Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

<div>

Natural Resources Management, MS
SNRE
2017-18

</div>

Submitted by: Peter Fix
Contact Information: pjfix@alaska.edu
Date: 6/8/18

1. Assessment information collected

1) 1 project defense was evaluated by the committee chair with the Oral Communication VALUE Rubric.

2) 1 thesis was evaluated by the committee chair with the Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric.

3) 4 thesis defenses were evaluated by a five-question audience questionnaire. While 17 questionnaires were completed, the distribution was not equal across defenses, ranging from 2 to 8.

The VALUE rubrics utilize a 4-point scale, where 1 = benchmark and 4 = capstone; scores => 3.0 will be taken as evidence of competence related to the goal. The rubrics can be found at:
http://www.uaf.edu/files/provost/SLOA/NaturalResourcesManagementBSPlan2017.pdf

(*Note*, the same rubrics were applied to all NRM degrees, but are only displayed in the BS.)

Questions on the defense audience survey utilized a 5-point response scale where 1 = weak and 5 = excellent. A score of >= 4.0 will be taken as evidence of competence related to the goal. The questionnaire can be found at:
http://www.uaf.edu/files/provost/SLOA/NaturalResourcesManagementMSPlan2017.pdf

4) Graduates were tracked to assess career advancement.

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

1) Defense presentations evaluated by graduate committee.

Overall, for 4 of the 5 individual items within the Oral Communication Rubric evaluated the score was 3. Delivery was the exception, with a score of 2 (Table 1, Appendix A).

2) Project reports evaluated by graduate committee.

Of the 22 individual items evaluated within the rubrics, all but 4 received a score of 4 (Table 2, Appendix A). Problem Solving Implementing Solutions, Problem Solving Evaluating Solutions, Inquiry and Analysis Analysis and Inquiry and Analysis Conclusions received a 3.

3) Thesis defense as evaluated by audience.

Overall, all 5 questions had mean scores > 4.0 (Table 3, Appendix A). While the sample size was too low for statistical testing, anecdotally, one student appears to have consistently received relatively low scores.

When examining scores across the type of rater, e.g., faculty, staff, student, general public it appears (again, anecdotally), on average, students provided relatively low scores; faculty and students were consistent in the supporting material question receiving the lowest average score (Table 4, Appendix A).

4) Tracking of graduates.

Of the four graduates during this period, 1 contact was made; that student is currently a PhD student.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

No curricular changes were deemed to be necessary. Faculty will be encouraged to work closely with students in developing and practicing presentations.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

Peter Fix, David Valentine.

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program's Communication Plan, as required by Faculty Senate motion? (required for baccalaureate programs only)

Yes, the Communication VALUE rubric was included.

Appendix A: Supporting Data

Table 1. Oral Communication Scores from Defense Presentation, Evaluated by Graduate Committee.

Rubric	Score (n = 1)
Oral Communication: Organization	3.00
Oral Communication: Language	3.00
Oral Communication: Delivery	2.00
Oral Communication: Supporting Material	3.00
Oral Communication: Central message	3.00

Table 2. MS Thesis, Evaluated by Graduate Committee.

Rubric	Score (n = 1)
Critical Thinking: Explain issues	4.00
Critical Thinking: Evidence	4.00
Critical Thinking: Influence context assumptions	400
Critical Thinking: Position	3.00
Critical Thinking: Conclusions	4.00
Problem Solving: Define problem	4.00
Problem Solving: Identify strategies	4.00
Problem Solving: Solutions-hypotheses	4.00
Problem Solving: Evaluate solutions	3.00
Problem Solving: Implement solutions	3.00
Problem Solving: Evaluate outcomes	3.00
Written Communication: Context purpose	4.00
Written Communication: Development	4.00
Written Communication: Disciplinary conventions	4.00
Written Communication: Sources evidence	4.00
Written Communication: Syntax mechanics	4.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Topic selection	4.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Existing knowledge	4.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Design	4.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Analysis	3.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Conclusions	3.00
Inquiry and Analysis: Limitations	4.00

Table 3. Audience Evaluation of Project Defense Presentations, by Student.

Questionnaire topic	Student				
	1 (n = 3)	2 (n = 8)	3 (n = 4)	4 (n = 2)	All (n = 17)
Topic selection/focus	3.67	4.75	3.88	3.50	4.21
Methods & analysis	3.33	4.75	4.75	4.00	4.41
Conclusions	3.67	4.75	4.75	4.00	4.47
Oral communication	3.33	4.75	5.00	3.50	4.41
Supporting material	3.00	4.38	5.00	3.00	4.12

Table 4. Audience Evaluation of Project Defense Presentations, by Evaluator Classification.

Questionnaire topic	Evaluator Classification		
	Faculty (n =3)	Student (n = 3)	Public (n = 11)
Topic selection/focus	4.33	3.33	4.41
Methods & analysis	4.00	4.00	4.64
Conclusions	4.67	3.67	4.64
Oral communication	4.00	4.00	4.64
Supporting material	3.67	3.00	4.55