

Program Assessment Report
Graduate Program
Department of Poultry Science Ph.D.
March 2017

A. The goal of the poultry science PhD is to promote a fundamental understanding of poultry science across sub-disciplines, with an emphasis on the scientific basis underlying the poultry industry.

B. **Overall Expected Outcomes**

- Students will obtain a depth of information in one or more selected areas of poultry science or related disciplines including; poultry health, immunology, genetics, molecular biology, nutrition, parasitology, physiology, food safety/microbiology, poultry product technology, and poultry enterprise operations. The PhD is generally a research degree that is not heavily weighted by additional course material.

1) Assessment Measure

- a. Every graduate committee is different and therefore the requirements and recommendations are as well.
- b. Students are required to take a qualifying exam that is for review by their graduate committee. The committee will score the written thesis using the attached rubric for evaluation of written work.
- c. Students are required to participate in an oral qualifying exam for review by their graduate committee. The committee will score the oral qualifying exam using the attached rubric for evaluation of oral presentations

2) Acceptable and Ideal Targets

- a. It is expected that 80% of our students will complete their written qualifying exams with a score of meets expectations
- b. It is expected that 80% of our students will complete the oral portion of their qualifying exams with a score of meets expectations

3) Key Personnel

- a. The chair of the departmental graduate student committee (Dr. John Marcy) will be responsible for monitoring this outcome and preparing findings.

4) Summary of Findings

- a. The percentage of students failing to complete the written and oral qualifying exams will be plotted. Once enough data is accumulated it will be presented as a 3 year rolling mean. This data will be updated once a year and presented in a departmental faculty meeting for interpretation and discussion.

5) Recommendations

- i. Any recommendations will come about from the faculty discussion of the data at during the faculty meeting that the data is presented.
- Although PhD graduates are not expected to function as independent researchers, they will be able to organize, analyze, communicate and apply technical information. Therefore, graduates will be able to communicate effectively in both oral and written form. The ability to communicate findings to a wide range of audiences is deemed essential.

1) Assessment Measure

- a. Every PhD committee is different and therefore the requirements and recommendations are as well.
- b. Students are required to write a dissertation for review from their graduate committee. The committee will score the written thesis using the attached rubric for evaluation of written work.
- c. Students are required to participate in an oral defense of the dissertation for review by their graduate committee. The committee will score the oral presentation using the attached rubric for evaluation of oral presentations.

2) Acceptable and Ideal Targets

- a. It is expected that 90% of all students successfully complete their written dissertation and dissertation defense.
- b. It is expected that 80% of thesis will meet expectations based on attached rubric for written dissertation.
- c. It is expected that 80% of dissertation defenses will meet expectations as defined by the attached rubric for dissertation defense.

3) Key Personnel

- a. The chair of the departmental graduate student committee (Dr. John Marcy) will be responsible for summarizing these results and preparing findings.

4) Summary of Findings

- a. The percentage of students failing to complete the written and oral defense of the thesis will be plotted. Once enough data is accumulated it will be presented as a 3 year rolling mean.. This data will be updated once a year and presented in a departmental faculty meeting for interpretation and discussion.

5) Recommendations

- a. Any recommendations will come about from the faculty discussion of the data at during the faculty meeting that the data is presented.

- PhD students must complete an exit interview with the Poultry Science Department Head.

1) Assessment Measure

Indirect, subjective measure of student experience.

2) Acceptable and Ideal Targets

N/A

3) Key Personnel

The Department head (Dr. Michael Kidd) will be responsible for interviewing the PhD students.

4) Summary of Findings

General summary of student concerns and successes will be presented once a year at a faculty meeting. It is at this time that interpretation and discussion will occur.

5) Recommendations

Any recommendations will come about from the faculty discussion of the data at during the faculty meeting that the data is presented.

Student's Graduate Program:

Thesis/Dissertation ORAL DEFENSE _____

Rubric – Completed by: _____ **Date:** _____

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for ORAL	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category.</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weakness in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope <input type="checkbox"/> No application to Poultry Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the the draw from knowledge in several disciplines <input type="checkbox"/> Application to Poultry Science evident	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation shows clear application to Poultry Science
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete or required prompting <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD) <input type="checkbox"/> Student does not realize the connection of research to poultry science	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD) <input type="checkbox"/> Student adequately connects research to poultry science	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of degree program of graduate (MS or PhD) <input type="checkbox"/> Student is able to discuss in depth the connection of thesis research to poultry science
Overall assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Confidential Comments:

Student's Graduate Program:

Thesis/Dissertation Written Material _____

Rubric – Completed by: _____ **Date:** _____

(To be completed by each committee member & reader. Please check each evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)

Attribute for WRITTEN	Does Not Meet Expectations <i>Provide a short explanation for each attribute that you select in this category</i>	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are incorrect, incoherent, or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrated rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Does not reflect understanding of Subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates originality	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mastery of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality

	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight	<input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication impact
Experimental design implementation and interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplication of previous work. Design/approach not appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Data interpretation is inappropriate and/or uses incorrect methodology; <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies no weakness in interpretation <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a lack of ability to articulate a critical response in one's own work or that of other research in the field	<input type="checkbox"/> Design/approach moderately moderately appropriate or innovative <input type="checkbox"/> Data interpretation is appropriate and uses limited number of correct methodology; <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies some weaknesses in interpretation <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a limited ability to articulate a critical response in in one's own work or that of other research in the field	<input type="checkbox"/> Design/approach appropriate of innovative <input type="checkbox"/> Data interpretation is appropriate and creatively uses correct methodology; <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies weaknesses in interpretation; <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an advanced ability articulate a critical response to one's own work or that of other research in the field
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Overall assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Confidential Comments:			