

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
PhD NRS

School of Natural Resources and Extension and School of Management

Expanded Statement of Intuitional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
<p>UAF and the School Natural Resources and Extension is committed to providing quality graduate education through small classes, close student-faculty relationships and research and scholarly endeavor. Continuous self-examination, flexibility and openness to innovation enhance the quality of graduate education available to students.</p> <p>The hallmark of the graduate program in Natural Resources Management is its recognition of individual differences and interests of students, and responding to these individual needs. The PhD NRS focuses on the sustainability of natural resources and communities that depend on those resources.</p> <p>Goal Statement: PhD NRS graduates will enter into advanced research-oriented</p>	<p>1) Graduates will have the research skills to contribute to the advancement of the natural resources sustainability field and address sustainability problems faced by society.</p> <p>2) Graduates are able to synthesize knowledge from multiple disciplines and provide new insights into natural resources sustainability.</p> <p>3) Graduates are proficient in communicating their knowledge in oral and written format to scientists, agencies and private sector personnel at state, national, and international levels.</p> <p>4) Graduates are prepared to enter careers in natural resources management or academia.</p>	<p>1) Comprehensive exam will be evaluated with the Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. 1a) Thesis defenses will be rated on the rigor of the student's research design/analysis and the soundness of the process used to reach their conclusions. 1b) Thesis will be evaluated with the Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric.</p> <p>2) The student's comprehensive exam and thesis will be evaluated with the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving VALUE Rubrics.</p> <p>3) The student's communication skills at their thesis presentation/defense will be evaluated 3a) Theses will be evaluated with the Written Communication VALUE rubric. Theses presentation/defenses will be evaluated with the Oral Communication VALUE</p>	<p>1, 1b, 2, 3a) The graduate committee will assess comprehensive exams, project presentations and theses with the appropriate rubrics. This will be done for each comprehensive exam and thesis presentation. Data will be compiled by the chair of the assessment committee.</p> <p>1a & 3) This will be done via a set of questions passed out to attendees. The chair of the graduate committee will be responsible for administering questionnaires to attendees. The questionnaires will include the rater's affiliation (i.e., faculty, staff, student, and general public). This will be conducted at each thesis presentation. Data will be compiled by the chair of the assessment committee. Results will be presented separately for faculty,</p>

<p>positions within agencies or private firms or enter into academia. They will contribute to the field through publications, conference presentations, and collaboration with other researchers.</p>		<p>rubric.</p> <p>The VALUE rubrics range utilize a 4-point scale, where 1 = benchmark and 4 = capstone; scores ≥ 3.0 will be taken as evidence of competence related to the goal.</p> <p>1a & 3 will be conducted via a set of questions passed out to attendees (see attached). Questions will be asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = weak and 5 = excellent. A score of ≥ 4.0 will be taken as evidence of competence related to the goal.</p> <p>4) Graduates will be tracked to assess career advancement.</p>	<p>staff, and students.</p> <p>4) The Director of Academic Programs will task the academic program assistant with the responsibility of tracking graduates. A qualitative report will summarize employment in the Natural Resources Management field.</p>
---	--	--	---

NRS PhD thesis defense attendee survey (Note for SLOA review: Question 1 evaluates research design, question 2 evaluates methods, question 3 evaluates “soundness” of process to reach conclusions, question 4 evaluates oral communication skills, question 5 written communication skills.)

Student’s Name _____ Date: _____

Your affiliation (please check one): ___ Faculty ___ Staff ___ Student ___ General public

Thank you for taking the time to answer these five questions. Your input will provide guidance to improve the NRS PhD degree program. Please return the completed questionnaire to the committee chair.

1. Rate the student’s research design/methods (circle one).

Weak (i.e., methods not appropriate or applied incorrectly)	Below average (i.e., methods appropriate, but limited understanding)	Average (i.e., methods appropriate, adequate understanding)	Above average (i.e., advanced methods, appropriate understanding)	Excellent (i.e., advanced methods, high level of competency)
1	2	3	4	5

2. Rate the rigor of the student’s methods and analysis (circle one).

Weak (i.e., rudimentary, expect more advanced methodology)	Below average (i.e., sound, but does not reflect most recent advances in field)	Average (i.e., incorporates recent advances, little novelty)	Above average (i.e., provides some advancement of field)	Excellent (i.e., significant advancement to field)
1	2	3	4	5

3. Did the conclusions follow from the results?

Weak (i.e., key findings ignored, no basis for conclusions)	Below average (i.e., attempts to incorporate findings, but not clearly linked)	Average (i.e., linked results to conclusions, but not a strong case)	Above average (i.e., strong case as to how conclusions followed results)	Excellent (i.e., conclusions soundly linked to results)
1	2	3	4	5

4. Rate the student’s oral communication skills.

Weak (i.e., not able to understand/follow, no logical flow)	Below average (i.e., mostly a logical flow, but sections difficult to understand/follow)	Average (i.e., logical flow, OK presentation, room for improvement)	Above average (i.e., Effective at conveying points in logical manner, minor room for improvement)	Excellent (i.e., Highly effective in presenting project, few suggestions for improvement)
1	2	3	4	5

5. Rate the student’s supporting materials (i.e., presentation).

Weak (i.e., not able to follow slides – too busy, poor color choice, etc.; contained typos)	Below average (i.e., could follow slides, formatting distracting, lots of room for improvement)	Average (i.e., easy to follow, effectiveness could be improved)	Above average (i.e., engaging, effective, little room for improvement)	Excellent (i.e., innovative, extremely engaging, highly effective)
1	2	3	4	5