**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 Sciences** Degree **Master of Science**

Assessment Coordinator: **Amanda McKeith**

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

In reviewing the learning outcomes, it was determined that our learning outcomes have not been re-evaluated since the name change of the MS program. No students graduated the MS in Agricultural Sciences during the 2018-2019 academic year. However, every semester the students write a paper as well as give an oral presentation in Graduate Seminar. Graduate Seminar is taken their first three semester and then their final semester the complete their thesis and defend their thesis. This allows us to track the advancement our students make in the program from their first semester to their last.

Goal: Students must develop the ability to critically review literature, design appropriate experimental procedures, analyze samples and interpret data, write clear, concise and thoughtful research papers, and communicate appropriately with colleagues, students and the public.

Upon completion of the program, students should be able to:

1. Read, understand and evaluate scientific papers on subjects related to ~~animal science~~ animal science or agricultural education

2. Gather and integrate information from several scientific sources to write a coherent paper as well as a thesis with scientific substantiation for the hypothesis, methods and conclusions

4. Analyze and interpret data appropriately to answer scientific questions

5. Present information to colleagues and classmates on topics in ~~animal science~~ animal science or agricultural education

6. Write with clarity and good organization of thought, demonstrating correct spelling and punctuation.

Students should become empowered to advance their own careers, to contribute to the Animal Science profession, and to educate themselves beyond the completion of the degree program.

Upon completion of the program, students should be able to:

1. Communicate, verbally and in writing, in a clear and understandable way, using correct scientific terminology to express their ideas and goals.

1. 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.**

No graduate students graduated in the 2018-2019 academic year. No thesis or thesis presentations could be evaluated for that reason.

However, graduate students write papers as well as give oral presentations every semester in ASCI 229 – Graduate seminar. This allows us to track the progress the students make throughout their program. Each semester the paper and presentation are differently. Fall 2018 the paper was a minimum of a 15-page literature review (beginning of their thesis) and they had to give a presentation over the research that has been conducted related to their project which would lead to their research question. Spring 2019 the paper was a popular press article pertaining to an issue in the agricultural industry that the general public is not well educated on or has misconceptions on. The students then develop a presentation that would be given at a community type meeting to inform and educate the public on an issue.

1. 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.

No students graduated during the 2018-2019 academic year so no thesis or thesis presentations could be evaluated. There were 4 students evaluated each semester in ASCI 229 – Graduate Seminar. All students were evaluated to be making progress in their program pertaining to public speaking and writing skills. The rubric used for this doesn’t indicated direct proficiency like we use for the thesis evaluation. However, all students (100% of those evaluated) were deemed to be proficient in public speaking and were making progress in their scientific writing ability.

Table 1: Scores relative to Literature Review Presentation – Fall 2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STUDENT  | Organiation | Language | Delivery | Review of Literature | Statement of Objective | Answering Questions |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 3.5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 3.91666667 | 3.75 | 3.25 | 3.6666667 | 3.916666667 | 3.875 |

Table 2: Scores relative to Popular Press Presentation – Spring 2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Organization | Language | Delivery | Review of topic | Answering of Questions |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 4 | 3.75 | 3.875 | 4 | 4 |

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

The students seem to be progressing in their writing and public speaking abilities. However, we will know more after Spring 2020 when we have thesis and thesis presentations to evaluate.

1. 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.

Not Applicable

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

This coming year, we will evaluate thesis presentations for oral communication skills as well as the written thesis as students complete their program. We are also in the process of developing an exit survey for graduate students as well as an alumni survey.

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

The last program review occurred in February 2019. Since last Fall (2018) the graduate program as increased from 4 graduate students to 9. We are in the process of growing our program as we have hired 5 new faculty in 6 years. The program went from almost being non-existent to 9 students. This is tremendous growth and we are planning to continue to grow our program so we can remain in compliance with Title 5 with 5 graduates from the program per year. The graduate faculty will be meeting this year to discuss the student learning outcomes for the graduate program as well as helping develop the alumni and graduate surveys.

