculum adheres to a reflective decision-making model of training. Professional and personal growth are interrelated and encouraged through experiences that promote awareness of self and one’s impact on others. The curriculum underscores the importance of supervised clinical experiences. To ensure excellence throughout the curriculum and our identity as professional counselors, the program maintains CACREP accreditation.
**PART ONE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed? Committee/person responsible?</th>
<th>What are the expectations/criteria for success?</th>
<th>What are the results? Committee/person responsible?</th>
<th>How will/have the results be used? Committee/person responsible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will learn and demonstrate knowledge of the eight core common designated by CACREP Standards: (a) professional identity; (b) social and cultural diversity; (c) human growth and development; (d) career development; (e) helping relationships; (f) group work; (g) assessment; and (h) research and program evaluation.</td>
<td>All master’s students will obtain a passing score on the objective section of the comprehensive exam. The Counseling Program Faculty is responsible for evaluating the results.</td>
<td>A passing score is within one standard deviation of the national mean on the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination.</td>
<td>Of the 14 students taking the objective portion of the comprehensive exams during the 2007-08 academic year, 14 passed and 0 failed the objective portion of the exam.</td>
<td>These results are used to not only monitor student progress and development but also to assess the program. The programmatic assessment aspects include review with and by the faculty as to whether these results suggest a need for greater emphasis in various program areas (or strengthening various program areas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will learn and demonstrate knowledge, skill, and professional competency in the CACREP standards for foundations of school counseling.</td>
<td>All master’s students will obtain a passing score on the school counseling specialization section of the comprehensive exam. The Counseling Program Faculty is responsible for evaluating.</td>
<td>A passing score by two out of three counseling program faculty evaluators using the appropriate rubric.</td>
<td>Of the 14 students taking the written portion of the comprehensive exams during the 2007-08 academic year, 14 passed and 0 failed the written portion of the exam.</td>
<td>These results are used to not only monitor student progress and development but also to assess the program. The programmatic assessment aspects include review with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment Plan

**3. Students will successfully complete a supervised counseling experience in clinical situations diagnosing and treating mental and emotional disorders, including a supervised internship in a school setting.**

The clinical course sequence includes evaluation points at the beginning, penultimate, and final points of a program of student. This sequence is composed of CGPS 786: Pre-Practicum; CGPS 795: Practicum: School Counseling; CGPS 792: Special Topics: Clinical Experience and Technological Innovation; and CGPS 794: Internship: School Counseling.

All students will earn a grade of “B” or higher in the clinical course sequence.

Faculty instructors and site supervisors evaluate students using the appropriate program rubric.

Of the 24 enrolled in internship for the 2007-08 academic year, 24 received a rating of acceptable or higher by their site supervisor on the student’s final evaluation.

**4. Students will demonstrate satisfactory development (increases) of knowledge (CACREP Core and specialty areas),**

Each semester the faculty review students enrolled in the program once according to the criteria on the Annual Student Evaluation form developed by the counseling program faculty.

Students must be rated as meeting the rubric criteria of “acceptable.” Students identified for assistance are required, at minimum, to work with a faculty advisor to address and remediate the academic.

For the 2007-08 academic year there were 65 students enrolled in the program. Of these, 7 received a letter indicating a need to review and or improve their

These results are used to not only monitor student progress and development but also to assess the program. The programmatic assessment aspects include review with and by the faculty as to whether these results suggest a need for greater emphasis in various program areas (or strengthening various program areas).
skills (CACREP Core and Specialty areas) and professional dispositions (ethics) for students enrolled in the program.

professional, and/or personal concerns. Students identified as making inadequate progress may be required to complete a remediation plan, placed on academic probation, or dismissed from the program in accordance with program, School of Education, and Graduate School policies and procedures. Intervention may include plans for developing writing skills, completing personal and/or career counseling, an evaluation for learning problems, enrolling in additional course work, and retaking courses.

The Graduate School informs the student and the counseling program if she or he is placed on academic probation (1/3 or more grades of “C” or lower in the student’s graduate coursework).

performance in some way.

For the 2007-08 academic year there were 65 students enrolled in the program. Of these, 0 received letters indicating they were on academic probation.

