ACADEMIC AFFAIRS GUIDELINES

Section 2.3	Academic Programs	
Title:	Program Evaluation and Review Guidelines	
Number (Current Format)	**Number (Prior Format)**	**Date Last Revised**
2.3.4.A	4.1	08/2022
Reference:	BOR Policy 2.3.4 – Board of Regents Academic Program Evaluation and Review AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(1) – Annual Program Health Analytics Evaluation Guidelines AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(2) – Mid-Cycle Program Evaluation Guidelines AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(3) – Comprehensive Program Review Guidelines AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(4) – Program Accreditation Review Guidelines AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(5) – Program Productivity Review Guidelines AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(6) – New Program Evaluation AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(A-1) – Program Analytics – Evaluation and Review Chart AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(A-2) – SDBOR Review of Academic Programs 6-Year Cycle Flowchart	
Related Form(s):		

1. Purpose

1.1. The purpose of program review is to examine strengths and challenges, to celebrate accomplishments, and to reflect on, and plan for, the future.

Program evaluation is a platform for exploring ways to maintain and enhance the quality of academic programs. Program evaluation provides the opportunity to set priorities, articulate a compelling case for the priorities, and develop strategies for a program to be at the forefront of its field in any budgetary environment. Moreover, program evaluation may provide a venue in which to consider discontinuing or realigning academic programs to strengthen priority areas.

Program evaluation requires significant investment of campus stakeholders. Campus academic leaders (Provost, Dean, Department Head, etc.) hold primary responsibility for monitoring the program evaluation. The program faculty have responsibility for self-study and for assuring the quality of the student experience.

The overall structure for program evaluation applies to all academic programs. While the program review forms will be consistent, each institution/college/department may supplement additional qualitative and quantitative information. All accreditation reviews meet the needs of program review regardless of the schedule assigned. The Board of Regents will maintain and govern all required quantitative data; the institutions can supplement quantitative data as warranted for the program.

2. Governance

2.1. The responsibility for program evaluation rests primarily with the deans/department heads and the Provost and Academic Vice President. The Board of Regents requires that the universities conduct program evaluation on a regular basis. The university accrediting organization requires institutions to maintain a regular practice of program reviews. Program evaluation is coordinated by the Office of the Provost or designee. The Board of Regents institutional research (partnering with university institutional research) will oversee all the required academic performance solutions (APS) quantitative metrics ensuring validity and developing new metrics as needed. BOR Policy 2.3.4 provides all the qualitative elements that a campus should consider during their comprehensive review.

3. Definitions

3.1. **Academic Performance Solutions (APS) or Edify Dashboards**: APS is a system reporting solution utilizing our student information system data and displaying utilizing visualizations.

3.2. **Academic Program**: Academic program is defined as the degree program approved and offered at each of the Regental institutions.

3.3. **Accreditation Reporting Requirement**: The institutions are required by the accrediting organization to complete a comprehensive program review and require a policy of practice for those reviews.

3.4. **Board of Regents**: Defined as the constitutional body responsible for governing the Unified System of Public Higher Education in South Dakota, which encompasses its supervision, coordination, management, and regulation. Board of Regents Policy 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and SDCL § 13-49 through § 13-53 provides the authority to govern academic programming.

3.5. **Institution**: One of the six (6) South Dakota Regental universities: Black Hills State University, Dakota State University, Northern State University, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, South Dakota State University, and The University of South Dakota.

3.6. **Institution Program Review and Evaluation**: A process outlined in BOR Academic Program Review and Evaluation policy requiring annual health analytics/evaluation, a year-three (3) mid-cycle analytics/review and a year-six (6) comprehensive program review are completed as outlined and scheduled.

3.7. **Major Level Program Review**: Defined as an evaluation at the major for undergraduate or graduate programming, i.e., math, political science, nursing, etc.

3.8. **Program Special Accreditation Review and Evaluation**: A process outlined and scheduled by the specialized accreditation organization.

3.9. **Program Migration**: The movement of enrollment within a program which may include in-migration (moving into a program) and out-migration (moving out of a program).

3.10. **Student Outcomes**: Defined as the student's educational experience including retention, academic success, learning outcomes, and educational attainment.

3.11. **Vital Data**: Quantitative data included in the academic performance solution to be utilized in all the analytics, evaluations, and reviews.

4. Program Review and Evaluation

Defined in BOR Policy, the complete program review and evaluation process is composed of each of the following elements associated with their individual guidelines. Each of the associated guidelines can be found by selecting the following evaluations or reviews.

4.1. [Annual Health Analytics/Evaluation](#)

4.2. [Year-Three (3) Mid-Cycle Analytics/Evaluation](#)

4.3. [Year-Six (6) Comprehensive Program Review](#)

4.4. [Program Accreditation Review](#)

4.5. [BOR Program Productivity Review](#)

4.6. [BOR New Program Review](#)

4.7. Ad hoc Program Review

5. Evaluation Cycle

The evaluation cycle includes an annual health, three-year (3) mid-cycle and a year-six (6) comprehensive program evaluation.