**Appendix A – Assignments used to evaluate students**

**Literature Review Assignment**

**Literature Review:** A minimum of 15 peer-reviewed research articles will be utilized in the development of a literature review. The literature review will be over the topic of your thesis project. The literature review will be a minimum of 15 pages double-spaced, size 12 font. These will be reviewed by the graduate program coordinator as well as the major advisor for completeness and correctness relative to their specific discipline.

**Literature Review Presentation:** A 10-minute presentation of the review of literature followed by 5 minutes for questions will be presented on Tuesday, December 11th, which will be similar to what you would present in a thesis defense. This will be assessed using the presentation rubric by graduate faculty in the Department of Animal Sciences and Agricultural Education.

**Popular Press Assignment**

**Popular Press Article:** This article will be based on at least 3 scientific research articles (from reputable journals) that refutes a topic in a book that is against conventional agriculture or agriculture in general. The article needs to be typed, double-spaced utilizing Times New Roman Font, size 12. The article must be AT LEAST 3 pages and NOT MORE than 6 pages. These will be reviewed by the graduate program coordinator for their ability to explain scientific material

**Popular Press Presentation:** A scientific presentation utilizing the information from popular press article. Presentation needs to be 20 minutes in length. The audience will be able to ask questions for 5 minutes following your presentation. Presentation will be on May 6th. The presentation will be assessed using the presentation rubric by graduate faculty in the Department of Animal Sciences and Agricultural Education.

Appendix B - Rubrics

ASCI 229 Literature Review Presentation Assessment

Presenter’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Organization

 4 – Pattern was clear, consistent and cohesive

 3 – Pattern was clear and consistent, but not as cohesive

 2 – Pattern was somewhat unclear and inconsistent

 1 – Pattern was not observed

Language

 4 – Correct, compelling and enhanced the effectiveness of presentation

 3 – Thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation

 2 – Mundane and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation

 1 – Unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation

Delivery (posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal expressions)

4 – Delivery techniques made the presentation compelling and the speaker was polished

3 – Delivery techniques made the presentation interesting and the speaker appeared

 comfortable

2 – Delivery techniques made the presentation understandable and the speaker appeared

 tentative

1 – Delivery techniques detracted from the understandability of the presentation and the

 speaker appeared uncomfortable

Review of literature

 4 – Was appropriate and relevant to the research topic

 3 – Was mostly relevant

 2 – Was mostly NOT relevant

 1 – Was NOT relevant to the research topic

Statement of Objective

 4 – Was clear and concise

 3 – Was mostly clear

 2 – Was somewhat unclear

 1 – Was unclear, confusing, and too long

Answering of Questions

 4 – Answered questions clearly and confidently

 3 – Answered questions clearly, but wasn’t confident

 2 – Answered questions somewhat clearly

 1 – Answered questions vaguely and unclearly

ASCI 229 Ag Issue Presentation

Presenter’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Organization

 4 – Pattern was clear, consistent and cohesive

 3 – Pattern was clear and consistent, but not as cohesive

 2 – Pattern was somewhat unclear and inconsistent

 1 – Pattern was not observed

Language

 4 – Correct, compelling and enhanced the effectiveness of presentation

 3 – Thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation

 2 – Mundane and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation

 1 – Unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation

Delivery (posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal expressions)

4 – Delivery techniques made the presentation compelling and the speaker was polished

3 – Delivery techniques made the presentation interesting and the speaker appeared

 comfortable

2 – Delivery techniques made the presentation understandable and the speaker appeared

 tentative

1 – Delivery techniques detracted from the understandability of the presentation and the

 speaker appeared uncomfortable

Review of topic

 4 – Was appropriate and relevant to the research topic

 3 – Was mostly relevant

 2 – Was mostly NOT relevant

 1 – Was NOT relevant to the research topic

Answering of Questions

 4 – Answered questions clearly and confidently

 3 – Answered questions clearly, but wasn’t confident

 2 – Answered questions somewhat clearly

 1 – Answered questions vaguely and unclearly