USD Program Review Handbook

INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment

VERSION 2.5

Table of Contents

Introduction

Academic program review is an essential component of efforts to maintain high-quality academic degree programs. This handbook outlines the processes and procedures used for academic program review at the University of South Dakota. The handbook was developed by the USD Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), which is responsible for overseeing all program review activities at the university.

USD Mission and Vision

South Dakota Board of Regents (SDBOR) Policy 1:10:1 defines the university's mission statement as follows:

> *"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."*[1]

The vision of the University of South Dakota is to be the best small, public flagship university in the nation built upon a liberal arts foundation.

Board of Regents Policies on Program Review

SDBOR Policy 2:11 requires that all regental degree programs be comprehensively reviewed on a regular basis.[2] SDBOR Administrative Guideline 4.2 further spells out all required components of this review process.[3]

In general, all degree programs are to be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. The length of this cycle may be shortened or lengthened for individual departments or degree programs at the discretion of the USD Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

---

[1] SDBOR Policy 1:10:1: https://www.sdbor.edu/policy/documents/1-10-1.pdf
[2] SDBOR Policy 2:11: https://www.sdbor.edu/policy/documents/2-11.pdf
[3] SDBOR Academic Affairs Guideline 4.2: https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/4_Guidelines/4_2_Guideline.pdf

Scope and Overview

The university's program review process is organized under two core principles:

1) The primary unit of analysis is the academic department.
2) Each academic department will, on a regular basis, undertake (as applicable):
   a. a comprehensive review of its non-accredited degree programs, and
   b. a comprehensive review of its accredited degree programs.

With these principles in mind, the university has established two separate program review schedules: a schedule for departments with non-accredited programs and a schedule for departments with accredited programs. All academic departments in the university are included on one or both of these schedules.   As dictated by these schedules, *each department will undertake a holistic review that comprehensively incorporates information from all degree programs (either non-accredited or accredited, as applicable) offered by the department.*[4]

In general, the program review process consists of four main stages:

1) Compilation of a Department Self-Study
2) Site Visit
3) Compilation of a USD Action Plan
4) Compilation of an SDBOR Summary Report

For reviews of accredited programs, departments may use an accreditor's self-study process and an accreditor's site visit process in lieu of the analogous regental processes outlined above. However, reviews of accredited programs still entail the preparation and submission of a USD Action Plan and an SDBOR Summary Report.

Note that any department (or individual degree program) may choose to seek external accreditation using procedures outlined in SDBOR documents (Academic Affairs Guidelines 4.3).[5] Formal SDBOR permission is required to seek accreditation.[6]

---

[4] For example, a department may offer three non-accredited degree programs and two accredited degree programs. This department will be included on both schedules, and will conduct separate reviews of its non-accredited and accredited programs accordingly.

[5] SDBOR Academic Affairs Guideline 4.3: https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/4_Guidelines/4_3_Guideline.pdf

[6] SDBOR requires that, as a condition for initial approval, all new graduate programs undergo an external review (SDBOR Policy 2:1).   Once approved by SDBOR, new programs will be included in non-accredited or accredited program reviews, as appropriate.

Process Stages

As outlined above, the four major stages of the program review process are summarized below.

Stage 1 – Department Self-Study

In the initial stage of review, the department will compile a comprehensive Department Self-Study. Each self-study will reflect holistically on the complete array of degree programs – either non-accredited or accredited, as applicable – offered by the department. For reviews of non-accredited programs, the content of the self-study is dictated largely by SDBOR guidelines (see Appendix A), and must include discussion of mission, quality, cost, productivity, and related topics. For these reviews, departments should use the electronic self-study template provided by IRPA. In contrast, departments undertaking reviews of accredited programs should use an accreditor's self-study form in lieu of the regental format described above.

Stage 2 – Site Visit

Once the completed self-study has been finalized, the department will host a site visit by a team of external peer reviewers. For reviews of non-accredited programs, it is expected that site review teams will consist of at least two reviewers.[7] For reviews of accredited programs, the number of reviewers will be dictated by accreditor guidelines.

Stage 3 – USD Action Plan

After the site visit report is received from external reviewers, the department will develop a USD Action Plan that addresses the opportunities, weaknesses, or other issues identified during the program review process. Using an electronic template supplied by IRPA, the department will compile and submit a draft of the USD Action Plan to the provost and dean within four weeks of receiving the site visit report. Following a preliminary review by the provost, dean, and IRPA, a final copy of the USD Action Plan must be submitted to and approved by both the provost and dean. In addition, any desired changes to Nuventive department goals or assessment plans arising from the final USD Action Plan should be communicated by the department to IRPA staff.