5.1. **Annual Health Analytics/Evaluation**: This is a quantitative review of system-governed analytics in the academic performance solutions. This annual evaluation should be completed no later than June 30 of the current academic year. Institutions will provide an internal process of reporting those programs that may need additional intervention prior to the year-three (3) mid-cycle review. No formal report is required by the institutions to the BOR.

5.2. **Year-Three (3) Mid-Cycle Analytics/Evaluation**: This is a quantitative review of system governed metrics providing trend analysis in the academic performance solution. This will occur within the third (3rd) year of the year-six review cycle with a report due by June 30 of that current academic year. If the third (3) year is scheduled in 2022-2023, then the final report is due by June 30, 2023.

Institutions will create a schedule and provide it to the BOR academic affairs office. These dates will be uploaded to the student information system allowing communication to be submitted to the campuses identifying programs identified for review. The BOR may at any time request a program be reviewed prior to the schedule due to program productivity.

5.3. **Year-Six (6) Comprehensive Program Review:** This review includes both quantitative and qualitative aspects of a program. Institutions may elect to include multiple

programs in the same report as appropriate given the administrative structure of the institution (i.e., departments with multiple programs can submit program review as a single unit). Note, if the program maintains specialized accreditation, the Program Accreditation Review can be utilized in lieu of the Year-Six (6) Comprehensive Program Review.

Institutions will develop a schedule and provide it to the BOR academic affairs office. These dates will be uploaded to the student information system allowing communication to be submitted to the campuses identifying programs identified for review.

This will be initiated after Spring term in year six of the review cycle with a final report due by March of the next academic year (I.e., program is scheduled for 2022, communication will occur in the Fall of 2021, final analytics will be pulled by the campus in June of 2022 with a final report due March 2022).

5.4. **Program Accreditation Review**: This schedule is determined by the accrediting organization. Institutions will develop a schedule and provide it to the BOR academic affairs office. These dates will be uploaded to the student information system allowing communication to be submitted to the campuses identifying programs identified for review.

5.5. **New Program Evaluation**: This is an abbreviated annual review starting in years two (2) and continuing through year six (6) of that new program. This review is a BOR review conducted by the system academic staff with reporting to the institution provost and vice president for their review and discussion. The review will be conducted in the Spring of year two (2) and each year through year six (6). BOR academic affairs will submit the findings to the office of the provost by June 30.

5.6. **Program Productivity Review**: This occurs with the year-three (3) mid-cycle review. The programs that are flagged in accordance with BOR Policy will require additional reporting by the campus and reported to the Board of Regents. Those programs on an extended cycle due to specialized accreditation will follow the accreditation cycle for program productivity; however, the BOR may at any time request a program be reviewed due to program productivity should the program warrant a review due to the vital health analytics/evaluation.

5.7. **Ad hoc Program Review**: This can be initiated by the institution or the Board of Regents. It is not formally scheduled and will be an abbreviated review.

6. Scheduling

Each institution will need to create a schedule for their mid-cycle and comprehensive reviews (year-three (3), year-six (6), or special accreditation cycle). System academic staff will enter the information into the student information system for comprehensive reporting on reporting requirements.

7. Communication

A report notification will be submitted from the student information systems to the office of the provost initially during the Fall term notifying the upcoming reviews for that academic year. A communication will be submitted from the student information system with a link to the academic performance solution and any required reporting in the Spring term as a reminder to evaluate and report in a timely manner.

8. **Program Status Tracker**

The Board of Regents staff are responsible for maintaining a tracking mechanism to monitor the status of the six-year comprehensive program review processes across the six institutions. The tracker will allow Board academic staff to search by institution, school/college, department, program, and/or review status.

9. **Reporting**

Specific reporting requirements can be found in section 4.

The Board of Regents academic staff will utilize academic performance solutions to provide standardized vital data visualizations for academic leadership at each institution. The visualizations can be used daily, weekly, monthly, annually, and over a period of years for trend analysis.

Quantitative data provided by board staff will be used in combination with qualitative and any additional quantitative data from the institution to inform the Year-Six (6) Comprehensive Program Review process, accreditation needs, and the strategic planning needs of the institution.

10. **Implementation/Transition of Guideline**

The guidelines associated with Program Review and Evaluation, approved April 2022, will be in effect September 1, 2022. Institutions will submit a full 6-year schedule of all programs by that date, and programs will be expected to complete their required review (annual, mid-cycle, or comprehensive) associated with their position in the six-year cycle. New program, program productivity, and ad hoc reviews will be effective August 1, 2022.

APPENDICES:
AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(A-1) – Program Analytics – Evaluation and Review Chart

AAC Guideline 2.3.4.A(A-2) – SDBOR Review of Academic Programs 6-Year Cycle Flowchart

RESOURCES:
Higher Learning Commission (HLC)

SOURCE:
AAC August 2022.