(Add rows for additional objectives as needed.)
PART TWO: Please summarize the changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. Specifically, describe:

(1) How you have shared responsibility for assessment of student learning
The faculty has taken large steps toward improving the breadth and depth of evaluation in the program. Program review, including studies of clinical site supervisors, program graduates, and program modifications are done at least every three years.

(2) How you have evaluated and improved the effectiveness of your efforts to assess and improve student learning.
The faculty utilizes a number of evaluation tools to aid in program evaluation:

1. CACREP Accreditation Standards and Program Evaluation
2. M.A. and Ph.D. Program Standards Course Matrices and M.A. and Ph.D. Course Objectives;
3. program specific surveys of master’s and doctoral graduates;
4. enrollment and graduation data;
5. internship site supervisor ratings;
6. NCE examination results;
7. CPCE examination results (required as a part of comprehensive exams for master’s students and preliminary exams for doctoral students);
8. student focus group data; and
9. Counseling Program Advisory Board focus group data and surveys.

Based upon data from the above sources, the counseling program faculty has made the following changes.

1. Created task groups to revise curriculum in line with 2008 CACREP Standards
2. Hired a new faculty member that increases the diversity of the overall faculty
3. Pursued expanding diversity training beyond Sioux Falls
# Assessment Plan – 2009

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM  Academic Year 2002-2003**

**Degree and Program Name:** BA/BS in Applied Statistics  
**Submitted By:** William Schweinle

## PART ONE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning outcomes?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed? Committee/person responsible?</th>
<th>What are the expectations, i.e. what are the criteria by which students demonstrate having achieved this outcome?</th>
<th>What are the results for the students in the degree program?</th>
<th>How will/have the results be used to improve the program curriculum and be shared? Committee/person responsible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will demonstrate that they can select an appropriate statistical method for a given question and dataset.</td>
<td>1.a. Comprehensive exam in statistics (Undergraduate Comp Committee)</td>
<td>1.a. Average score by the Undergraduate Comp Committee of 7 (out of 10) points using the comp-rubric.</td>
<td>1.a. Sixteen of the eighteen Statistics BA/BS students who completed the comprehensive exams passed. This is a higher pass rate than any year in the past five.</td>
<td>1.a. Both the questions and responses will be analyzed by the Undergraduate Comp Committee for trends over the past five years. If a positive trend is found, then this will suggest that there has been improvement in instruction. If a positive trend is found, and responses to the comp questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please complete a separate form for each academic program (major) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department.
- Completed forms are due to the Assessment Director annually by **December 3**.
- Completed forms should be sent electronically to wschwein@usd.edu. For information about assessment, visit the Assessment webpage at [http://www.usd.edu/assess/](http://www.usd.edu/assess/).
| 1.b. Required Internship. The student’s Internship Advisor and a representative from the internship site conduct independent, rubric-based assessments of the student’s work, then meet three times during the internship term to discuss the student’s performance and progress. (Internship Advisor and internship site representative) | 1.b. The Internship advisor and a representative from the internship host organization determine whether the work is progressing and is satisfactory with a score of 75 (out of 100) using the numerical internship scoring rubric. | 1.b. Of the 15 students currently on an internship, five were independently rated by internship host representatives as unsatisfactory, specifically in their written communication ability. (These students were not native English speakers.) | appear more similar over time, the U/G comprehensive exam will be revised. 1.b. The departmental curriculum committee and the USD Writing Task Force have been made aware of this and are discussing the implementation of more writing across the statistics curriculum and increasing funding for writing remediation. The Comp Committee will revise the comp scoring rubric to include assessment of student writing on the statistics comprehensive exams. |

| 2. Students will assist in answering a research question:  • design a data base  • design a collection method | 2.a. Required Internship (Internship Advisor) | 2.a. The Internship advisor and a representative from the internship host organization determine whether the work is |
- Develop an analysis strategy, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the research design
- Identify alternative strategies/analyses

2.b. Major project with previously collected data (~30pp. paper).

progressing and is satisfactory with a score of 75 (out of 100) using the numerical internship scoring rubric.

2.b. Students present and defend their paper to a committee of three faculty members selected by the student. A unanimous vote by the committee that the paper and presentation demonstrate competency in this learning objective is necessary for success.

3. Students will demonstrate proficiency in the use of popular word-processing and data management/collection software, e.g. MS-Word, WordPerfect, MS-Excel, MS-Access, Corel Quattro-Pro, etc.

