

**Program Assessment Report  
DBCALFS ANSC MS Program  
University of Arkansas  
Academic Year 2020-2021**

**1. Animal Science Department, B111 AFLS, 575-3745**

**2. Department Mission:**

The Department of Animal Science shall be a leading authority of animal agriculture by means of innovative research, teaching and extension programs for all Arkansans and the world.

- 3. Program Goals:** The Department of Animal Science will 1) perform research from discovery to application that benefits the production efficiency, animal health/well-being, food safety/security, and sustainability of animal agriculture, **2) recruit, educate, and prepare for the future, a new generation of citizens that will provide expertise in food production, animal health/well-being, as well as human health and nutrition,** and 3) provide research-based livestock and forage information through non-formal educational methods for the sustainability and management of agricultural production systems to improve Arkansans quality of life.

**4. Student Learning Outcome #1:**

Graduate students will demonstrate a basic knowledge of statistics, an in-depth knowledge of their specific thesis research area and a general knowledge of other research in the Department. Areas of emphasis may include animal nutrition, genetics, physiology, muscle foods, parasitology and forages.

A. Assessment Measure 1

- If thesis student -- completion of the thesis and successful defense to the faculty, turning in thesis to graduate school.
- If non-thesis student – completion of oral exam by committee.
- Indirect
- Report on number of graduates was obtained from Institutional Research

Summary of Findings:

- **1 student completed an oral exam and graduated with a non-thesis degree.**
- **5 students completed oral exams and a thesis and graduated.**

**5. Student Learning Outcome #2**

Graduate students will demonstrate problem solving skills.

- Not reported this year.

**6. Student Learning Outcome #3**

Graduate students will be able to communicate effectively in a) oral and b) written form.

- Oral Communication (rubric at end of report)

- A single mentor used this rubric for a student in the thesis program. This student was scored as Exceeds Expectations for all categories.
- Written Communication (rubric at end of report)
  - A mentor completed the rubric for a student in the thesis program. Scores were Meets Expectations Well or Exceeds Expectations for all questions on the rubric.

#### 7. Overall Recommendations

- Rubrics for assessing the Student Learning Outcomes #3 were used this year by a mentor. Emphasis must be placed on completing the rubrics at the conclusion of all defenses. And it should be emphasized that all committee members are to independently complete the rubrics.

#### 8. Action Plan

- The Department's Administrative Assistant has digital copies of the rubrics that will be used to report Learning Outcomes 2 and/or 3 next year. These rubrics will be handed to major professors at the start of each defense. **Each committee member is supposed to complete the rubric.**
- Faculty will continue to mentor M.S. students as they have successfully done this year

<b>Attribute for ORAL</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b> Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category (Equivalent to Benchmark =1 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Meets Base Expectations</b> (Equivalent to Milestone = 2 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Meets Expectations Well</b> Results BETWEEN a basic meeting of expectations and exceeding expectations (Equivalent to Milestone = 3 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b> (Equivalent to Capstone = 4 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)
<b>Overall quality of presentation</b>	__ Poorly organized	__ Clearly organized	__ Clearly organized	__ Well organized (introduction, conclusion, sequenced material in the body, transitions)
	__ Poor presentation	__ Clear presentation	__ Clearer presentation	__ Professional presentation
	__ Poor communication skills	__ Good communication skills	__ Better communication skills	__ Excellent communication skills
	__ Slides and handouts difficult to read	__ Slides and handouts clear	__ Slides and handouts good	__ Slides and handouts outstanding
<b>Overall breadth of knowledge</b>	__ Presentation unacceptable	__ Presentation acceptable	__ Presentation good	__ Presentation superior
	__ Presentation reveals critical weakness in depth of knowledge in subject matter	__ Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter	__ Presentation reveals adequate depth of knowledge in subject matter	__ Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge
	__ Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills	__ Presentation reveals average critical thinking skills	__ Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills	__ Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills
	__ Presentation is narrow in scope	__ Presentation reveals the draw from knowledge in several disciplines	__ Presentation reveals the draw from knowledge in several disciplines	__ Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
	__ No application to ANSC	__ Application to ANSC evident	__ Application to ANSC evident	__ Presentation shows clear application to ANSC
<b>Quality of response to questions</b>	__ Responses are incomplete or required prompting	__ Responses are complete	__ Responses are more complete	__ Responses are eloquent
	__ Arguments are poorly presented	__ Arguments are well organized	__ Arguments are well organized	__ Arguments are skillfully presented
	__ Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area	__ Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area	__ Respondent exhibits good knowledge in subject area	__ Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area
	__ Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	__ Response meets level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	__ Response meets level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)	__ Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD)
	__ Student does not realize the connection of research to ANSC	__ Student adequately connects research to ANSC	__ Student adequately connects research to ANSC	__ Student is able to discuss in depth the connection of thesis research to ANSC
<b>Overall assessment</b>	__ Does not meet expectations	__ Meets expectations	__ Meets expectations	__ Exceeds Expectations