Stage 4 – SDBOR Summary Report

The final stage of the program review process involves the completion of an SDBOR Summary Report. This report offers a brief, high-level overview of the completed program review, and must be completed using the electronic template available from IRPA. The final SDBOR Summary Report must be approved by the provost, and will be submitted by the provost to the system Academic Affairs Council upon conclusion of the review.

---

[7] For reviews of non-accredited programs, review team personnel must be approved by the dean of the department under review.

Review Timeline, Departments with Non-accredited Programs

General Guidelines

- Departments undertaking reviews of <u>non-accredited</u> degree programs must undertake program review using the regental self-study process and the regental site visit process described in SDBOR Policy 2:11; such programs also must prepare and submit a USD Action Plan and an SDBOR Summary Report.
- All non-accredited degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) within a given department will be reviewed simultaneously.
- Programs reviews must be conducted according to the timeline below.

Timeline

Month	Tasks
May	- IRPA notifies department of upcoming program review - IRPA schedules first meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to discuss the general process, set the focus of the review, and discuss provost's expectations for the review
August	Department submits nominations for external reviewers to dean and provost; reviewers approved by dean
December	Department schedules second meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to review progress on draft Department Self-Study
January	Department submits final Department Self-Study to provost, dean, and IRPA for distribution to site visit team
January-March	- Department notifies provost, dean, IRPA of site visit schedule - Site visit
Within 4 weeks of site visit	Department, dean, provost receive report from site team
Within 4 weeks of site visit report	- Department submits draft USD Action Plan to provost, dean - Department submits draft SDBOR Summary Report to provost
Within 4 weeks of submission of draft USD Action Plan and draft SDBOR Summary Report	- Department schedules third meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to discuss draft USD Action Plan and draft SDBOR Summary Report - Final USD Action Plan approved by dean and provost; final SDBOR Summary Report approved by provost - Department notifies IRPA of any changes required to department goals and assessment plans in Nuventive (based on approved USD Action Plan) - Department uploads Department Self-Study, site visit report, USD Action Plan, and SDBOR Summary Report to Nuventive document repository - Provost submits SDBOR Summary Report to system office

Review Timeline, Departments with Accredited Programs

General Guidelines

- Departments undertaking reviews of <u>accredited</u> degree programs may use an accreditor's self-study process and an accreditor's site visit process in lieu of the analogous regental processes; such programs also must prepare and submit a USD Action Plan and an SDBOR Summary Report.
- All accredited degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) within a given department will be reviewed simultaneously.
- Program reviews must be conducted according to the timeline below.

Timeline

Time Frame	Tasks
12 months before site visit	- Department notifies IRPA of upcoming accreditation review and submission deadline - IRPA schedules first meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to discuss the general process, set the focus of the review, and discuss provost's expectations for the review
4 weeks before self-study submission to accreditor	Department schedules second meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to review progress on draft Department Self-Study
Submission to accreditor	Department submits final Department Self-Study to provost, dean, IRPA, and external accreditor
Site visit	- Department notifies provost, dean, IRPA of site visit schedule - Site visit
Within 4 weeks of site visit	Department, dean, provost receive report from site team
Within 4 weeks of site visit report	- Department submits draft USD Action Plan to provost, dean - Department submits draft SDBOR Summary Report to provost
Within 4 weeks of submission of draft USD Action Plan and draft SDBOR Summary Report	- Department schedules third meeting with provost, dean, IRPA to discuss draft USD Action Plan and draft SDBOR Summary Report - Final USD Action Plan approved by dean and provost; final SDBOR Summary Report approved by provost - Department notifies IRPA of any changes required to department goals and assessment plans in Nuventive (based on approved USD Action Plan) - Department uploads Department Self-Study, site visit report, USD Action Plan, and SDBOR Summary Report to Nuventive document repository - Provost submits SDBOR Summary Report to system office
Upon receipt of accreditation letter	Department uploads accreditation letter to Nuventive document repository

Responsibilities of Stakeholders

Provost

- Hosts all meetings between department, provost, dean, IRPA as shown in the timeline(s) above
- Hosts meeting with external reviewers to discuss expectations for the review
- Approves final USD Action Plan and SDBOR Summary Report
- Submits SDBOR Summary Report to system office

IRPA Staff

- Provide data summaries and documentation templates to department as necessary
- Participate in all meetings between department, provost, dean, IRPA as shown in the timeline(s) above; schedule initial meeting
- Support provost in review of draft reports submitted by department
- Warehouse final copies of all Department Self-Study reports, USD Action Plans, SDBOR Summary Reports, and accreditation letters.
- Update department goals and assessment plans in Nuventive, as dictated by approved USD Action Plans

Dean

- Participates in all meetings between department, provost, dean, IRPA as shown in the timeline(s) above
- Approves external reviewers (for reviews of non-accredited programs)
- Meets with external reviewers
- Approves final USD Action Plan

