

South Dakota Board of Regents Institutional Program Review Guidelines

Undergraduate and Graduate programs

Purpose:

The primary purpose for conducting institutional program reviews is to continuously improve the quality of educational programs. Periodic program review involves stakeholders in the improvement of academic programs. Such review includes an analysis of past performance which is used to inform present and future directions and decision-making. The review process must be integrated with strategic planning and budgeting, with regional and specialized accreditation processes, and with student-learning outcome assessment.

Major assumptions:

1. Program review involves the comprehensive and intensive examination of a particular program, which includes the undergraduate and/or graduate academic programs (if available), research, scholarship and creative activity and the service/outreach component. The review is a process for improvement which uses both qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the program
2. The primary unit of analysis is the academic program. An academic department may have several academic programs which can be reviewed at the same time.
3. The academic program component of the review includes major requirements, other related requirements such as a minor or support courses, general education and other degree requirements and general electives.
4. Quality is not easily defined. The definition emerges from honest professional discourse about how graduates of the program meet or exceed disciplinary academic standards and are able to address identified societal needs. The program review process must be owned and driven by the faculty if it is to be effective.

Scope of program reviews:

All University programs (undergraduate and graduate) not subject to specialized accreditation or nationally recognized review processes (e.g., National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA))

shall be evaluated at least once every seven years. The University President or Chief Academic Officer may require a shorter review interval. Universities may use national accreditation reviews to satisfy the requirement for periodic program review. In such cases, the timing of the review will be determined by the cycle of specialized accreditation. If possible, accredited undergraduate programs and non-accredited graduate programs in the same discipline should be reviewed at the same time. Follow these IPR guidelines for the non-accredited graduate program. If programs would like to propose an alternative time to evaluate non-accredited graduate programs, contact the Academic Evaluation and Assessment (AEA) Office.

Programs that are nationally accredited and/or reviewed are required to submit a program review report using the template in Appendix A. The program review report is due one month after receipt of the final letter and report from the accrediting/reviewing organization.

Unit/Program Review Process

Undergraduate and/or graduate programs that are not nationally accredited and/or reviewed will conduct their review in accordance with this set of guidelines.

- I. **Introduction**: Describe the unit/program under review. The description should include the 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 technology or at attendance centers.

- II. **Mission Centrality**: Does the program advance institutional strategy? Provide data, evidence and explanation to address the following:
 - II.1 The program supports the mission, vision and strategic goals of the University. The institutional mission is the basis for strategic planning and priority setting. Demonstrate how the program links directly to and produces outcomes that advance the institutional purpose, vision, and goals.

- II.2 The program’s mission, strategic goals, and student learning outcomes are clearly stated. Faculty and students are aware of the mission, goals, and outcomes. (Include a copy of the department/program strategic plan, if available.)
- II.3 The program contributes to other programs (undergraduate, graduate, and student support) across campus. Many programs have significant roles to play in support of other programs across campus. If this is the case, provide a brief description of how extensive this is – in general education, in interdisciplinary programs (please name them), or as support for other majors on campus (describe how), etc. Carefully consider the extent to which faculty invest time in these partnerships. If the program has little or no supporting roles, this should be stated.
- II.4 The program’s graduates meet identifiable state, regional, national and international needs. Include placement data for graduates (bachelors, masters, and doctoral). Indicate if graduates are working in discipline-related fields. Provide detailed data for the most recent three to five years. If available, labor market projections for likely careers pursued by graduates should be included.
- II.5 The program’s outreach, community service, and other external linkages support the cultural, educational, and economic development of the state and region. As you reflect on your program, please consider the following (all may not apply):
- How does the program serve the state and region in ways beyond producing graduates?
 - Are there significant PreK-12 linkages? Why does the program have these linkages? What are the direct benefits of these linkages?
 - Are there formal and/or informal linkages with external communities, groups, or organizations? Why does the program have these linkages? What are the direct benefits of these linkages?
 - Are these linkages worth continuing?

III. Quality: Is the program of high quality? Provide data, evidence, and explanation to address the following:

- III.1 The program is committed to creating an environment that engages students in their learning. This type of learning environment challenges students to be open,

and to critically explore multiple, diverse perspectives both in and out of the classroom. The intent of this item is to recognize that in all fields there is the possibility of alternative points of view. As noted, in some fields this may be more limited than in others. However, even in highly technical, empirically-based fields, there are competing theories, methodologies in research and practice, and ethical decisions related to application of knowledge.

