Table 4.1 Outcomes Assessment Implementation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment information collected</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Oral Qualifying Exams</td>
<td>1) Oral Qualifying Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Review of oral dissertation presentation by audience.</td>
<td>2) Review of oral dissertation presentation by audience. Rankings were on a scale from 1-5, with 1 being excellent and 5 being poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Review of graduate dissertations by Department Head</td>
<td>3) Review of graduate theses by Department Head. Rankings range from Outstanding to Excellent to Adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Graduate presentation and publication record</td>
<td>4) Graduate presentation and publication record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Graduates first employment</td>
<td>5) Graduates first employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Graduate satisfaction after graduation assessed through an exit interview. Rankings range from very Satisfied to Mostly Satisfied, to Not Satisfied.</td>
<td>6) Graduate satisfaction after graduation assessed through an exit interview. Rankings range from very Satisfied to Mostly Satisfied, to Not Satisfied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions drawn from the information collected above and how are faculty collectively involved in drawing conclusions

1) Two PhD Marine Biology students took their qualifying exams this year and both passed.
2) No PhD dissertation defenses occurred during this review period.

1) One PhD Marine Biology student took their qualifying exams this year and passed.
2) Two students defended their dissertation, but only responses for one of the defenses were submitted. This defense was evaluated by 14 reviewers, which combined, combined

1) Two PhD Marine Biology students took their qualifying exams this year and both passed.
2) Three students defended their dissertation. Responses to the defenses ranged from 13 to 18 reviews. Reviewers
3) No PhD Marine Biology students graduated this year.

4) n/a

5) n/a

ranked this student as 1.4.

3) Two PhD Marine Biology students graduated this year. The review by the Program Head assessed one of the dissertations as outstanding for both competence of research skills and level of written communication skills, while the other was ranked excellent for both.

4) One of the students who completed his degree this year presented his research in two oral and two poster presentations. Thus far, his research has resulted in three peer-reviewed journal publications. The other student presented 1 oral and 2 poster presentations but has not yet published his research in peer-reviewed journals.

5) Both students have taken post-doctoral positions.

6) Both students were very satisfied with their research experience and training. One student was mostly satisfied with the GPMSL courses while the other was very satisfied. The one that was mostly satisfied reported that his lack of satisfaction was from the video-conferencing, which he agreed got better towards the end of his degree. For courses outside of GPMSL, both students were very satisfied.

ranked the quality of student presentations from 1.3 to 1.5 All students combined were ranked as 1.4 by all reviewers combined.

3) Three PhD Marine Biology students graduated this year. The review by the Program Head of these dissertations was assessed as excellent to very good for competence of research skills and excellent to very good for level of written communication skills.

4) These students presented at between five to eight scientific venues while at GPMSL. These were largely split between oral and poster presentations. Thus far, two of the students have one peer-reviewed publication while the other has two.

5) Two of these graduates are working as faculty. The third is working for a non-profit organization in Alaska.

6) All students ranked their research experience and training as mostly satisfied to very satisfied. One student wanted more lab meetings and lab and mentor interactions. These types of interactions seem to vary among our faculty but we should encourage our faculty to have lab meetings and be engaged with their students. In general, these students were mostly to very satisfied with GPMSL and UAF courses. The two students who voiced concern about courses were all related to the lack of quality of statistics courses offered at UAF and the overall lack of...
| Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above | GPMSL faculty have regular, monthly faculty meetings to evaluate and improve our programs. GPMSL decided graduate student satisfaction needed to be measured. An exit interview asking about satisfaction will be implemented next year.

The low number of graduating students in this program is problematic, but the program is only supported by few faculty; however, we will strive to increase the student number. | GPMSL is aware that video-conferencing is important but can be frustrating by technical limitations. We have been working very hard to get the system running smoothly and have seen improvement over the years. We will continue to make this a priority.

We also decided to improve our outcomes assessment metrics by adding a finer scale for the evaluation of theses by the program head.

GPMSL faculty also developed a set of expectations to guide PhD students to be successful in their graduate and following professional career. | GPMSL has been aware of the lack of statistics courses within our department that classes delivered through the Statistics department do not meet our students’ needs. We have voiced this concern with the Statistics department and also have supported the addition of a statistics course in 2010 taught by one of our research faculty in GPMSL. |