3.a. The USD Information Technology exam or complete CSCI-105, in which the exam is given.

3.a. Graduation requires a passing grade on the Information Technology Exam.

4. Students will demonstrate proficiency in the use of at least two popular statistical software packages, e.g.

4.a. Internship (Internship Advisor)

4.a. The Internship advisor and a representative from the internship site use a specially designed
| Toolset: SAS, SPSS, Stata, Statistica, etc. | 4.b. Major project (~30pp. paper) in which they use real or simulated (Monte-Carlo) data in both of their chosen statistical software packages to conduct appropriate analyses. Students present and defend their paper to a committee of three faculty members selected by the student. | Scoring form to conduct independent assessments of the students’ work. They then meet to review these scores and determine whether the student’s work is satisfactory.  
4.b. Student success requires a unanimous vote by the committee that the paper and presentation demonstrate competency in this learning objective. |
PART TWO: Please summarize the changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning—at the program level—that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How did you use the data? With whom will the results be shared? This section should focus on the current academic year, though some departments may find it useful to discuss longer trends.

The Undergraduate Comprehensive (Comp) Committee is currently analyzing Comp questions and responses over the past five years. Their preliminary findings suggest that students’ responses have indeed improved, suggesting that instruction and learning in the Statistics Department has improved over the past five years. The Comp Committee is trying to make sure that this is not a function of more lenient scoring standards or the sharing of Comp questions among students. Regardless, these findings have prompted the development of a much larger pool of U/G Comp questions and the development of a standardized departmental scoring method and form (rubric). The Statistics Department is planning to develop mechanisms by which faculty members can conveniently submit at least one new Comp question each year for possible inclusion in the Comp pool. The Comp Committee will decide which questions are to be added to the pool.

In 2009 the Comp pool and students’ responses will again be subjectively and objectively analyzed by looking for general characteristics and trends in students’ responses. Good questions will be retained and poor questions will be dropped from the pool.

Student writing, particularly for non-native English speakers, will be more carefully attended to and assessed in the statistics courses as well as in the comprehensive exams and major papers. The Departmental Curriculum Committee will develop and promulgate a statement to this effect.

Also, as statistical methods advance (quite rapidly with advances in computer technology) some of the learning outcomes will have to be revised and others added. The U/G Statistics Comprehensive Exam and major paper requirement will be reviewed bi-annually and revised as necessary to reflect these changes. If necessary, the review/revision time-line can be accelerated.

The goal is continuous improvement of the U/G Statistics Comprehensive Exam as one of the valid, reliable assessments of student learning outcomes in the statistics program.
Appendix C

University of South Dakota
DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
(Based on HLC/NCA Matrix 2002; reviewed FA 2008)

Person Reporting_________________________

Degree Program__________________________

Academic Term___________________________

1. Learning Objectives

Level 1
- Learning objectives identified.

Level 2
- Learning objectives identified.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3
- Comprehensive learning objectives identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- They are measurable.
- They support USD’s educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.
- Course objectives correlate with program goals.

2. Assessment Measures

Level 1
- Measures identified.

Level 2
- Measures were identified.
- Measures relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning.

Level 3
- Measures identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. Expectations

Level 1
- Some expectations identified.
- Expectations may be vague or lacking specificity.

Level 2
- Performance expectations/standards established.
- They are specific.
- They describe desired outcomes for all measures.

Level 3
- Performance expectations/standards established.
- They are specific.
- They describe desired outcomes for all measures.
- They describe indirect and direct measures.
- They can be tracked over time.
- Expectations are re-evaluated regularly.

4. Results

Level 1
- Data collected for at least some objectives.

Level 2
- Data collected for all objectives.
- Data analyzed in a routine and systematic manner.
- Data compared over time.
- Program implications for results are discussed and engage faculty/program choices.

Level 3
- Data collected for all objectives.
- Data analyzed in a routine and systematic manner.
- Data compared over time.
- Program implications for results are discussed and engage faculty/program choices.
- Results reported annually and in self-studies and program reviews.
- Changes made based on previous results are analyzed, assessed, and documented.