- Describe elements of the program, classroom-based activities, and co-curricular activities that are intentionally designed to develop the ability to understand the discipline from different perspectives. Provide sample copies of syllabi.
- Describe practical learning experiences, (internships, field experiences, service learning, research opportunities, practica) that contribute to student engagement.
- Explain how technology or other tools are used to engage students in their learning.
- Are library resources invested in publications and services that are actively used by students and faculty? Evaluate the investments for the college/unit. Identify trends in library publications and journals that demonstrate how the collection has changed over the past three to five years.

III.2 The curriculum is contemporary and coherent, appropriately representing the breadth and depth of the discipline. In this section, describe curricular changes that have been made since the last program review. Describe the data sources and process used for reviewing and updating curriculum. Information received from advisory boards, alumni, exit interviews should be included (if available).

III.3 The program assessment processes are well developed, with measurable student learning outcomes based on commonly accepted disciplinary standards. Assessment data are used to improve the programs (undergraduate and graduate) and student learning. The assessment processes are consistent, continuous, formalized, and carefully documented. Assessment employs multiple measures to inform evaluation of learning outcomes, and then uses the results to take actions for improvement.

Explain how stated student learning outcomes are kept 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? (The undergraduate and graduate assessment findings may be included.)

III.4 The program demonstrates and promotes equity, diversity, and inclusiveness. The program values multiple perspectives, which include race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, and disability. Address this from the following perspectives: recruitment and retention of students (undergraduate and graduate), staff and faculty, and the content and delivery of the curriculum. The following questions will aid you as you develop the narrative:

- How does the unit/program promote inclusiveness?
- What supports are in place for a diverse student body? What alternative pedagogies are used for multiple learning styles?
- How does the curriculum reflect and support cultural and global competence?

III.5 The program demonstrates that faculty and instructional staff members are up-to-date in their disciplines and use current knowledge and strategies to engage students in active learning. The program utilizes the scholarship of teaching and learning to ensure that learning activities are grounded in evidence-based instructional practices. The following will aid you as you develop the narrative:

- Describe steps that the faculty are taking to remain current in their disciplines.
- Describe steps the unit/institution has taken to support and to promote these efforts.
- How have the Professional Development Plans (PDPs) been used to assist in the development of needed knowledge and skills?

III.6 The program demonstrates that its faculty members have been and continue to be productive scholars, researchers, and/or creative artists in ways that support the institution's mission. (Include copies of the College/Department Standards Document and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, if available.)

- Provide 3-5 years' worth 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. (Information from the PDP might be helpful here.)
 - Explain any new initiatives for undergraduate research, if applicable.
 - Provide 3-5 years' worth of evidence of graduate student research productivity including theses, dissertations, co-authored papers, etc.
- III.7 The unit uses academic advisors who support student learning. Describe how the program's academic advising responsibilities are assigned and assessed. Evaluate the effectiveness of advising for undergraduate and graduate students. What are the retention and graduation rates of graduate students? For the last 3-5 years, provide a list of faculty who advise graduate students, the number of advisees and the number of graduates in each year. (See Table 1: Graduate Advisee and Graduation)
- III.8 The program contributes in a unique or unusual way (through its teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service) that enhances the university's identity and distinctiveness.
- III.9 The program has sufficient staffing to provide effective continuity and stability and is not vulnerable to personnel changes that could interfere with sustaining quality assurance. Consider the number and longevity of faculty, professional staff, and career service. How is the unit/program 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. (See Table 2: Faculty Credentials). Provide a list of Career Service and Professional Staff members. (See Table 3: Staff and Professional Staff Credentials)
- III.10 The program has sufficient facilities (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, etc.) and equipment to provide effective teaching, learning, and research environments.