**Confidential comments:**

<b>Attribute for WRITTEN</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b> Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category (Equivalent to Benchmark =1 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Meets Base Expectations</b> (Equivalent to Milestone = 2 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Meets Expectations Well</b> Results BETWEEN a basic meeting of expectations and exceeding expectations (Equivalent to Milestone = 3 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b> (Equivalent to Capstone = 4 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)
<b>Overall quality of science</b>	___ Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed	___ Arguments are correct	___ Arguments are coherent and clear	___ Arguments are superior
	___ Objectives are poorly defined	___ Objectives are clear	___ Objectives are clear	___ Objectives are well defined
	___ Demonstrated rudimentary critical thinking skills ___ Does not reflect understanding of subject matter and associated literature	___ Demonstrates average critical thinking skills ___ Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature	___ Demonstrates above average critical thinking skills ___ Reflects good understanding of subject matter and associated literature	___ Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills ___ Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature
	___ Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts	___ Demonstrates some understanding of theoretical concepts	___ Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts	___ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts
	___ Demonstrates limited originality ___ Displays limited creativity and insight	___ Demonstrates originality ___ Displays creativity and insight	___ Demonstrates good originality ___ Displays good creativity and insight	___ Demonstrates exceptional originality ___ Displays exceptional creativity and insight
<b>Contribution to discipline</b>	___ Limited evidence of discovery	___ Some evidence of discovery	___ Good evidence of discovery	___ Exceptional evidence of discovery
	___ Limited expansion upon previous research	___ Builds upon previous research	___ Extends previous research	___ Greatly extends previous research
	___ Limited theoretical or applied significance	___ Reasonable theoretical or applied significance	___ Good theoretical or applied significance	___ Exceptional theoretical or applied significance
	___ Limited publication impact	___ Reasonable publication impact	___ Good publication impact	___ Exceptional publication impact
<b>Experimental design implementation and interpretation</b>	___ Duplication of previous work. Design/approach not appropriate	___ Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative	___ Design/approach appropriate	___ Design/approach appropriate and innovative
	___ Data interpretation is inappropriate and/or uses incorrect methodology	___ Data interpretation is appropriate and uses limited number of correct methodology	___ Data interpretation is appropriate and uses correct methodology	___ Data interpretation is appropriate and creatively uses correct methodology
	___ Identifies no weakness in interpretation	___ Identifies some weaknesses in interpretation	___ Identifies weaknesses in interpretation	___ Identifies weaknesses in interpretation
	___ Demonstrates a lack of ability to articulate a critical response in one's own work or that of other research in the field	___ Demonstrates a limited ability to articulate a critical response in one's own work or that of other research in the files	___ Demonstrates ability to articulate a critical response to one's own work or that of other research in the field	___ Demonstrates an advanced ability to articulate a critical response to one's own work or that of other research in the field
<b>Quality of writing</b>	___ Writing is weak ___ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors	___ Writing is adequate ___ Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent	___ Writing is good ___ Limited grammatical or spelling errors apparent	___ Writing is publication quality ___ No grammatical or spelling errors apparent

	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is good <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets base expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations well	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
<b>Confidential comments:</b>				