



**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.

UNIVERSITY:	DSU
DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL:	Beacom College of Computer & Cyber Sciences
PROGRAM REVIEWED:	AS/BS Network and Security Administration
DATE OF REVIEW:	4/4/2022
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Institutional Program Review

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

8/19/2022

Date

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

Dr. Seth Hamman, Director, Center for the Advancement of Cybersecurity, Cedarville University

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: The greatest strength of the NetSec program is the faculty. The faculty are dedicated, highly competent, and passionate about cybersecurity and DSU. Another obvious strength is DSU’s technology infrastructure and facilities. Considerable financial investments have been made in DSU’s cyber programs and have been leveraged to build outstanding facilities and resources for students.

Weaknesses: One area of improvement for DSU is faculty recruitment and retention. Faculty compensation at DSU needs to keep pace with national trends. DSU Instructor salaries are exceptionally low for cyber teaching positions. Hiring faculty candidates with MS degrees is an emerging trend in cyber higher ed due to the shortage of PhDs in the cyber faculty job market. Therefore, Instructor salaries are on the rise. DSU currently has 6 open positions that need to be filled to maintain program quality. Meanwhile, they risk losing current faculty members to burnout and higher paying competitors.

Additionally, faculty are limited in their ability to supplement their university-provided income through grants. The current mechanism for supplementing salaries from grants is through teaching overloads, but this is an awkward workaround and exacerbates the problem of overworked faculty. A better solution would be to increase faculty salaries or to provide extra stipends directly to faculty. If nothing is done to correct this issue, faculty might start finding revenue streams outside of grants awarded to DSU, or they may even stop pursuing grant opportunities altogether to the detriment of DSU.

Continuous improvement is occurring because faculty care about their courses and update them regularly, but without a rigorous assessment program, there is little quality assurance for determining where there may be weak or overlooked areas. As the NetSec program grows, implementing quality assurance best practices will become even more vital.

2(B). Briefly summarize the review recommendations

Review faculty and instructor compensation policies to ensure they are competitive. Implement a robust assessment program in keeping with continuous improvement best practices.

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 university has identified that compensation for faculty is restricted by BoR policies.

Faculty within the program are actively working to redesign and fully implement an assessment program within the degree. The Trojan Assessment Profile, TAP, is rolling out across campus and already has a baseline for assessment. The NetSec program will identify the core outcomes of the program and conduct a more rigorous assessment now that regular assessment data is available.

3. Starting in Fall 2019 reporting year, campuses will identify the undergraduate cross-curricular skill requirements as part of programmatic student learning outcomes and identify assessment methods for cross-curricular skill requirements as outlined in Board Policy 2:11. Program review completed prior to Fall 2019 need not include cross curricular skills.

As noted by the program reviewer, the program's formative assessment plan is currently under re-development. As such, specific metrics for the assessment of cross-curricular skill requirements have not yet been reestablished due to the timing of the report and the progress of the assessment plan's redevelopment.