Program Assessment Report
DBCALFS ANSC PhD Program
University of Arkansas
Academic Year 2021-2022

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.

   - Assessment Measure 1
     - Completion of the dissertation and successful defense to the faculty, turning in dissertation to graduate school.
     - Indirect
     - Report on number of graduates was obtained from Institutional Research
     Summary of Findings:
     - **1 student completed a dissertation defense 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)
     - No committees completed the rubric this year.
   - Written Communication (rubric at end of report)
     - No committees completed the rubric this year.

7. **Overall Recommendations**
   - Rubrics for assessing the Student Learning Outcomes #2 and #3 have been developed and now emphasis must be placed on completing them at the conclusion of defenses. The intention is for each committee member to complete the forms, not just the mentor.

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. Multiple copies of these rubrics will be handed to major professors at the start of each defense. A reminder that each committee member is to complete them will be given.
   - Faculty will continue to mentor Ph.D. candidates as they have successfully done in previous years.

Attribute for ORAL	Does Not Meet Expectations Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category (Equivalent to Benchmark =1 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	Meets Base Expectations (Equivalent to Milestone = 2 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	Meets Expectations Well Results BETWEEN a basic meeting of expectations and exceeding expectations (Equivalent to Milestone = 3 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)	Exceeds Expectations (Equivalent to Capstone = 4 on ANSC Undergraduate Rubric)
Overall quality of presentation	__ 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
Overall breadth of knowledge	__ 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
Quality of response to questions	__ 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
Overall assessment	__ Does not meet expectations	__ Meets expectations	__ Meets expectations	__ Exceeds Expectations

Confidential comments:

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

	__ Organization is poor __ Documentation is poor	__ Organization is logical __ Documentation is adequate	__ Organization is good __ Documentation is good	__ Organization is excellent __ Documentation is excellent
Overall assessment	__ Does not meet expectations	__ Meets base expectations	__ Meets expectations well	__ Exceeds Expectations

Confidential comments: