

AAMU INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PLAN



JUNE 22, 2020

OIPRE

AAMU Institutional Effectiveness Plan: Student Learning and Unit Level Effectiveness

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	2
<i>Annual Unit-level Assessment</i>	3
Student Outcomes: Academic Programs (8.2a)	4
Student Outcomes: General Education (8.2b).....	5
Student Learning: Academic and Student Support Services (8.2c)	7
Administrative Units (7.3)	8
Support for Annual Unit-level Assessments	9
<i>Student Achievement</i>	10
<i>Quality Enhancement Plan</i>	10
<i>Assessment Management Software</i>	11
<i>Assessment Structures</i>	11
Academic Program Unit Review Committee	11
Academic Support and Administrative Support Unit Program Review Committee	11
Assessment Committee	11
General Education Committee	12
Institutional Effectiveness Committee	12
Quality Enhancement Plan Committee	12
<i>Appendix A: Relevant SACSCOC Standards</i>	13
<i>Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process:</i> <i>Administrative Units (7.3)</i>	14
<i>Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process: Academic</i> <i>Programs (8.2a)</i>	15
<i>Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process: Academic</i> <i>and Student Support Units</i>	16

Introduction

Alabama A&M University engages in continuous improvement via its institutional effectiveness (IE) processes. IE is an iterative process of self-reflection undertaken to determine the extent to which the University is achieving its mission. The full realization of the University’s mission through an ongoing, intentional process of improvement intrinsically appeals to the best ideals of the academy. There are also external demands for such engagement. The University’s regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) specifies multiple IE standards in the following areas: student outcomes, student achievement, quality enhancement plan, and administrative effectiveness. Table 1 lists the specific accreditation standards for each of these areas. Appendix A presents the full text for each standard.

Table 1. Institutional Effectiveness Areas, SACSCOC Standards and AAMU Processes

IE Area	SACSCOC Standard	AAMU Process
Student Outcomes	8.2.a Educational Programs	Annual unit-level assessment
	8.2.b General Education	Annual unit-level assessment
	8.2c Academic and Student Services	Annual unit-level assessment
Student Achievement	8.1 Student Achievement	Student achievement
Quality Enhancement Plan	7.2 Quality Enhancement Plan	QEP
Administrative Effectiveness	7.3 Administrative Effectiveness	Annual unit-level assessment

This document specifies the processes and means through which Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University maintains compliance with student learning and unit-level effectiveness standards of SACSCOC. AAMU addresses SACSCOC standard 7.1 (institutional planning) through its strategic plan and planning processes. This document does not address institution-level planning.

Annual Unit-level Assessment

AAMU conducts an annual assessment process that includes administrative units (7.3), academic programs (8.2.a), the general education program (8.2.b), and academic and student support units (8.2.c) to document continuous improvement efforts and maintain relevant supporting data for future reference. The general model for continuous improvement¹ is presented in figure (1). Three components comprise the annual assessment process²: 1) identification of expected outcomes, 2) assessment of the extent to which the outcomes are achieved and 3) the use of assessment data to inform continuous improvement efforts when expected performance levels are not achieved. A list of the University's administrative units, academic programs, and academic and student support units engaged in the annual assessment report process are listed in appendix B.

Figure 1. Continuous improvement of outcomes.



¹ Retrieved from <https://sacscoc.org/app/uploads/2019/08/2018PrinciplesOfAcrcditation.pdf>

² The SACSCOC 2018 Principles of Accreditation only require steps 1 and 2 for administrative units (7.3).

At the start of each fall semester, units submit assessment plans that 1) identify the outcomes to be assessed during the academic year, 2) specify two assessment measures³ to evaluate each outcome, and 3) set minimum acceptable performance targets for each measure. Assessment data are generated throughout the year. At the end of the spring semester, units will submit assessment reports. Assessment reports are extensions of the previously submitted assessment plans that include presentation and analysis of assessment data and, where necessary, describe improvement efforts to be implemented the following academic year. Assessment plans correspond to steps 1-2 of the model while steps 3-5 correspond with the AAMU assessment report. Units articulate their intended use of assessment results for improvement in the assessment report though the actual implementation of these actions intended for improvement occurs the subsequent academic year.

Student Outcomes: Academic Programs (8.2a)

All of Alabama A&M's academic programs are expected to participate in the annual outcomes assessment process. Academic program here refers to a degree program. Programs in the same field/discipline but offered at different levels are considered distinct academic programs (e.g., B.S. Biology and M.S. Biology are two distinct programs). Concentrations within a degree program are not considered academic programs.

Each year, all programs are expected to assess a minimum of three student learning outcomes and two program outcomes⁴.

- Student learning outcomes identify the knowledge, skills, or attitudes students are expected to acquire or demonstrate as they progress through their academic programs. Programs are encouraged to use two assessment measures to evaluate each student learning outcome with at least with one direct assessment measure (i.e., measurement of actual student artifacts such as exams/tests, papers, projects, presentations, portfolios, performances, etc.).
- Program outcomes are intended to assess the performance of the academic program rather than the learning of students in the program. Examples of program outcomes include program enrollments and completions, course pass rates, licensure pass rates, faculty productivity, etc.

For student learning outcomes evaluated in courses offered in multiple modalities (e.g., face-to-face, online) assessment reports should reflect data collected across all course modes.

During the fall, in college or departmental planning meetings, academic programs are to develop and submit an assessment plan followed by a full assessment report at the end of the spring semester. Assessment plans identify the outcomes to be assessed for the academic year (three

³ Assessment measures operationalize outcomes in measurable terms.

⁴ This document does not proscribe a minimum (or maximum) number of student learning outcomes for each program.

student learning outcomes and two program outcomes), the assessment measures that will be used to assess performance on the outcomes, and the minimal levels of acceptable performance for each outcome. Assessment reports extend the assessment plans by reporting and interpreting assessment results and, where necessary, specifying plans for improvements to be implemented in the following academic year.

The outcomes assessment process is cyclical with results from one year informing the subsequent year's assessment plan. When students in an academic program fall short of the performance target for one or more student learning outcomes, the program is expected to identify actions it intends to take in the subsequent academic year to improve student learning. These intended actions may include changes to curriculum (e.g., restructure course sequencing, modify existing courses, develop new courses, etc.), pedagogy (e.g., introduce novel instructional methods or technology, modify current or develop new assignments, etc.) or changes to assessment measures/performance targets (e.g., raise/lower performance targets, introduce a novel assessment measure, etc.)

The focus of this process is improvement of student learning. When a program's students achieve or exceed minimum acceptable performance targets for an outcome on both assessment measures, the program is encouraged to assess a different outcome the following year. If the unit chooses to evaluate the same outcome the following year a written justification must accompany the following year's assessment plan. In these instances, the program may be encouraged to raise the minimum acceptable performance threshold or adopt new assessment measures. When minimum acceptable performance levels are not achieved for a student learning or unit outcome, the unit is expected to articulate an improvement plan in the assessment report then in the following academic year implement the improvement measures and re-evaluate the outcome. This rotation ensures that all of the program's student learning outcomes go through a complete continuous improvement cycle at least once each five years.

The annual outcomes assessment process report process ensures each academic program is compliant with SACSCOC standard 8.2a (student outcomes: educational programs). Specifically, via the annual outcomes assessment process, academic programs:

1. Identify expected outcomes, operationalized via clearly defined by multiple assessment measures and performance targets,
2. Assess the extent to which students achieve the stated outcomes, and
3. Where necessary, indicate plans for improvement to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

Student Outcomes: General Education (8.2b)

AAMU's general education program is the foundation of all undergraduate programs at the University and is required of all undergraduate students. AAMU's general education core has student learning outcomes in five competency areas: quantitative, computational and scientific reasoning; cultural competency; critical thinking; information literacy, and communication. The competency areas are delineated below with their accompanying student learning outcomes.

