



**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FORMS**

**Institutional Program Review  
Report to the Board of Regents**

Use this form to submit a program review report to the system Chief Academic Officer. Complete this form for all units/programs undergoing an accreditation review, nationally recognized review process, or institutional program review. The report is due 30 days following receipt of the external and internal review reports.

<b>UNIVERSITY:</b>	SDSU
<b>DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL:</b>	<b>Engineering</b>
<b>PROGRAM REVIEWED:</b>	<b>BS Civil Engineering</b>
<b>DATE OF REVIEW:</b>	<b>9/29/2015</b>

**University Approval**

*To the Board of Regents and the Executive Director: I certify that I have read this report, that I believe it to be accurate, and that it has been evaluated and approved as provided by university policy.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
President of the University

11/4/2016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**1. Identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:**

Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET); it appointed the following reviewers:

Team Chair: Dr. Karen Fujikawa; Manager, BWR Stress Analysis, Castle Rock, CO  
Program Evaluator: Dr. Yvette Weatherton; University of Texas at Arlington

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

**2(A). Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers**

Strengths: (1) College of Engineering facilities (excluding Agricultural Engineering Building); (2) engagement with regional employers; (3) commitment to providing the best teaching training for faculty members (provided by the American Society for Engineering Education); (4) program commitment to undergraduate teaching and learning.

The EAC of ABET was so impressed with the accreditation visit and the high quality of the Civil Engineering self-study document provided by the program that it asked permission to use it (and the self-study documents for the other three engineering

programs) to place on display as a model for engineering programs at other universities at its annual ABET conference.

**2(B). Briefly summarize the review recommendations**

One Concern<sup>1</sup> cited: the program needs to more consistently document curriculum substitutions and waivers.

<sup>1</sup>ABET definition for a Concern: *“A Concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.”*

**2(C). Indicate the present and continuous 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?**

The department addressed the shortcoming by implementing a formal approval and documentation process for all curriculum substitutions and waivers. It has been in practice since before the final report from ABET was received.