IV: Cost: Is the program financially viable yet cost efficient? Provide a copy of the program budget/s (Table 4: Department Budget). (Include personnel: administrative, instructional, research, career service, and non-faculty exempt salaries and fringe benefits, and operations and maintenance budgets.) Include information on program fees, lab fees, research grants/contracts and other supplemental revenues and related costs (Table 5: Expenditures). Provide separate revenue/expenses for University Center or self-support faculty and staff. Provide 3-5 years of data, review and analyze for trends. Delaware Study data may be used if available. Comment on cost effectiveness of the program relative to the following:

IV.1 In Table 6, Department Faculty and Graduate Assistants, provide the number of instructional faculty and graduate teaching assistants. The number of student credit hours generated at the graduate, upper-division (300-400 level), lower-division (100-200 level) levels. Some department will need to include the credit hours for pre-general education courses (English, Mathematics, etc.) (See Table 7: Student Credit Hours). Include state support. The SDSU Redbook includes information.

IV.2 The number of self-support student credit hours generated at educational centers (i.e. UC) or on-line. What are the total credit hours generated per full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional staff. (Use Table 7 as a model)

V. Program Productivity: Comment on the program's productivity in regard to the following:

V.1 Enrollment in Program. Include enrollment figures from most recent census figures for fall semester.

The number of graduates in each degree program per year (based on CIP Code). See Table 8: Undergraduate and Graduate Program Enrollment and Graduates and the Number of Degrees Granted.

For any undergraduate program (degree plus major/specialization) graduating fewer than 20; masters programs graduating fewer than 12, or doctoral programs graduating fewer than 6 students over the past four years, briefly summarize the importance of the program in terms of mission centrality, quality and cost based

on information in earlier sections of this report. Also, outline the action steps to be taken to strengthen the program particularly in regard to building enrollment and graduation rates. Set specific targets for increasing the number of graduates from the program so as to track progress. Programs identified as not meeting the BOR specified graduation numbers may be required to be evaluated again within the next three years.

- VI: Plans for the Future: Given the present status of the program, what changes are proposed to help the program advance? Include targets for change and plans to enhance quality and competitiveness that are based on this evaluation.
- VII. Assessment of progress: How will we evaluate future progress and successes? Identify 5-10 key benchmarks which will be used to evaluate progress.

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT TO BOARD OF REGENTS

***Due 30 days following receipt of the External and Internal Reviewers' Report.
This form is available electronically.***

This report is filed with the Board of Regents Office. All units/programs undergoing an accreditation review, nationally recognized review process or institutional program review need complete this form. The Dean or Department Head must approve this report and submit it to Academic Evaluation and Assessment for approval and submission to the Board of Regents.

Institution: _____

Department or School: _____

Program(s) Reviewed: _____

Date of Review: _____

Please identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Items A & B should address the following issues: mission centrality, program quality, cost, program productivity, plans for the future, and assessment of progress.

- A. Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers.
- B. Briefly summarize the review recommendations.
- C. Indicate the present and continuing actions to be taken by the college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

Submitted by: _____

Department Head

Reviewed by: _____

Dean

Approved by: _____

Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment

South Dakota State University Institutional Program Review Process

Guidelines and documents are located on InsideState.

A. Plan

1. Review SDBOR IPR Guidelines. Clarify with the College Dean and the Office of Academic Evaluation and Assessment (AEA), as needed.
2. Identify the Departmental Coordinator.
3. Involve departmental faculty.
4. Establish departmental timetable and strategy for conducting self-study, site visit, and related reporting responsibilities.
5. Identify an external reviewer and possible site visit dates. When a graduate program is part of the review, the external reviewer must be a member of the graduate faculty or have experience with graduate education. Submit **Approval form for Reviewers** to AEA.

External reviewers should be from out-of-state, preferably some distance from SDSU and have experience at a land grant or institution with similar breadth. They should not be selected from alumni, former employees, or co-workers.

The IPR includes two internal reviewers selected from senior faculty and administrators: one is selected by the Dean of the College, the second by the Director of AEA. When a graduate program is being reviewed, at least one internal reviewer must have graduate faculty status.

These reviewers provide context and develop greater understanding because of the interaction between faculty and programs and provides the College and University with additional input.

6. **Schedule site visits prior to March 31, 2012**. All visits begin and end with sessions including the following: Academic Affairs (either the Provost/VPAA or Associate VPAA), Graduate School (the Graduate Dean or Associate Dean), if appropriate, and the College Dean, Director of AEA, External and Internal Reviewers (2). Schedule the date and times early as calendars fill quickly.
7. Review and finalize plans with your Dean.