1. Quantitative, computational and scientific reasoning includes understanding and interpreting data, being able to communicate quantitatively, employing the scientific method, explaining phenomenon with numerical evidence, and utilizing appropriate technological/computer applications for problem solving.
 - a. Need to refine SLOs
2. Cultural competency is (1) understanding and recognizing differences and cultural variation based on social, economic, religious, linguistic, and political backgrounds as well as worldviews and belief systems, (2) developing self-awareness of one's cultural identification, distinguishing it from others', and integrating that knowledge to gain greater cultural comprehension, and (3) appreciating differences and applying knowledge to generate respect and tolerance.
 - a. SLOs in development
3. Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by comprehensive evaluation of issues, ideas, artifacts, events, and sources prior to accepting or formulating an opinion, conclusion, or theory.
 - a. Students will be able to identify the significant issue, concept, problem, or argument in information.
 - b. Students will be able to formulate a position and support it with evidence from multiple sources.
4. Information literacy is the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and accurately, effectively, and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand across various media.
 - a. SLOs in development
5. Communication is the development and expression of ideas or knowledge in writing, speaking, and visual format which should be received and understood by the intended reader, listener, or audience in order for it to be effective.
 - a. Students will be able to read and interpret texts and to react to them in logical and well-organized essays, demonstrating their abilities to locate, evaluate, use, and cite appropriate sources and to inform and persuade targeted audiences.
 - b. Students will be able to read and interpret literature, taking into account its connections to cultural and philosophical movements and demonstrating their abilities to write about the literature using appropriate documentation.
 - c. Students will be able to develop written and oral presentations employing persuasive strategies to include the use of facts, evidence, examples, analysis, and correct diction, grammar, and syntax.

The University general education committee serves as the administrative home of the general education core and is responsible for the conduct and documentation of the continuous improvement cycle for standard 8.2b. The Director of the Office of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment is an ex-officio member of the General Education Committee (GEC). As the general education core does not constitute an academic program (see Student Outcomes: Academic Programs for AAMU's definition of an academic program), no program outcomes are assessed for 8.2b.

The outcomes assessment process is cyclical, with results from one year informing the subsequent year's assessment plan. Each fall the general education committee submits an

assessment plan for the academic year. The assessment plan indicates the two general education student learning outcomes to be assessed during the academic year, specifies the assessment measures used to evaluate them, and sets minimum acceptable performance standards for each assessment measure. AAMU evaluates general education student learning outcomes with the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AACU) VALUE (valid assessment of learning in undergraduate education) assessment rubrics. After determining which outcomes will be assessed, the general education committee selects classes from the general education core to obtain student artifacts for evaluation. For courses taught in multiple modalities (e.g., face-to-face, online) artifacts are collected across all course modalities. Existing assignments from the selected classes are reviewed for suitability as an assessment measure. After this review for all student learning outcomes being evaluated for the year, the GEC finalizes the assessment plan. This procedure is in keeping with best assessment practices, which favor direct assessments of authentic student learning products versus standardized or external assessment measures and indirect measures of student learning.

At the end of the spring semester, the GEC submits an assessment report. The assessment report expands upon the previously submitted assessment plan by reporting and analyzing assessment results and, where necessary, detailing improvement plans to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

When a student learning or unit outcome achieves or exceeds minimum acceptable performance thresholds for both assessment measures, the GEC selects a different student learning outcome to evaluate the following year. Should the GEC choose to evaluate an outcome for which the minimum acceptable performance target was met or exceeded the following year, a written justification will be provided. In this scenario, the GEC may be encouraged to raise the minimum acceptable performance threshold for the student learning outcome and/or adopt a new assessment measure. When minimum acceptable performance levels are not achieved for a student learning outcome, the GEC is expected to articulate an improvement plan in the assessment report then implement the improvement measures and re-evaluate the outcome in the following academic year.

The annual outcomes assessment process report process ensures AAMU's general education student learning outcomes are subjected to an intentional process of continuous improvement and compliant with SACSCOC standard 8.2b (student outcomes: general education). Specifically, via the annual outcomes assessment process, the general education core:

1. Identify expected outcomes, operationalized via clearly defined multiple assessment measures and performance targets,
2. Assesses the extent to which students achieve the stated outcomes, and
3. Where necessary, indicates plans for improvement to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

Student Learning: Academic and Student Support Services (8.2c)

Academic and student support units fill a unique niche at the University. "These units provide

direct support to faculty and students as related to their educational programs, indirect support for student learning, or a specific co-curricular mission that supports the collegiate experience” (SACSCOC, 2018, p. 59). Units with direct instructional responsibilities and those that provide co-curricular activities must articulate and assess student learning outcomes. For those units that do not have direct instructional responsibilities or do not provide co-curricular activities, unit outcomes should be consistent with the unit’s mission and should address how the unit supports the University’s educational mission.

