

**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Academic and Student Affairs**  
**Consent**

**AGENDA ITEM: 6 – B (3)**  
**DATE: August 2-4, 2022**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBJECT**

**Revised BOR Policy 2:11 – Assessment (Second Reading)**

**CONTROLLING STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

[BOR Policy 2:11](#) – Assessment

[BOR Policy 2:7](#) – Baccalaureate General Education Curriculum

[BOR Policy 2.26](#) – Associate Degree General Education Curriculum

**BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION**

Following the elimination of the CAAP examination in 2016, the Board of Regents (BOR) adopted a system-wide process to assess general education using authentic assessment. The new assessment process was modeled after the AAC&U VALUE Institute, an organization that conducts secondary assessment of a sample of de-identified student work using VALUE rubrics to draw conclusions about the efficacy of a general education program. The BOR system scaled the process to draw conclusions about general education outcomes at the state level using system-created rubrics, university faculty, and an assessment summit.

The system piloted the model in the summers of 2018 and 2019. Feedback from faculty participants, board office staff, and university academic leaders suggested the process did not result in sufficiently useful data. Following an Academic Affairs Council (AAC) meeting in October of 2019, the Board academic staff notified the System General Education Committee (general education faculty from all six universities) and System Assessment Committee (assessment stakeholders from all six universities) that the assessment summits would be discontinued in favor of a more decentralized process for assessment of general education. The notification indicated a collaborative process would be used to propose a revision to Board policies pertaining to the assessment of general education.

Due to COVID and various transitions, AAC evaluated assessment at their January 2022 meeting. The council discussed history and a proposed revision to Policy 2:11. The

(Continued)

\*\*\*\*\*

**DRAFT MOTION 20220802\_6-B(3):**

I move to approve the second and final reading of the proposed revisions to BOR Policy 2:11, as presented.

revision was crafted and recommended by the System Assessment Committee and the System General Education Committee.

At the February 2022 AAC meeting, the council supported the revised policy with guidelines to be updated reflecting Board policy changes. Policy 2:11 was revised to include:

1. Aligned the structure of the policy to include the current formatting.
2. Addition of the definitional section.
3. Addition of the Policy Statements.
4. Addition of System Reporting Requirements.
5. Removal of the Cross Curricular Skills from Policy.

### **IMPACT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The BOR academic staff and legal counsel recommend that Board Policy 2:11 be revised to:

- reflect the current effective practice of institutional assessment of the System General Education Requirements,
- require each institution to report its general education findings annually to the Board of Regents, and
- remove the list and definitions of the cross-curricular skills from the policy and place them in a new guideline.

The timeline associated with these changes is as follows:

- First Reading – June 2022 BOR Meeting
- Guidelines Updated – August 2022 (In-progress)
- Second Reading – August 2022 BOR Meeting

This is the second reading of the policy. No other revisions have been made since the first reading at the June 2022 BOR meeting.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment I – Proposed Revisions to BOR Policy 2:11 (with track changes)

Attachment II – Proposed Revisions to BOR Policy 2:11 (clean copy)

## SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS

### Policy Manual

**SUBJECT:** Assessment

**NUMBER:** 2:11

---

#### **A. PURPOSE-Purpose of Assessment**

This policy identifies the responsibility of each university to assess student learning within its academic programs. The aAssessment of student learning enhances the overall quality of academic and co-curricular programs. University assessment programs increase communication within and between departments/units related to departmental, college and institutional goals and objectives. Assessment also enhances public understanding of higher education and diversity of institutional roles and missions.

#### **B. DEFINITIONS**

1. **Academic Program:** The degree, major, and as applicable the specialization approved by the Board of Regents for the degree-granting institution.
2. **Assessment:** A systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development.
3. **Institutional Accreditor:** The six public universities are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

#### **C. PRINCIPLES, EXPECTATIONS AND POLICY STATEMENTS**

1. Assessment is a necessary and integral component of continuous improvement for academic programs.
2. Information gained from assessment should be used to improve student outcomes.
3. Assessment of student outcomes may include authentic student work, student performances, nationally normed tests, licensure exams, surveys, observations, placement rates and other measures as determined by the academic department and university.
4. The Board shall remain apprised of students' learning outcomes and each university's efforts to improve student learning outcomes.
5. Assessment for continuous improvement should not be used to make comparisons among Regental universities, as the curriculum, assessment plans, measurement instruments, ratings, resources, faculty, ~~students~~students, and missions are different for each university.

