

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
Masters of Natural Resources Management

School of Natural Resources and Extension

Expanded Statement of Intuitional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
<p>UAF and the School Natural Resources and Extension is committed to providing quality graduate education through small classes, close student-faculty relationships and research and scholarly endeavor. Continuous self-examination, flexibility and openness to innovation enhance the quality of graduate education available to students.</p> <p>The hallmark of the graduate program in Natural Resources Management is its recognition of individual differences and interests of students, and responding to these individual needs.</p> <p>Goal Statement: MNRM graduates will be professionals in the natural resources management field, with advanced expertise in their chosen specialty. They will have the tools to make responsible</p>	<p>1) Graduates will have the skills to participate responsibly in the decision making process about the use of natural resources.</p> <p>2) Graduates are able to synthesize knowledge for applications in resource issues to reach management decisions.</p> <p>3) Graduates are proficient in communicating their knowledge in oral and written format to scientists, agencies and private sector personnel.</p> <p>4) Graduates are prepared to enter or advance in careers in natural resources management.</p>	<p>1) Comprehensive exam will be evaluated with the Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. 1a) Project defenses will be rated on the soundness of the student’s process to reach their conclusions. 1b) Project reports will be evaluated with the Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric.</p> <p>2) The student’s comprehensive exam and project will be evaluated with the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving VALUE Rubrics.</p> <p>3) The student’s communication skills at their project presentation/defense will be evaluated. 3a) Project paper will be evaluated with the Written Communication VALUE rubric. Project presentation/defenses will be evaluated with the Oral Communication VALUE rubric based both on</p>	<p>1, 1b, 2, 3a) The graduate committee will assess comprehensive exams, project presentations and final project reports with the appropriate VALUE rubrics. This will be done for each comprehensive exam and project presentation. Data will be compiled by the chair of the assessment committee.</p> <p>1a & 3) The chair of the graduate committee will be responsible for administering questionnaires to attendees. This will be conducted at each project presentation. The questionnaires will include the rater’s affiliation (i.e., faculty, staff, student, and general public). Data will be compiled by the chair of the assessment committee. Results will be presented separately for faculty, staff, and students.</p> <p>4) The Director of</p>

<p>natural resources management decisions, implement successful long-term management for protection and maintenance of ecosystems while meeting the needs and values of humans.</p>		<p>faculty evaluation and public feedback.</p> <p>The VALUE rubrics range 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.</p> <p>1a & 3 will be conducted via a set of questions passed out to attendees (see attached). Questions will be asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = weak and 5 = excellent. A score of ≥ 4.0 will be taken as evidence of competence related to the goal.</p> <p>4) Graduates will be tracked to assess career advancement.</p>	<p>Academic Programs will task the academic program assistant with the responsibility of tracking graduates. A qualitative report will summarize employment in the Natural Resources Management field.</p>
---	--	--	--

SNRE MNRM project defense attendee survey (Note for SLOA review: Questions 1 – 3 evaluate “soundness” of process to reach conclusions, question 4 evaluates oral communication skills, question 5 written communication skills.)

Student’s Name _____ Date: _____

Your affiliation (please check one): ___ Faculty ___ Staff ___ Student ___ General public

Thank you for taking the time to answer these five questions. Your input will provide guidance to improve the NRM graduate degree program. Please return the completed questionnaire to the committee chair.

1. Rate the student’s assessment of the issue that was the focus of the project (circle one).

Weak (i.e., not coherent, limited understanding/review of situation)	Below Average (i.e., coherent, but limited understanding/review of situation)	Average (i.e., moderate knowledge/review, but could have been extended)	Above average (i.e., advanced knowledge/review, finer details missing)	Excellent (i.e., thorough knowledge/review of situation)
1	2	3	4	5

2. Rate the student’s methods/analysis (circle one).

Weak (i.e., methods not appropriate or applied incorrectly)	Below average (i.e., methods appropriate, but limited understanding)	Average (i.e., methods appropriate, adequate understanding)	Above average (i.e., advanced methods, appropriate understanding)	Excellent (i.e., advanced methods, high level of competency)
1	2	3	4	5

3. Did the conclusions follow from the results?

Not at all (i.e., key findings ignored, no basis for conclusions)	Very little (i.e., attempts to incorporate findings, but not clearly linked)	Somewhat (i.e., linked results to conclusions, but not a strong case)	To a great extent (i.e., strong case as to how conclusions followed results)	Fully (i.e., conclusions soundly linked to results)
1	2	3	4	5

4. Rate the student’s oral communication skills.

Weak (i.e., not able to understand/follow, no logical flow)	Below average (i.e., mostly a logical flow, but sections difficult to understand/follow)	Average (i.e., logical flow, OK presentation, room for improvement)	Above average (i.e., Effective at conveying points in logical manner, minor room for improvement)	Excellent (i.e., Highly effective in presenting project, few suggestions for improvement)
1	2	3	4	5

5. Rate the student’s supporting materials (i.e., presentation).

Weak (i.e., not able to follow slides – too busy, poor color choice, etc.; contained typos)	Below average (i.e., could follow slides, formatting distracting, lots of room for improvement)	Average (i.e., easy to follow, effectiveness could be improved)	Above average (i.e., engaging, effective, little room for improvement)	Excellent (i.e., innovative, extremely engaging, highly effective)
1	2	3	4	5