Department Chair

- Participates in all meetings between department, provost, dean, IRPA as shown in the timeline(s) above; schedules all meetings except initial meeting
- Oversees the composition of all reports, including the Department Self-Study, USD Action Plan, and SDBOR Summary Report
- Identifies, schedules, and coordinates the activities of external reviewers (for reviews of non-accredited programs)
- Meets with external reviewers
- Submits all documentation to provost, dean, IRPA, and external reviewers as shown in the timeline(s) above

Appendix A: Outline of SDBOR Program Review Guidelines

Reviews of non-accredited degree programs must include the completion of a Department Self-Study report that features the following headings: Introduction, Mission Centrality, Quality, Cost, Program Productivity, and Future Planning. The guidelines outlined below are taken SDBOR administrative guidelines and are subject to change pending future board actions.[8] IRPA staff will provide department chairs with an electronic template to be used for the completion of the Department Self-Study report.

Many of the data points required by this report are available on-demand from various university reporting platforms, including Nuventive and Digital Measures. In addition, IRPA staff will provide continuous support to department chairs throughout the program review process in the form of process guidance, data reports, and analysis support.

Introduction

Describe the departmental programs under review, including undergraduate/graduate majors, specializations, minors, and certificates offered; the research, scholarship and creative activity conducted (including amount of funded research expenditures per annum since the last review); the outreach, engagement and service activities provided both within the university and externally. This should include a summary of offerings via distance education and university centers or other off-site locations.

Mission Centrality

The institutional mission is the basis for strategic planning and priority setting. Provide data and evidence demonstrating how the program supports the mission, vision and strategic goals of the university.

    A. Clearly state the department's mission, strategic goals, and the student learning outcomes for the programs and explain how faculty and students are made aware of them. Include a copy of the department strategic plan, if available.

    B. Explain how the department contributes to other departments and programs (undergraduate, graduate, and student support) across campus. If the department plays a significant role in supporting other areas, provide a brief description of the extent, including identifying the supported programs.

---

[8] SDBOR Academic Affairs Guideline 4.2: https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/4_Guidelines/4_2_Guideline.pdf

C. Include detailed placement data for graduates (bachelors, master's, and doctoral) for the most recent three to five years. Indicate if graduates are working in discipline-related fields. State whether the departmental program(s) is(are) meeting state, regional, national and international employment needs and include labor market projections for likely careers pursued by graduates (if available).

D. Explain how the department's outreach, community service, and other external linkages support the cultural, educational, and economic development of the state and region. Topics may include how the department serves the state and region beyond producing graduates, the benefits of any linkages to PK-12 education, and formal and informal linkages with external communities, groups, or organizations and related benefits.

Quality

Provide data, evidence, and explanation addressing whether the program(s) in the department are of high quality.

A. Demonstrate the department's commitment to creating an environment that engages students in their learning, including encouraging students to critically explore multiple and diverse perspectives. The intent of this item is to recognize that alternative points of view exists in all fields, including competing theories, methodologies in research and practice, and ethical decisions related to application of knowledge.

B. Describe the classroom-based and co-curricular activities designed to develop the ability to understand the discipline from different perspectives (and provide copies of syllabi). Describe practical learning experiences (internships, field experiences, service learning, research opportunities, practica, etc.) that contribute to student engagement. Explain the use of technology and other tools used in student learning.

C. Describe the use and availability of library resources by students and faculty, including identifying any trends in library publications and journals that demonstrate how the collection has changed over the past three to five years.

D. Demonstrate the curriculum is contemporary and coherent, appropriately representing the breadth and depth of the discipline. In this section, describe curricular changes made in the last seven years and the data sources and process used for reviewing and updating curriculum.

E. Demonstrate well-developed program assessment processes, including measurable student learning outcomes based on commonly accepted disciplinary standards. Explain the use of assessment data in improving programs (undergraduate and graduate) and student learning. Demonstrate assessment employs multiple measures to evaluate learning outcomes and that assessment processes are consistent,

continuous, formalized, and documented. Explain how student learning outcomes remain current with disciplinary standards, how assessment data are shared with faculty, how curriculum changes are made and what differences any changes have made in student learning?

F. Demonstrate the department promotes equity, diversity, and inclusiveness. Demonstrate the department values multiple perspectives, including race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, and disability in recruitment and retention of students (undergraduate and graduate), staff and faculty, and the content and delivery of the curriculum.

G. Demonstrate department faculty and instructional staff are current in their disciplines and use current knowledge and strategies to engage students in active learning. Demonstrate the department utilizes the scholarship of teaching and learning and that learning activities include evidence-based instructional practices. Explain how faculty are remaining current in their disciplines, how the department promotes these efforts, and how professional development plans assist in the development of needed knowledge and skills.