At the start of each fall semester, academic and student support units submit assessment plans that articulate student learning and/or unit outcomes, specify assessment measures for each outcome, and indicate minimum acceptable performance thresholds for each assessment measure. Units are expected to assess a minimum of two outcomes each year, evaluating each outcome with two assessment measures. For student learning outcomes, at least one assessment measure must be a direct assessment of student learning.

At the end of the spring semester, academic and student support units submit assessment reports. Assessment reports expand upon previously submitted assessment plans by reporting and analyzing assessment results and, where necessary, detailing improvement plans to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

When a unit or student learning outcome achieves or exceeds minimum acceptable performance thresholds, the unit is encouraged to assess a different outcome the following year. If the unit chooses to evaluate the same outcome the following year, a written justification must accompany the following year’s assessment plan. In these instances, the unit may be encouraged to raise the minimum acceptable performance threshold. When minimum acceptable performance levels are not achieved for a unit or student learning outcome, the unit is expected to articulate an improvement plan in the assessment report then implement the improvement measures and re-evaluate the outcome in the following academic year.

The annual outcomes assessment process report process ensures each academic and student support unit is compliant with SACSCOC standard 8.2c (student outcomes: academic and student support services). Specifically, via the annual outcomes assessment process, academic programs:

1. Identify expected outcomes, operationalized via clearly defined multiple assessment measures and performance targets,
2. Assess the extent to which students achieve the stated outcomes, and
3. Where necessary, indicate plans for improvement to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

Administrative Units (7.3)

At the start of each fall semester, administrative units submit an assessment plan comprised of outcomes to be assessed during the academic year, two assessment measures for each outcome, and the minimum acceptable performance targets for each assessment measure. Each administrative unit must assess a minimum of two outcomes each year. Administrative units are

critical to the University's overall functioning, yet they typically do not have a direct impact upon the institution's educational mission (SACSCOC, 2018). Accordingly, expected outcomes for these units do not focus on student learning. Instead, outcomes for these units are directly related to how each unit supports the University mission.

At the end of the spring semester, each administrative unit submits an assessment report that extends the previously submitted assessment plan by presenting and interpreting assessment results. When an expected outcome's minimum acceptable performance level is not met, the unit is expected to analyze the data to determine potential reasons. This analysis should inform efforts to improve performance on that outcome in the following year. Improvement efforts are implemented in the following academic year and the outcome will be assessed once again. When an outcome's minimum acceptable performance level is met, the unit is expected to assess a different outcome the following year⁵. SACSCOC does not explicitly dictate that administrative units must document improvement efforts when minimum acceptable performance thresholds are not achieved for an outcome. However, AMU holds that the spirit of continuous improvement should permeate all of the University's operations. Thus, the University requires administrative units to develop and implement improvement plans

Support for Annual Unit-level Assessments

The office of Institutional Planning Research and Effectiveness (OIPRE) coordinates the annual assessment process and provides support to the academic programs, academic and student support units, and administrative units. This support includes assessment workshops, assessment consultations, an assessment resource library, and a computer lab housed in the OIPRE office suite. However, outcomes assessment is the responsibility of the academic programs and units. Each academic program, academic and student support unit, and administrative unit has a designated assessment coordinator who is responsible for submitting assessment plans/reports and is the primary point of contact for OIPRE. Though each program/unit has an assessment coordinator, outcomes assessment is most effective when it is a shared responsibility among program faculty/unit staff members.

The annual outcomes assessment process report process ensures each administrative unit is compliant with SACSCOC standard 7.3 (administrative effectiveness). Specifically, via the annual outcomes assessment process, academic programs:

1. Identify expected outcomes, operationalized via clearly defined multiple assessment measures and performance targets,
2. Assess the extent to which students achieve the stated outcomes, and
3. Where necessary, indicate plans for improvement to be implemented the subsequent academic year.

⁵ Some administrative units may assess the same outcomes each year to satisfy regulatory requirements.