B. Obtain Resources

1. Once the external evaluator is confirmed, identify departmental resources for the evaluator, word processing, etc. Discuss resource needs with your Dean, as needed
2. No resources will be available through AEA.
3. Complete a Consultant Contract and/or Letter of Agreement; send it and a W-9 form to the evaluator for signature. Once it is returned, process the contract to encumber the funds.

C. Develop the Self Study

1. Use the IPR guidelines to conduct your departmental review and include all majors, minors, and specializations. Depending upon the department's complexity, you may want to do this as a total department or by a task force/committee.
2. At least three weeks prior to the visit, send an agenda and the following items to the external site reviewer and two internal reviewers:
 - a. The self-study document,
 - b. The current SDSU bulletin
 - c. A copy of the SDSU Strategic Plan
 - d. The University's promotion and tenure document
 - e. The Department's standards document.

Send self-study electronically (PDF format) to each of the following: the Office of Academic Affairs, Dean of the Graduate School, if appropriate, the Dean of your College, and AEA.

Send one hard copy of the self-study document to AEA.

D. Host Site Visit no later than March 31, 2012 (Suggested Format for Site Visit) Keep AEA and Academic Affairs informed of the site visit date(s) and agenda.

E. Report of External and Internal Reviewers

1. Exit reports should include conclusions about strengths, weaknesses, and include recommendations.
2. Follow the **Guidelines for Written Reports** and submit the report within **60 days** of the site visit. Copies of this report are provided to Academic Affairs, AEA, College Dean, Department Head, and Graduate School Dean, if appropriate.

F. Report to Board of Regents

Use **Appendix A** (found in SDBOR IPR Guidelines) to prepare the report. Submit your report to the AEA within 30 days of receipt of the Reviewers' Report. This is critical so that the institution's summary can be submitted to the SDBOR as required.

G. Utilize Program Review Findings and Recommendations

Integrate findings and recommendations into long-range and budget planning.

Timeline

Early Fall	Schedule Review Dates
September 30	Planning Form due to AEA
	Complete self-study and send to reviewers and on-campus personnel
March 31	Site Visit Completed
June 1	Review Report due from External Reviewer
July 1	Program Report submitted to AEA

Please call Jo Ann Sckerl, Director of AEA, at 688-4217 if you have any questions.

Documents on InsideState:

A SD BOR Institutional Program Review Guidelines

Table 1 Graduate Advisee and Graduation

Table 2 Faculty Credentials

Table 3 Staff and Professional Staff Credentials

Table 4 Department Budget

Table 5 Expenditures

Table 6 Department Faculty and Graduate Assistants

Table 7 Student Credit Hours

Table 8 Undergraduate and Graduate Program Enrollment and the Number of Degrees Granted

Appendix A Program Review Report to Board of Regents

B SDSU IPR and Accreditation Schedules

C Approval Form for Reviewers, External

D Planning Form for Program Review

E Suggested Format for On-Site Visits

F Guidelines for Written Report

G Program Review Report to Board of Regents

South Dakota State University

APPROVAL FORM FOR REVIEWERS

#EXTERNAL

Department: _____

REVIEWER

Name: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Academic Rank/Position: _____

Member of the Graduate Faculty? Yes No

Graduate Degrees and/or Educational Experience:

Degree	Institution	Major
	Year	

Professional Experience/Employment:

Employer	Position	Duties
	Dates	

Significant Contributions to Discipline:

Criteria Utilized in Selecting this Individual as an Evaluator:

Exceptions to Suggested Guidelines for the Selection of Reviewer:

_____	Date	_____	Date
Department Head		Dean	

_____ Date

Jo Ann Sckerl, Director

- Approved
- Denied

Academic Evaluation and Assessment

Additional Information Requested

South Dakota State University

PLANNING FORM FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

Return this form by **September 30th** to Academic Evaluation and Assessment, SDSU Box 550.