H. Demonstrate the department's faculty members have been and continue to be productive scholars, researchers, and/or creative artists in ways that support the institution's mission. Provide 3-5 years of evidence of scholarly engagement, including peer-reviewed publications, performances, exhibitions, and funded research expenditures per annum for faculty who support the program. Describe how faculty members recognize the importance of engaging students in collaborative scholarly activities and creative projects as a critical component of learning. Provide 3-5 year of evidence of graduate student research productivity including theses, dissertations, co-authored papers, etc.

I. Demonstrate the program unit uses academic advisors who support student learning. Explain the process for assigning and assessing advising responsibilities. Provide 3-5 years of information on faculty who advise graduate students, the number of advisees and the number of graduates in each year.

J. Demonstrate the department contributes in a unique way to the university's identity and distinctiveness through its teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service.

K. Demonstrate the department has sufficient staffing to provide effective continuity and stability in consideration of the number and longevity of faculty, professional staff, and career service. Explain how the department is positioning itself to hire personnel with the expertise in strategic areas. Provide a list of faculty by name, year of hire, rank, area/s of expertise as well as career service and professional staff members.

L. Demonstrate the department has sufficient facilities (classrooms, laboratories, etc.) and equipment to provide effective teaching, learning, and research environments.

Cost

Provide information showing the department as financially viable yet cost efficient. Provide a copy of the program budget (revenues and expenses), including personnel, operations, and maintenance costs, as well as supplemental revenues. Provide separate revenue/expenses for off-campus or self-support faculty and staff. Provide and review 3-5 years of data, including analyzing for trends.

A. Provide the number of instructional faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the program(s) for the department. Provide the number of student credit hours generated at the graduate, upper-division (300-400 level), lower-division (100-200 level) levels. Provide the credit hours generated for pre-general education courses if applicable.

B. Provide the number of self-support student credit hours generated at off-campus sites (e.g., university centers) or through distance education. Provide the total credit hours generated per full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional staff.

Program Productivity

Demonstrate the department's productivity. Provide enrollment figures from most recent census figures for fall semester for programs within the department. Provide the number of graduates in each degree program per year (based on CIP Code). Outline action steps to strengthen the enrollment and graduation rates for the program(s), including setting specific targets. Programs within the department identified as not meeting the program productivity guidelines may require evaluation again within the next three years.

Future Planning

Demonstrate a plan for the department's future. Include targets and goals for change and plans to enhance quality and competitiveness based on this evaluation process. Demonstrate a plan for assessing and tracking future success, including identifying 5-10 key benchmarks.

Appendix B: Program Review Schedule

This schedule is subject to change pending future accreditation requirements, degree offering changes, or other special circumstances.

Review Schedule, Departments with Non-accredited Programs

The departments below offer non-accredited programs and must undergo program review (of non-accredited programs) via the regental self-study process and the regental site visit process described in SDBOR Policy 2:11; these departments also must prepare and submit a USD Action Plan and an SDBOR Summary Report. *At the outset of each review, a full roster of non-accredited programs subject to review will be identified by IRPA staff and shared with the department.*

YEAR	DEPARTMENTS
2017-2018	Basic Biomedical Science, Chemistry, Kinesiology/Sport Mgmt.
2018-2019	History, Modern Lang. & Ling., Physics
2019-2020	Anthropology & Sociology, Biomedical Engineering, Educational Leadership
2020-2021	Communication Studies, English, Media & Journalism, Mathematics
2021-2022	Biology, Counseling & Psych. in Ed., Medical Laboratory Science, Political Sci.
2022-2023	Health Sciences, Health Sciences Dean, Psychology, Sustainability
2023-2024	Arts & Sciences, Comm. Sci. & Disorders, Graduate Studies

Review Schedule, Departments with Accredited Programs

The departments below offer accredited programs and may undergo program review (of accredited programs) using an accreditor's self-study process and an accreditor's site visit process in lieu of the analogous regental processes; these departments also must prepare and submit a USD Action Plan and an SDBOR Summary Report. *At the outset of each review, a full roster of accredited programs subject to review will be identified by IRPA staff and shared with the department.*

YEAR	DEPARTMENTS
2017-2018	Communication Sciences & Disorders
2018-2019	Accounting/Finance, Computer Science, Economics/Decision Sci., Entre./Mgmt./Marketing, Health Services Mgmt., Physical Therapy
2019-2020	Art, Curr. & Instr., Ed. Leadership, Kinesiology/Sport Mgmt., Law, Political Sci.
2020-2021	Media & Journalism, Theatre
2021-2022	Dental Hygiene
2022-2023	Addic. Stud., Couns. & Psych. in Ed. (NASP), Occl. Therapy, Phyician. Asst, Psych.
2023-2024	(*None currently scheduled*)
2024-2025	Social Work
2025-2026	Computer Science, Counseling & Psych. in Ed. (CACREP)
2026-2027	Music, Nursing