## **D. ASSESSMENT POLICY**

### **1. System Assessment ~~and Testing~~ Committee**

Each university shall appoint at least one representative to the SDBOR System Assessment ~~and Testing~~ Committee. The Committee shall:

- 1.1. Advise the Academic Affairs Council on matters related to assessment ~~and testing~~, including policy and guidelines designed to ensure that assessment ~~and testing~~ requirements and activities are clear, efficient, and effective;
- 1.2. Communicate and coordinate with the System General Education Committee to advance system initiatives pertaining to assessment.

### **~~2. System General Education Committee~~**

~~Each university shall appoint at least one representative to the SDBOR System General Education Committee. As noted in Policies 2.7 and 2.26, this committee is responsible for identifying the general education student learning outcomes with appropriate faculty input. The System General Education Committee shall provide guidance to the Assessment and Testing Committee to:~~

- ~~2.1. Formulate or select system rubrics or measures for the assessment and evaluation of general education standards.~~
- ~~2.2. Design and maintain a process for the assessment and evaluation of the System General Education Requirements.~~
- ~~2.3. Recruit, train and engage faculty members to assess and evaluate student attainment of general education goals and outcomes.~~
- ~~2.4. Serve as liaisons on their campuses for matters related to assessment of general education.~~

### **~~3. System General Education Requirements Assessment~~**

~~The SDBOR has established System General Education Requirements (Policy 2:7 and 2:26). To assess and evaluate student achievement of the goals and learning outcomes of the established System General Education Requirements, all universities shall participate in a shared assessment and evaluation process that utilizes a random sample of syllabi and student work produced in general education courses and system standard rubrics or other measures, as appropriate. —~~

~~As described in BOR policy 2:7, the System General Education Committee will conduct the assessment of system general education requirements.~~

~~The processes and methods used for assessment of general education will be included in the Academic Council Guidelines following approval by the Council and approval by the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs.~~

- ~~3.1. System General Education course syllabi and student work shall be reviewed on a scheduled approved by the Academic Affairs Council~~
- ~~3.2. Evaluators shall be members of the System General Education Committee and — additional faculty members drawn from all SDBOR universities as needed~~

- ~~3.3. Evaluators shall use rubrics or measures for assessment approved by the Academic Affairs Council~~
- ~~3.4. The System Assessment and Testing Committee shall support the System General Education Committee and its processes and identify a minimum of two members to serve on the General Education Committee~~
- ~~3.5. Results from the assessments shall be presented annually to the SDBOR in a format that serves the continuous quality improvement needs of the campuses and the Regental System~~

#### **4.2. University Assessment of Academic Programs**

Each university shall have in place a functioning assessment structure and processes which conform to the accreditation requirements of the ~~Higher Learning Commission (HLC)~~ institutional accreditor and any specialty accreditations or approvals maintained by programs or units at the university. At a minimum each institution's assessment structure and processes shall:

- ~~2.1. Assess and analyze student achievement of the goals and learning outcomes of the established SDBOR System General Education Requirements. Each university will submit a report of their assessment findings annually to the Board at its December meeting. AAC Guidelines outline the required components of the report.~~
- ~~4.1. Support institutional Program Review or Specialty Accreditation for each academic program/department. —~~
- ~~4.2.2. All academic programs will be reviewed on a 76-year cycle unless their specialized accreditation requires a different timeline. The university President or Chief Academic Officer may require a shorter review interval or grant an extension of no longer than two (2) years.~~
- ~~4.3.2.3. Include program-level (undergraduate, graduate and co-curricular) assessment plans and processes. Undergraduate program level assessment plans will include methods of assessment for Cross-Curricular Skill Requirements per Academic Affairs Guidelines.~~

~~The purpose of the cross-curricular skills is to enable each institution to integrate and extend general education learning into its programs of study in a manner consistent with and supportive of each institution's mission, vision and values and any requirements of ongoing institutional or program specific accreditation or approval.~~

~~Each institution will manage the design, integration, assessment, evaluation and ongoing continuous improvement of cross-curricular skills within its degree programs. Documentation on how each institution uses the cross-curricular skills to support general education learning will be reviewed by the Academic Affairs Council and the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs.~~

~~Each university program will select no less than five of the following cross-curricular skill requirements as programmatic student learning outcomes:~~

**Inquiry and Analysis**

A systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

**Critical and Creative Thinking**

A habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. Both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk-taking.