Department/Area of Study _____

1. Who is the Institutional Program Review Coordinator? _____

2. Who is the external reviewer? (*Approval Form for Reviewers*)

3. When will the review take place? (*Approximate dates are acceptable if not yet confirmed*)

4. The site visit date has been scheduled and confirmed with:
- Yes No Vice President for Academic Affairs
 - Yes No Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment
 - Yes No Dean of your College
 - Yes No Graduate Dean, if appropriate
 - Yes No External Reviewer
 - Yes No Internal Reviewer appointed by the College Dean
 - Yes No Internal Reviewer appointed by AEA

5. When do you need information from H.M.Briggs Library? _____

6. When will the self-study report be completed?

Jo Ann Sckerl, Director Date
Academic Evaluation and Assessment

Additional Information Requested

SDSU Program Reviews

SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR ON-SITE VISITS

Entrance Interviews

8:00 - 8:30 a.m.

Meet with representatives from the Office of Academic Affairs, Graduate School, (where appropriate, and the Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment and College Dean.

8:30 - 9:30 a.m.

Discussions with the dean, graduate dean (where appropriate), and department head will focus on an overview of the program, based on the institutional self-study.

Program Quality

9:30 - 10:30 a.m.

The department will decide the relative emphasis each area (the learning environment, curriculum, assessment, issues of equity, faculty/staff, library holdings, etc.) will be discussed or visited. The reviewer may have requests based on their reading of the self-study.

Faculty and Staff Interviews

10:45 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.; 1:00 - 2:00 p.m.

The reviewers interview the faculty from the department's or program's principal subareas separately, and can be scheduled concurrently, as needed. The dean and department head would not be included in these interviews.

Working Luncheon

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

Typically, the dean and department head will have lunch with the visitors. This time could be used for an advisory committee or some other important departmental group.

Discussion and work session

2:00 - 2:45 p.m.

This time is available for the external and internal reviewers to hold discussions prior to the exit interview.

Student Interviews

3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Student invited and an explanation provided by Department Head.

Work time for Review Team

4:00 - 4:30 p.m.

Exit Interview

4:30 – 5:00 p.m.

The review team will meet with representatives from the Office of Academic Affairs, Graduate School, (where appropriate, and the Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment and College Dean).

South Dakota State University

GUIDELINES FOR WRITTEN REPORT

PREPARED BY EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVALUATORS

Due 60 days following the site visit. Provide a copy of this attachment to your reviewers.

NOTE: The Reviewers' report should explain and augment, but not repeat the self-study information.

- I.** Introduction/Overview
- II.** Program Evaluation
 - A.** Mission Centrality
 - B.** Program Quality
 - C.** Costs
 - D.** Program Productivity
 - E.** Plans for the Future
 - F.** Assessment of Progress
- III.** Overall Assessment of Program
 - A.** Strengths
 - B.** Limitations
- IV.** Recommendations
- V.** Persons Interviewed (Attach schedule)

The written report is distributed to all reviewers, Academic Affairs, AEA, College Dean, Department Head, and Graduate Dean, if appropriate. These reports may be shared electronically.

South Dakota State University

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT TO BOARD OF REGENTS

Due 30 days following receipt of the External and Internal Reviewers' Report.

This form is available electronically from Academic Evaluation and Assessment.

This report is filed with the Board of Regents Office. All units/programs undergoing an accreditation review, nationally recognized review process or institutional program review need to complete this form. The Dean or Department Head must approve this report and submit it to Academic Evaluation and Assessment for approval and submission to the Board of Regents.

Institution: _____

Department or College: _____

Program(s) Reviewed: _____

Date of Review: _____

Please identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Items A & B should address the following issues: mission centrality, program quality, cost, program productivity, plans for the future, and assessment of progress.

- A. Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers.
- B. Briefly summarize the review recommendations.
- C. Indicate the present and continuing actions to be taken by the college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

Submitted by: _____ Date _____
Department Head

Reviewed by: _____ Date _____
Dean

Approved by: _____ Date _____
Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment

Table 1
South Dakota State University
FACULTY MAJOR ADVISOR
GRADUATE ADVISEE AND GRADUATION

Department: _____

College: _____

Degree Program: _____

Faculty Advisor: _____

Academic Year	2011-2012				2010-2011				2009-2010				2008-2009				2007-	
	Advisees		Graduates		Advisees		Graduates		Advisees		Graduates		Advisees		Graduates		Advisees	
Faculty Advisor	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>MA/MS</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>

Table 2
South Dakota State University
FACULTY CREDENTIALS

Department: _____

College: _____

Budget Year: _____

Name	Year of Hire*	Rank	Highest Degree	Institution Awarding Highest Degree	Field of Study	Graduate Faculty	Area/s of Expertise

