**Annual Assessment Report for 2018-2019 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2018-2019 AY will be due September 30th 2019 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Melissa Jordine (mjordine@mail.fresnostate.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: \_Agricultural Business Degree \_\_BS

Assessment Coordinator: \_\_Serhat Asci

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

The outcome assessed during the 2018-19 academic year was:

- Outcome 2.0\*: Students will integrate fundamental agribusiness principles and/or analytical techniques to identify benefit-cost decisions at all levels of agribusiness and/or consumer activity, and make recommendations based on an understanding of policy and the regulatory environment.

\* The outcome number was revised to Outcome 2.1 in the latest 2019 SOAP document.

Student performance on service assignments, and internship reports (including self evaluation) will be evaluated using rubrics. Such information, when combined with results obtained from direct methods of assessment, will help to more fully evaluate success in students’ participation to out of classroom activities.

Courses to be assessed:

I. AGBS 170S – Advanced Agricultural Applications, *3-unit course* (Service assignment)

**Catalog Description:** Research methods applied to agricultural business in the areas of strategic management. Data collection and analysis using statistics and other techniques will be expected. Culminating activities may include commodity research analysis with price forecasting, development of a business plan, or case studies. A service-learning project is expected of all students.

II. AGBS 194 Agribusiness Internship, *3-unit course* (Self-evaluation)

**Catalog Description:** Emphasis on development of decision-making ability through industrial experience integrated with basic principles acquired in the classroom.

The goal of this learning outcome is that the graduates will utilize basic management, marketing and finance concepts in order to comprehend and affect change in the private and public sectors.

**2.** What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

I. AGBS 170S – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Annette Levi)

The AGBS 170S course requires the students (all are seniors) to dedicate at least 20 hours of service-learning activities at a community-based organization (nonprofit). A survey instrument was designed to measure progress in thirteen skills that students may have used in the service-learning project. (The survey instrument appears at the end of this report.) Skill area groups that were measured included: oral and written communication skills, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking and so forth. For each of the thirteen skills, students were asked to rank their perceived level of abilities before and after participating in the service-learning project. Students indicated their perceived level of skill using a Likert scale where 1 = poor to 6 = excellent. Students were required to fill out the service-learning evaluation form at the end of the semester.

Questions throughout the survey are directly related to the Department of Agricultural Business’ Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Students learning and applying these skills are deemed necessary for success in the service-learning venue. Other questions in the assessment tool included information regarding what courses (in the major and outside the major) were useful in having a successful service- learning project.

To assess the SLO of the service-learning component in AGBS 170S, the faculty member used the Department of Agricultural Business’ benchmark of 75%. Students were expected to score an average of 4.5 out of 6 after the completion of their service learning (on the self reported Likert scale of 1 = poor to 6 = excellent). The thirteen attributes and skills attained appear on page two of the attached rubric.

II. AGBS 194 – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Srinivasa Konduru)

For assessing outcome No. 2, the learning objectives agreement, internship reports and self evaluation by the students were used. A learning objectives agreement is formulated by the students at the beginning of their internship period in consultation with their work supervisor. Every student undergoing an internship has to formulate 3-4 learning objectives which are in accordance with the knowledge and skills that they have acquired in their classrooms and upon their potential job responsibilities. Once the learning objectives are formulated, they have to be approved by the internship advisor of the department.

Once the internship starts, every student has to report periodically to the advisor about 6-8 times during their internship period indicating the progress they are making towards fulfilling

the learning objectives. In addition to this, an evaluation form is completed by all students at the end of their internship period. The goal of these two tools is to obtain general student perceptions about their internship experience, usefulness of their academic preparation in their jobs, professionalism, communication skills, work ethic, skill set and job performance.

The benchmark to assess the outcome 2.0 is that 75% of the students will score an average of 3.75 out of 5.0 at the end of their internship on the attached rubric (See Appendix 2).

3. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

I. AGBS 170S – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Annette Levi)

The course enrollment for fall 2018 was 60 students, and the course enrollment for spring 2019 was 74, for a total of 134 students assessed. The percent change of self-evaluated improvement in skills from before to after participating in service-learning activities for each semester appear in rank order below:

**Percent Change Before vs After Service-Learning in Fall 2018 & Spring 2019Rank Attribute %**△ **Fall Rank Attribute %**△ **Spring 1 Time Management 13.57% 1 Time Management 16.35% 2 Business Knowledge 8.61% 2 Computer Application 15.60% 3 Production Ag. 7.18% 3 Oral Communication 15.17% 4 Ethical Awareness 6.17% 4 Written Communication 14.98% 5 Quantitative Reasoning 5.98% 5 Technical Equipment 12.33% 6 Oral Communication 5.60% 6 Business Knowledge 12.17% 7 Computer Application 5.48% 7 Quantitative Reasoning 11.81% 8 Written Communication 4.75% 8 Production Ag. 11.11% 9 Critical Thinking 4.61% 9 Ethical Awareness 10.35% 10 Global Awareness 4.56% 10 Work Ethic 9.42% 11 Technical Equipment 4.22% 11 Critical Thinking 9.20% 12 Work Ethic 3.83% 12 Bilingual 8.93% 13 Bilingual 1.28% 13 Global Awareness 7.78%**

The percent change of improvement in skills from before to after participating in service learning activities using data for the academic year (aggregating both semesters’ data) appear in the table below in rank order:

**Percent Change Before vs After Service**

**Learning AY 18 /19**

**Rank Attribute %**△ **AY 18/19**

**1 Time Management 15.09%**

**2 Computer Application 10.73%**

**3 Oral Communication 10.69%**

**4 Business Knowledge 10.54%**

**5 Written Communication 10.18%**

**6 Production Ag. 9.30%**

**7 Quantitative Reasoning 9.01%**

**8 Technical Equipment 8.51%**

**9 Ethical Awareness 8.44%**

**10 Critical Thinking 7.11%**

**11 Work Ethic 6.84%**

**12 Global Awareness 6.30%**

**13 Bilingual 5.33%**

In both semesters, Time Management was the attribute that students indicated that they had improved the most. Reported values in fall 2018 are consistently lower than those reported in spring 2019. A probable reason for this is that in fall 2018 two large student groups (17 of the 60 students, 28%) indicated dissatisfaction (scored less than 4.5 in average) with two service learning partners because of “disorganization” and “lack of communication.” Those organizations were not asked to be service-learning partners in spring 2019. The reported levels of improvement from fall 2018 to spring 2019 are significant. The service-learning partners used for spring 2019 also indicated higher levels of student improvement.

II. AGBS 194 – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Srinivasa Konduru)

The student performances did meet the expectations in the assessment for outcome No. 2. In both the semesters, more than 75 percent of the students have surpassed the benchmark scores. *A score of 3.75 out of 5.0 by 75% of the students is set as a benchmark and is considered to be satisfactory.* The performance of most of the students was satisfactory except that of three students in Fall 2018, whose scores were below 3.75 out of 5.0 in Criterion 2.

Fall 2018

Percent surpassed (out of 33 students)

Spring 2019

Percent surpassed (out of 13 Students)

Criterion 1 95% 100%

Criterion 2 86% 80% Criterion 3 84% 90%

4. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

I. AGBS 170S – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Annette Levi)

The department is pleased with the self-assessed progress in the skills measured by the survey. Changes are not contemplated at this time. However, it is important to remember that service learning projects are dependent on activities outside the classroom, with nonprofit directors and supervisors calling the shots when students are on site. Changes can be made to improve the service-learning experience for students (in AGBS 170S). Listening to student and nonprofit director concerns is a critical step when conducting a service-learning course. Faculty must be willing to make adjustments regarding: 1) targeting appropriate nonprofit projects that build upon student skillsets, 2) maintaining student interest and commitment to the projects, and 3) determining which service-learning partners should, and should not, be used in the future. Faculty must never lose sight of the goal of improving student learning and preparing better equipped professionals.

II. AGBS 194 – fall 2018 & spring 2019 (faculty - Dr. Srinivasa Konduru)

As a result of these findings, we plan to do the following:

∙ Reinforcing the importance of formulating learning objectives which are in tune with the learning that happened in the class and potential job duties.

∙ Reinforcing the importance of application of agribusiness concepts (that they have learned in the class) in their job. Also, stressing the importance of communicating legibly and go through any report/memo that they have written at least once to identify any grammatical or spelling errors.

∙ I would be interacting with the work-supervisors to request them to provide challenging opportunities where the students can apply the concepts that they learn in the class during their jobs.

5. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

N/A

These courses were assessed for the first time for the student outcome 2.0. The report will be achieved and the progress will be evaluated in the future.

6. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?

The outcome to be assessed during the 2018-19 academic year is:

- Learning Outcome 1.1 (Knowledge): Students will apply economic concepts, as well as statistical and quantitative analyses, to agribusiness and/or consumer issues and interpret the results.

Courses to be assessed:

Accounting and Finance Related Lower and Upper Division Core Courses: AGBS 31 Farm Accounting

AGBS 32 Agribusiness Managerial Accounting

AGBS 130 Agricultural Finance

Student knowledge on accounting and finance related lower and upper division core courses will be evaluated using homework and exam results. Such information, when combined with results obtained from indirect assessment measures, will help assess success in students’ capacity in applying one of the main economic concept (Accounting and Finance knowledge) to agribusiness issues.

7. What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?

**Program Review of BS in Agricultural Business in October 2017:**

**Areas of Improvement/Recommendations Made by External Committee** *1) Make this a systematic assessment practice, to ensure consistency and sustainability. 2) Modify an existing course (For example, the capstone course, AGBS170S) to address*

*the writing need and avoid the obvious resource strain a brand new course may cause.*

*3) Maintain syllabus uniformity across its courses.*

4) *Encourage faculty to pursue curriculum related research and service activities (aligned with the Institute of Food and Agriculture (IFA)) that engage students in their respective classes.*

5) *Consider appropriate measures to control student enrollment growth and maintain program integrity.*

6) *Follow, document and prominently showcase the post-graduation career path of students to properly tell the success story of the department.*

*7) FERP faculty Spring 2018 position needs to be filled in a timely fashion.*

**Progress Made by Department of AGBS since October 2017**

*1. Make this a systematic assessment practice, to ensure consistency and sustainability:* The Agricultural Business Department rigorously improve their systematic approach to assess the classes and its curriculum. The department revised its SOAP in 2019 and make some changes in its curriculum utilizing some of the information from the assessment practices.

*2. Modify an existing course (For example, the capstone course, AGBS170S) to address the writing need and avoid the obvious resource strain a brand new course may cause:* AGBS170S is restructured and the course is in the process of being approved as AGBS170SW course which will include writing component starting in Spring 2020 semester.

*3. Maintain syllabus uniformity across its courses:* Efforts are being made to encourage all faculty to follow/use the syllabus templates on CFE’s website. The follow up is planned in fall faculty retreat.

*4. Encourage faculty to pursue curriculum related research and service activities (aligned with the Institute of Food and Agriculture (IFA) and/or* university farm (*UAL) enterprises) that engage students in their respective classes:* Service learning course actively engage with UAL and/or IFA.

*5. Consider appropriate measures to control student enrollment growth and maintain program integrity:* Attempts to control student enrollment were made by increasing admission standards. A slight decline was observed in 2018-2019 academic year. However, the results were not published, yet.

*6. Follow, document and prominently showcase the post-graduation career path of students to properly tell the success story of the department:* Exit survey is administered to the graduating students. Department will follow up with the participants for an alumni survey after analyzing the results and creating a database of the participants.

*7. FERP faculty Spring 2018 position needs to be filled in a timely fashion:* Request has been submitted by the department to the Dean’s office. Currently, a part time lecturer was recruited to help in dealing with workload.

**APPENDIX 1. STUDENT SERVICE-LEARNING EVALUATION FORM – AGBS 170S** *The feedback you provide on this evaluation will be used for future improvements to the Department of Agricultural Business Service-Learning Program. All student evaluations will be compiled and shared in a year-end report, but individual evaluations will be kept confidential.*

**STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

**Student Name: Last** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **First: ID#:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **When will you graduate? Month: Year: Estimated CSUF GPA**:

**Ethnicity** (Optional) **Age** *(Optional)*

\_\_\_\_African American \_\_\_\_Hispanic \_\_\_\_19 & under \_\_\_\_30 - 34 \_\_\_\_American Indian \_\_\_\_White \_\_\_\_20 - 24 \_\_\_\_35+ \_\_\_\_Asian \_\_\_\_Other \_\_\_\_25 - 29

**Gender (Optional):** \_\_\_\_Male \_\_\_\_Female

**Career Area of Interest (List one or two):**

**COMPANY/ORGANIZATION INFORMATION**

**Service-Learning Organization name**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**THE SERVICE-LEARNING EXPERIENCE**

**Please rate the following on a scale of 1 to 6**

***1 = Poor, 2 = Not Very Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Very Good, 6 = Excellent If not applicable, mark “NA”*** \_\_\_\_\_ Service-learning project orientation was provided by the organization

\_\_\_\_\_ Communication and feedback with the worksite supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_ Overall service-learning supervision provided by the worksite supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_ The physical work conditions of the service-learning site

\_\_\_\_\_ The overall learning value of the service-learning

**COURSEWORK APPLICATION**

**What AGBS courses (or equivalent) were ESPECIALLY useful in this service-learning project**? **What courses outside of your major were ESPECIALLY useful in this service-learning project**? **Were there additional skills you felt you needed that you didn’t have for this service-learning project**?

**Is there anything the site supervisor or worksite could have done to make your service-learning project a better experience?**

**SERVICE-LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**Using the following scale how important do you believe the following skills/attributes were to the success of this service-learning project:**

*1 = Not Important At All, 2 = Not Very Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Important, 5 = Very Important, 6 = Most Important*

\_\_\_\_ Written Communication Skills \_\_\_\_ Ethical Awareness

\_\_\_\_ Oral Communication Skills \_\_\_\_ Global Awareness

\_\_\_\_ Quantitative Reasoning \_\_\_\_ Integrated Knowledge of Business \_\_\_\_ Technical Equipment Usage \_\_\_\_ Critical Thinking

\_\_\_\_ Computer Applications \_\_\_\_ Work Ethic

\_\_\_\_ Production Agriculture \_\_\_\_ Bilingual (Spanish or other language proficiency)

**Using the following scale, please evaluate your level of skills/attributes when you (SL = service learning: *1 = Poor, 2 = Not Very Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Very Good, 6 = Excellent***

**Started your SL Project: Skill Areas: Completed your SL Project:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 Written Communication Skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Oral Communication Skills 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Quantitative Reasoning 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Technical Equipment Usage 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Computer Applications 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Production Agriculture 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Integrating Knowledge of Business 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Critical Thinking 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Team Work 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Motivation/Initiative 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Work Ethic 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Bilingual Proficiency 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Time Management 1 2 3 4 5 6

**Do you have any suggestions for improvement to service-learning process?**

***Thank you for your time and care in answering our questions!***

**APPENDIX 2.** AGBS 194 Agribusiness Internship Self Evaluation Rubric and Part of the Questionnaire used for Self-Assessment.

**Rubric for Assessing Outcome No.2 through Internships:**

**Criteria Grading Scale**

**1 2 3 4 5**

**1. Formulation of the Learning**

**Agreement**

**2. Fulfillment of objectives of**

**internship**

**(through**

**internship**

**reports)**

**3. Fulfillment of objectives of**

**internship by self-evaluation**

Poorly

formulated learning

agreement. Had to

redraft the objectives.

Incomplete fulfillment of the

objectives. Reports lacks many

elements of guidelines. No

Improvement in level of skills

/knowledge.

Needed some help in

formulation to be in

accordance with their

knowledge, skill level

and potential job duties. Partially

fulfilled the objectives. Reports lacks many

elements of guidelines.

Minimal

Improvement in level of

skills

/knowledge.

Fairly

formulated in accordance with their

knowledge, skill level and potential job duties.

Partially

fulfilled the objectives. Reports

followed only some

guidelines.

Somewhat Improvement in level of

skills

/knowledge.

Very well

formulated in accordance with their

knowledge, skill level and potential job duties.

Comprehensive ly fulfilled the objectives.

Reports

followed only some

guidelines.

Fair

Improvement in level of

skills

/knowledge.

Excellent

formulation in accordance with their

knowledge,

skill level and potential job duties.

Comprehensivel y fulfilled the objectives.

Reports

followed the guidelines.

Good

Improvement in level of skills/ knowledge.

**Information from Self Evaluation Questionnaire used for assessment:**

**Using the following scale, please evaluate your level of skills/attributes when you: *1 = Poor, 2 = Not Very Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Good, 5 = Very Good, 6 = Excellent***

**Started your internship: Skill Areas: Completed your internship:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 Quantitative Reasoning 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Computer Applications 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Production Agriculture 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Integrating Knowledge of Business 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6 Critical Thinking 1 2 3 4 5 6