5. Feedback Loop

Level 1
- Data is collected but not interpreted or used.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2
- Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3
- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.
Appendix D

SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS
Policy Manual
SUBJECT: Assessment
NUMBER: 2:11

1. Purpose of Assessment
The primary purpose of the system assessment policy is to enhance the quality and excellence of programs, learning, and teaching by providing important information on the effectiveness of academic programs. Campus assessment programs should also increase communication within and between departments related to the departmental and institutional goals and objectives. It is also important that campus assessment programs enhance the public understanding of higher education and diversity of institutional roles and missions.

2. Campus Assessment Programs
Each university shall have in place a functioning assessment program which conforms to the accreditation requirements of the North Central Association and any specialty accreditations held by the university. At a minimum each assessment program shall:
A. Assess the general education component of the baccalaureate curriculum.
B. Assess each of the specialty areas for which a baccalaureate degree is offered.
C. Consider the findings of the assessment program in the regular review of curriculum and related policies and procedures.

3. Assessment Periods
Each university shall integrate the assessment program into its orientation and registration process. Each university may designate, as needed, one day in the fall calendar and one day in the spring calendar to be used for the administration of assessment instruments to currently enrolled students.

4. Assessment Fee
Each campus is authorized to include in its university support fee a fee to be used for the administration of the assessment program.

5. Approval and Reporting
Each university shall provide a report of its assessment program to the Board at five year intervals, beginning no later than 1995.

6. Student Participation
Student participation in the assessment program established by each university is required. Students who do not participate shall be prevented from subsequent registration and graduation.

SOURCE: BOR, August 1984; BOR, April 1987; BOR, June 1987; BOR, June 1992
Appendix E

Overview of University-wide Academic Assessment Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Exams/Tests</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants/Matriculating Students</td>
<td>1. ACT*</td>
<td>1. ACT Entering Students Survey*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. SAT*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Placement Exam* (ACT-COMPASS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1. English Assessment</td>
<td>4. IDEA (Kansas Form)* - Student evaluation of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Assessment of Aesthetic Experience</td>
<td>5. National Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. VSA CAAP Critical Thinking* and Writing* (beginning of Fall 2009).</td>
<td>6. Faculty Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1. SD BOR Proficiency Exam* (ACT-CAAP, Nat. norm, 48/32 Credit hours). Reading, Science Reasoning, Writing and Math.</td>
<td>1. IDEA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Assessment of Aesthetic Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1. IdEA Program Assessment of Globalization and Writing Intensive.</td>
<td>1. IDEA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Assessment of Aesthetic Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3. VSA CAAP Critical Thinking* and Writing* (beginning Fall of 2009).</td>
<td>5. IDEA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. IdEA Program Assessment of Globalization and Writing Intensive.</td>
<td>6. National Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. National Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
<td>7. Faculty Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. VSA Critical Thinking and Writing Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1. IDEA*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. VSA Follow Us Survey.</td>
<td>2. VSA Follow Us Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1. Faculty Annual Evaluations.</td>
<td>1. Faculty Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Assessment Description to follow for a complete description of each measure;
* Nationally referenced or normed instruments.
Assessment Instrument Descriptions

1. **ACT and SAT.** The ACT and SAT are nationally normed instruments used throughout the U.S. for admissions decisions and placement in higher education. All applicants to USD are required to submit scores. These measures are important to assessment because they are used to establish baseline proficiency levels for incoming freshmen. Data are warehoused in the SD-BOR System database (DATATEL) and are accessible to faculty, advisors, administrators and other offices for academic purposes.

2. **Aesthetic Experiences Assessment.** This is an assessment being developed (SP09) and will be implemented starting the FA09 addressing the outcomes for the SDBOR Aesthetic Experiences requirements. It will be administered each semester and collected as part of the fine arts courses approved to be used to meet the Aesthetic Experiences requirement at USD. These data will be collected by the Fine Arts area but transferred and archived in the OAEA.

3. **COMPASS.** The COMPASS exam is used to place incoming and transfer students in appropriate math and English courses as well as for establishing baseline academic proficiency levels in English and math. Compass tests are administered by the USD Office of Academic Affairs, and results are stored in DATATEL.

4. **English Writing Assessments.** The English faculty administers the objective test and forward results to the Director of the Writing center at USD. The initial English courses take a pre-test post-test based exam assessing basic writing skills. This is done yearly. The data are archived in the English department and OAEA. OAEA provides an annual evaluation of the outcomes.

