

Annual Academic Assessment Report

(PhD/POULTRY SCIENCE)

(May 20, 2022)

Report annually to the Dean of the college/school the following:

- **Results of analysis of assessment of Student Learning Outcome**

Assessment 1: 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.

Measure 1: Qualifying Exam. Students met or exceeded expectations per rubric for oral and written communication (below).

Measure 2a: Written dissertation. 100% of students met or exceeded expectations per rubric (below) for written communication (average score 2.9 out of 3)

Measure 2b: Oral communication (defense). 100% of students met or exceeded expectations per rubric (below) for oral communication (average score 2.9 out of 3)
100% of students successfully passed defense.

Measure 3: Exit interview. No formal exit interviews were given.

- **Any changes to degree/certificate planned or made on the basis of the assessment and analysis.**

No changes to report at this time. Few students graduated within the past year and those students are doing well (exceeding expectations in most categories of assessment) on written and oral communication and/or content. However, the graduate curriculum committee and remaining faculty will hold discussions regarding potential core classes within the POSC curriculum.

- **Any changes to the assessment process made or planned.**

Rubrics for oral and written communication will be used by all committees for qualifying exams, dissertation reviews, and student defenses. Assessment plan will be revised for 2022-2023.

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"/> Demonstrates limited originality <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight	<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"/> Displays creativity and insight	<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"/> 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:			