Student Achievement

Educational access and opportunity are central to AAMU's mission. In keeping with this mission, the University evaluates student achievement with the following measures:

- 1) IPEDS GRS Retention Rates (fall-to-fall retention)
- 1) IPEDS GRS Graduation Six-Year Rates
- 2) Course Completion Rates
- 3) Licensure Exam Pass Rates
 - a. AWSB BSW Exam
 - b. AWSB MSW Exam
 - c. Didactic Program in Dietetics
 - d. BS Communicative Sciences and Disorders Praxis Exam
 - e. Teacher Education Praxis II Exam
 - f. edTPA Exam (teacher preparation)

Student achievement measures and results are posted to the [OIPRE web page](#). OIPRE collects and reports IPEDS GRS retention and six-year graduation rates each spring. Upon submission of the respective IPEDS surveys (fall enrollment and graduation rates), the student achievement web page is updated. OIPRE also compiles and analyzes course completion rates. Course completion rates are updated on that site each spring semester. Licensure exam pass rate data are provided by the College of Agricultural, Life and Natural Sciences (CALNS – Didactic Program in Dietetics), and the College of Education, Health and Human Behavior (CEHBS – all other licensure exams).

Consistent with a September 12, 2019, SACSCOC directive, AAMU disaggregates graduation rates by gender, first-generation status, Pell grant status, and expected family contribution. These measures help the University more thoroughly evaluate the extent to which its access and opportunity mission is realized for all segments of its student body.

Quality Enhancement Plan

AAMU has a standing Quality Enhancement Plan committee charged with the development, implementation, and evaluation of the University's QEP. The QEP submitted as part of the University's 2014 decennial reaffirmation, "Dare to Think!," focused on critical thinking. The Quality Enhancement Plan committee is currently developing a new QEP for its 2024 decennial reaffirmation of accreditation.

Assessment Management Software

AAMU adopted Watermark Insight's *Planning & Self-Study* as its electronic assessment management/accreditation support software tool summer 2020. OIPRE will provide ongoing training and support for the software to all academic programs, academic and student support units, and administrative units via Zoom and in-person training workshops and individual training sessions in the OIPRE assessment computer lab.

Assessment Structures

AAMU stands several committees charged with oversight of various elements of the University's institutional effectiveness efforts. These committees are outlined in the [University Committees Book](#).

Academic Program Unit Review Committee

This committee provides oversight and recommends policies to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee on the procedures used to review academic programs. The committee is comprised of four faculty members (one per college selected by the respective dean); the Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness; the Associate Vice-President for Graduate Studies and one Faculty Senate representative.

Academic Support and Administrative Support Unit Program Review Committee

This committee provides oversight and recommends policies to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee on the procedures used to review academic support and administrative unit programs. The committee is comprised of four faculty members (one elected member per college); five administrative staff members appointed by the respective Vice Presidents; the Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness; one representative of the Faculty Senate, one representative of the Staff Senate; a representative from the Office of Research, Economic Development and 1890 Programs; and a representative from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Assessment Committee

This committee provides oversight and reviews data relating to program assessments, student learning outcomes assessment, and assessment of the general education curriculum. The committee is comprised of Associate Vice-President Academic Affairs – Faculty and Undergraduate Studies; Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs – Academic Administration and Dean, Graduate Studies; Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness; Departmental Assessment Coordinators (one per academic department).

General Education Committee

The General Education Committee is advisory to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is responsible for the formulation and alteration of all policies and procedures related to general education and its outcomes assessment. The Committee is comprised of the Associate Vice-President, Undergraduate Studies; one representative elected from each college's undergraduate program faculty; one representative from the Faculty Senate and two graduate student representatives. Chairs of departments offering general education courses and deans of colleges are ex-officio members.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

This committee provides oversight to the institution's long- and short-range planning, assessment, evaluation and budgeting systems and recommends changes in policies and procedures. The committee is comprised of two faculty members per college selected by the respective deans; the Associate Vice-President, Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies; Deans of each academic school; Assistant Vice-President, Planning and Budgeting; Director, Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness; Director, Learning Resource Center; Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; Vice President of Research, Planning and Sponsored Programs; two student representatives (one undergraduate, one graduate) and the Faculty Senate President or their representative.

Quality Enhancement Plan Committee

This committee provides oversight for the planning, implementation and evaluation of the University's Quality Enhancement Plan and recommends changes to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The committee is comprised of the Director of the QEP Office; one faculty member from each college selected by the respective dean with input from the chairs and faculty; five administrative staff members appointed by the respective Vice-Presidents; Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness; one Faculty Senate representative; one Staff Senate representative; a representative from the Office of Research, Economic Development and 1890 Programs; and a representative from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appendix A: Relevant SACSCOC Standards

7.2 The institution has a Quality Enhancement Plan that (a) has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; (d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and (e) includes a plan to assess achievement. ([Quality Enhancement Plan](#))