5. **Faculty Annual Evaluations.** The faculty is evaluated annually by the Dean of their unit. This evaluation incorporates the information available on teaching, research, and service. It is developed by the faculty with his or her dean and is archived in Dean’s Office for each unit.

6. **Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE).** The FSSE is an on-line survey administered every two years by the Office of Academic Affairs to USD Faculty Members. It taps faculty perceptions very similar to those tapped in the NSSE (below). Results and data are warehoused by the Office of Academic Affairs in electronic (ASCII, SPSS, Excel) and paper forms. Aggregated results and raw data are warehoused by the Office of Academic Affairs in electronic (ASCII, SPSS, Excel) and paper forms.

7. **Graduate Status Survey (GSS).** The GSS, administered at the end of each semester, is a multimodal (on-line, paper, phone) survey administered by the USD Career Development Center (K. Smith-Keller). Its purpose is to collect information about jobs, graduate education and salaries earned by USD alumni. This survey taps students’ perceptions of the relevance of their USD education to the career they are currently pursuing. Data from the early 1980’s to the present are warehoused in Excel files by the USD Career Development Center.

8. **IDEA Diagnostic Report (Kansas Form)** is a nationally normed, paper/pencil instrument for assessing the quality of classroom teaching across the 4 broad areas of (1) Progress on Relevant Objectives, (2) Excellence of Teaching, (3) Excellence of the Course and (4) Overall Summary. The items address multiple areas including: (1) Course Organization and Planning, (2) Communication, (3) Faculty/Student Interaction, (4)
Assignments/Exams/Grading, (5) Course Outcomes, (6) Student Effort and Involvement, and (7) Course Difficulty/Workload/Pace. It is administered at the end of each course (with >4 enrolled) by the USD Office of Academic Affairs (Director) in conjunction with the USD Colleges and Departments. Data are stored electronically.

9. **IdEA Program Advanced Writing and Globalization Assessment.** Student learning outcomes concerning Globalization are assessed each semester in the IdEA Foundation class by asking questions concerning the construct on the midterm and final tests as well as one of the 750 word essay assignments congruent to each class. It is expected that at least 80 percent of the students correctly answer the test questions and that 90 percent of the students pass the essay. This data will be gathered and utilized to assess the teaching of Globalization by IdEA Foundation faculty at the end of each academic year.

10. **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).** The NSSE is an on-line survey administered every two years by the Office of Academic Affairs to USD Freshmen and Seniors. It measures five benchmark areas: (1) Active and Collaborative Learning, (2) Academic Challenge, (3) Supportive Campus Environment, (4) Enriching Experiences, and (5) Faculty/Student Interaction. Aggregated results and raw data are warehoused by the Office of Academic Affairs in electronic (ASCII, SPSS, Excel) and paper forms.

11. **South Dakota Board of Regents Proficiency Exam (CAAP- from ACT).** The ACT-CAAP Exam is a paper/pencil regentally mandated exam administered by the SD-BOR and the USD Office of Academic Affairs to Bachelor’s degree seeking students after their 48th credit hour and to Associates’ degree seeking students after their 32nd credit hour. Students are required to achieve a minimum score (established by the SD-BOR) in each section of the exam: (1) Reading, (2) Writing, (3) Mathematics, and (4) Science Reasoning. Data are warehoused in the SD-BOR System-wide database (DATATEL) and as data files in the USD Office of Academic Affairs. This assessment is of the core undergraduate skills directly, but also makes use of value-added or “gain” scores though a comparison with the ACT scores at admission. The CAAP is administered by the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment in the fall and spring of each calendar year.

12. **Voluntary System of Accountability Assessment of Critical Thinking and Writing.** The ACT CAAP Critical Thinking and Writing Essay portion will be administered beginning in the FA09 semester participants from a randomly selected sample of 200 freshman with 200 seniors selected the following spring semester (SP10). Freshman will be tested each fall semester with seniors each spring semester beginning the 2010. These 2 samples will be reviewed independently for academic quality, but also used to conduct a comparison analysis along the VSA value-Added guidelines to review growth as well. ([http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm?page=homePage](http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm?page=homePage))

13. **Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) Follow-Up Survey.** This survey is embedded into the Graduate Status Survey to assess the career placement and career goals assessments element of the Voluntary System of Accountability. ([http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm?page=homePage](http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm?page=homePage))