**Information Literacy**

The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and convey that information to address the need or problem at hand.

**Teamwork**

Behaviors under the control of individual team members—effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.

**Problem Solving**

The process of designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

**Civic Knowledge and Engagement**

Developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation that make a difference in the civic life of communities and promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non political processes. Engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life-enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

**Intercultural Knowledge**

Cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts.

**Ethical Reasoning**

Reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions.

**Foundational Lifelong Learning Skills**

Involves “purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence.”

### **Integrative Learning**

An understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

### **Diversity, Inclusion and Equity**

The intentional engagement with diversity (i.e., individual differences and group/social differences) in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions leading to opportunities for equal access to and participation in educational and community programs for all members of society.

4.4.2.4. \_\_\_\_\_ Include other required elements of the university assessment program as identified by individual institutions.

4.5.2.5. \_\_\_\_\_ Incorporate the results of assessment and evaluation processes into the regular review of curriculum, co-curricular programs and related policies and procedures.

## **FORMS / APPENDICES:**

None

## **SOURCE:**

BOR August 1984; BOR April 1987; BOR June 1987; BOR June 1992; BOR March 2005; BOR August 2016.

# SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS

## Policy Manual

**SUBJECT:** Assessment

**NUMBER:** 2:11

---

### **A. PURPOSE**

This policy identifies the responsibility of each university to assess student learning within its academic programs. Assessment of student learning enhances the overall quality of academic and co-curricular programs. University assessment programs increase communication within and between departments/units related to departmental, college and institutional goals and objectives. Assessment also enhances public understanding of higher education and diversity of institutional roles and missions.

### **B. DEFINITIONS**

- 1. Academic Program:** The degree, major, and as applicable the specialization approved by the Board of Regents for the degree-granting institution.
- 2. Assessment:** A systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development.
- 3. Institutional Accreditor:** The six public universities are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

### **C. POLICY STATEMENTS**

- 1.** Assessment is a necessary and integral component of continuous improvement for academic programs.
- 2.** Information gained from assessment should be used to improve student outcomes.
- 3.** Assessment of student outcomes may include authentic student work, student performances, nationally normed tests, licensure exams, surveys, observations, placement rates and other measures as determined by the academic department and university.
- 4.** The Board shall remain apprised of students' learning outcomes and each university's efforts to improve student learning outcomes.
- 5.** Assessment for continuous improvement should not be used to make comparisons among Regental universities, as the curriculum, assessment plans, measurement instruments, ratings, resources, faculty, students, and missions are different for each university.



**D. ASSESSMENT POLICY****1. System Assessment Committee**

Each university shall appoint at least one representative to the SDBOR System Assessment Committee. The Committee shall:

- 1.1. Advise the Academic Affairs Council on matters related to assessment, including policy and guidelines designed to ensure that assessment requirements and activities are clear, efficient, and effective;
- 1.2. Communicate and coordinate with the System General Education Committee to advance system initiatives pertaining to assessment.

**2. University Assessment of Academic Programs**

Each university shall have in place a functioning assessment structure and processes which conform to the accreditation requirements of the institutional accreditor and any specialty accreditations or approvals maintained by programs or units at the university. At a minimum each institution's assessment structure and processes shall:

- 2.1. Assess and analyze student achievement of the goals and learning outcomes of the established SDBOR System General Education Requirements. Each university will submit a report of their assessment findings annually to the Board at its December meeting. AAC Guidelines outline the required components of the report.
- 2.2. Support institutional Program Review or Specialty Accreditation for each academic program/department. All academic programs will be reviewed on a 6-year cycle unless their specialized accreditation requires a different timeline. The university President or Chief Academic Officer may require a shorter review interval or grant an extension of no longer than two (2) years.
- 2.3. Include program-level (undergraduate, graduate and co-curricular) assessment plans and processes. Undergraduate program level assessment plans will include methods of assessment for Cross-Curricular Skill Requirements per Academic Affairs Guidelines.
- 2.4. Include other required elements of the university assessment program as identified by individual institutions.
- 2.5. Incorporate the results of assessment and evaluation processes into the regular review of curriculum, co-curricular programs and related policies and procedures.

**FORMS / APPENDICES:**

None

**SOURCE:**

BOR August 1984; BOR April 1987; BOR June 1987; BOR June 1992; BOR March 2005; BOR August 2016.