7.3 The institution identifies expected outcomes of its administrative support services and demonstrates the extent to which the outcomes are achieved. [Administrative Effectiveness](#)

CR 8.1 The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success. [Student Achievement](#)

8.2 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results in the areas of

- a. Student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs [Student outcomes: educational programs](#)
- b. Student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs [Student outcomes: general education](#)
- c. Academic and student services that support student success [Student outcomes: academic and student services](#)

Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process: Administrative Units (7.3)

President

Athletic Compliance
Cooperative Extension
General Counsel
Internal Auditor
President's Office

Academic Affairs

AAMU Community Development Corporation
AAMU RISE
Compliance
Institutional Planning, Research and Effectiveness
Sponsored Programs

Finance and Administration

Bulldog Transit System
Comptroller
Facilities and Administrative Services
Human Resources
Planning and Budget
Property Management
Purchasing

Marketing, Communications and Advancement

Alumni Affairs
Corporate Affairs
Marketing and Public Relations
Telecommunications
University Publications

ITS

Change Management
Cloud and Enterprise
Networking
Special Projects
User Services
Web, Mobile App and Digital Forms

EVP and COO

AAMU Foundation
Economic Development
Emergency Preparedness
Governmental Affairs and Communications
Title III

Student Affairs

Registrar

Athletics

Academic Enhancement
Athletic Compliance
Sports Information

Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process: Academic Programs (8.2a)

<u>Program</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Degree</u>
Accounting	B.S.	General Art	B.S.
Animal Bio-Health Sciences	B.S.	Instructional Leadership	M.Ed.
Applied Physics	Ph.D.	Kinesiology	M.S.
Biology	B.S.	Liberal Studies	B.L.S.
Biology	M.S.	Logistics and Supply Chain Management	B.S.
Business and Commerce, General	B.S.	Marketing	B.S.
Business Management & Administration	B.S.	Mathematics	B.S.
Business Management & Administration	M.B.A.	Mechanical Engineering	B.S.M.E.
Chemistry	B.S.	Mechanical Engineering	M.S.M.E.
Civil Engineering	B.S.C.E.	Music	B.M.
Communications Media	B.A.	Physical Education	B.S.
Communications Specialist	M.S.	Physics	B.S.
Communicative Sciences and Disorders	B.S.	Physics	M.S.
Communicative Sciences and Disorders	M.S.	Plant and Soil Science	M.S.
Computer Science	B.S.	Plant and Soil Science	PH.D.
Computer Science	M.S.	Plant Biotechnology	B.S.
Construction Management	B.S.	Political Science	B.A.
Counseling Psychology	M.S.	Pre-Elementary Education	B.S.
Criminal Justice	B.S.	Pre-Elementary Education	M.Ed.
Education, General	Ed.S.	Psychology	B.A.
Electrical Engineering	B.S.E.E.	Reading	Ph.D.
Electrical Engineering	M.S.E.E.	Secondary Education	B.S.
Elementary Education	B.S.	Secondary Education	M.Ed.
Elementary Education	M.Ed.	Social Work	B.A.
English	B.A.	Social Work	M.S.W.
Entrepreneurship	B.S.	Sociology	B.A.
Environmental Science	B.S.	Special Education	B.S.
Family and Consumer Sciences	B.S.	Special Education	M.Ed.
Family and Consumer Sciences	M.S.	Sport Management	B.S.
Finance	B.S.	Systems and Materiel Engineering	M.Eng.
Food Science	B.S.	Urban and Regional Planning	B.S.
Food Science	M.S.	Urban and Regional Planning	M.U.R.P.
Food Science	Ph.D.	Visual Art	B.A.
Forestry	B.S.		

Appendix B: Programs/Units Engaged in the Annual Assessment Report Process: Academic and Student Support Units (8.2c)

Student Affairs

Admissions
Counseling and Development
Counseling and Health Services
Financial Aid
Health and Wellness Center
International Programs
Judicial Affairs
Placement and Cooperative
Education
Public Safety
Residential Life and Housing
Student Activities and Leadership
Student Health Center
Veterans Affairs/ADA

Academic Affairs

Instructional Technology, Distance Learning & Extended Studies
Learning Resource Center
Office of Retention & Academic Support (ORAS)
State Black Archives & Museum
University College
Writing Center

Athletics

Academic Enhancement