Highlighted fields are to be completed by Department. Assistance with table is available in Institutional Research
 *See *University Bulletin* for information

Table 3
South Dakota State University
STAFF AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF CREDENTIALS

Department: _____

College: _____

Budget Year: _____

Name	Position/Title	Year of Hire

Table 4
South Dakota State University
DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Department: _____

College: _____

Budget Year: _____

Total Financial Support for the Budget Year: _____

Budget Category	Fund Source				
	Tuition	State Support	Student Fees	Grants	Other Funds
Personnel Services					
Salaries					
Faculty/Instructional Administration					
Professional					
Career Service					
Graduate Assistants					
Subtotal Salaries					
Benefits					
Labor					
Subtotal Personnel Services					
Operation and Maintenance					
Travel					
Contractual Services					
Supplies and Materials					
Capital Assets					
Subtotal O&M					
Grants					
Subsidies					
Other					
Total					

Other than scholarships and foundation funds, data are available from Institutional Research.

Comments:

Table 5
South Dakota State University
EXPENDITURES

Department: _____

College: _____

Budget Year: _____

Total Financial Support for the Budget Year: _____

Budget Category	Fund Source				
	State Support	Fees	Federal Funds	Grants	Other(s)
Personnel Services					
Salaries					
Faculty					
Professional					
Career Service					
Graduate Assistants					
Subtotal Salaries					
Benefits					
Labor					
Subtotal Personnel Services					
Operation and Maintenance					
Travel					
Contractual Services					
Supplies and Materials					
Capital Assets					
Grants and Subsidies					
Subtotal O&M					
Scholarship					
Foundation (gifts)					
Other					
Total					

Other than scholarships and foundation funds, data are available from Institutional Research.

Comments:

Table 6
South Dakota State University
DEPARTMENT FACULTY AND GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Department: _____

College: _____

Budget Year: _____

:

Academic Year	Number of Faculty				Total FTE	
	FTE Tenured and tenure-track	FTE Non-tenure	Supplemental Part-time/Adjunct	Graduate Assistants	Budgeted	Actual
2011-2012						
2010-2011						
2009-2010						
2008-2009						
2007-2008						
2006-2007						

Table 7
South Dakota State University
STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

Department: _____

College: _____

Program/Major: _____

**State Support /
Self-Support Credit Hours**

Academic Year	Students/Graduate Level (500+) Credit Hours								
	Level	Summer Term		Fall Term		Spring Term		Student/credit hours	
		State	Self	State	Self	State	Self	State	Self
2011-2012	Pre-Gen. Ed. (032, etc.)								
	Lower Level (100/200)								
	Upper Level (300/400)								
	Graduate Level (500+)								
	Thesis								
	Dissertation								
<i>Total:</i>									
2010-2011	Pre-Gen. Ed. (032, etc.)								
	Lower Level (100/200)								
	Upper Level (300/400)								
	Graduate Level (500+)								
	Thesis								
	Dissertation								
<i>Total:</i>									
2009-2010	Pre-Gen. Ed. (032, etc.)								
	Lower Level (100/200)								
	Upper Level (300/400)								
	Graduate Level (500+)								
	Thesis								
	Dissertation								
<i>Total:</i>									
2008-2009	Pre-Gen. Ed. (032, etc.)								
	Lower Level (100/200)								
	Upper Level (300/400)								
	Graduate Level (500+)								
	Thesis								
	Dissertation								
<i>Total:</i>									

Include Summer School, if appropriate. See Redbook for additional information.

Pre-General Education offerings Applies to Departments offering pre-general education courses: Mathematics, English, General Studies

Table 8
South Dakota State University
UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND
THE NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED
By Major by Year

Department: _____

Degree Offered: _____

Major: _____

CIP Code(s): _____

Academic Majors and Degrees

Academic Year Granted	Number of Enrolled Majors			Degrees Granted		
	Undergraduate	Master's	Doctoral	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
2011-2012						
2010-2011						
2009-2010						
2008-2009						
2007-2008						
2006-2007						
2005-2006						

Prepare a separate table for each major offered within the department or program. Data are available from the SDSU Registrar's Office or Institutional Research.