Assessment Analysis Report

Academic Year Assessed: 2018-19
College: Agriculture
Department: Animal & Range Sciences
Department Head: Patrick Hatfield

Majors/Minors/Certificate:	Options
Program(s) Submitted for Assessment by AOC	
BS Animal & Range Sciences	**Equine Science, Livestock Management & Industry, Animal Science**
BS Natural Resources/Rangeland Ecology	**Wildlife Habitat Ecology & Management, Rangeland Ecology/Management**
BS Sustainable Food and Bioenergy	**Livestock Production***
Year 0 Reports	**None submitted**
Programs Not Reported	**Genetics Minor (listed under this department, but interdisciplinary in nature)**
PhD & MS Animal & Range Sciences	**Submitted (but not due until 2020 – will be reviewed in the fall)**
** *BS Ranching Systems (New)**	

***Unique Programming:** Sustainable Food and Bioenergy is an interdisciplinary program that has options in four departments: Livestock Production – Animal & Range Sciences; Agroecology – Land Resources and Environmental Science; and Crop Production – Plant Sciences/Plan Pathology; and Health and Human Development. The Department of Health and Human Development is spearheading an assessment plan that will include all options and have been working collaboratively with the departments in the college of agriculture to develop this strategy.

** For your new program, BS Ranching Systems, please work with your faculty in the development of an assessment plan (Year 0). A Year 0 form will be available on the Provost's Webpage that can be submitted in the fall of 2020, and a full plan can be then submitted in 2021 (with the first cycle of assessment occurring in the academic year of 2021-22).

Overview: The assessment process includes several sections (as described in the assessments form). The first section is a self-evaluation of the process, which directs faculty to consider the main points to which need to be reported. The remaining sections request information on the program learning outcomes, threshold analysis, rubrics used to assess outcomes, results, and analysis. Lastly, we request programs to consider the analysis and reflect on potential programmatic improvements. We also want programs to reflect on past assessments and improvements, and how these changes are reflected in student success (Closing the Loop).

The two programs are reported together in this document. For areas that are specific to one or the other, those programs will be identified individually.

The faculty reviewed the assessment results, and responded accordingly:
Animal Sciences - Revision of PLO's to be more assessable and consistent with industry standards of ethics.
Natural Resources/Rangeland Ecology - revised the PLO's to be more quantifiable and better match the industry standards of ethics.

Does your report demonstrate changes made because of previous assessment results (closing the loop)?
NO__X__

1. Assessment Plan, Schedule and Data Source.

a. Was a multi-year assessment schedule provided that shows when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data)?
Comments: Criteria was completely addressed

b. Where threshold values that will demonstrate student achievement included in the report?
Comments: Criteria was completely addressed

2. What Was Done

Was the submitted assessment report consistent with assessment plan (if plan was included)
Was a rubric included in the report that demonstrated how the assessment artifacts were assessed?
Comments: Yes, the information provided in both reports was through and well-constructed.

3. How Data Were Collected

How were data collected? (including method of collection and sample size).
Was there an explanation on the assessment process, and who participated in the analysis of the data?
Comments: Information well described, no recommendations, the process looks fine.

4. What Was Learned

Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values provided, what was learned from the assessment?
a) Areas of strength – in both programs the strengths identified are consistent with data and program learning outcomes

b) Areas that need improvement – no identifiable areas for improvement were identified (based on the data analysis).

5. How the Department Responded

a) How as "What Was Learned" communicated to the department, or program faculty? Was there a forum for faculty to provide feedback and recommendations?
Comments: Yes, both programs identified the method of communication and faculty feedback.

b) Based on the faculty responses, will there any curricular or assessment changes (such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes)?
Comments: No - The programs did not identify areas for improvement

6. Closing the Loop

Was there any documentation from previous years that can demonstrate program level changes that have led to outcome improvements?

Both programs - The department has now completed one whole cycle of assessment for all 5 learning outcomes. In the next cycle they will be able to investigate outcome changes for Animal Sciences and Natural Resources/Rangeland Ecology

7. AOC Comments and Recommendations

Both programs This is a great example of assessing a difficult concept (ethics). The exam may be further refined by the development of a rubric (so a range of understanding or demonstration can be observed).
Congratulations on the streamlining and definitions of your PLO's!

We concur that there is probably no need to consider curricular changes, but we would recommend these little updates to your assessment process.
The use of "optional" sampling using extra credit may skew and limit the sample pool and having it required could both increase participation and keep the sample more neutral.

NOTE: ALL PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED USING THE ASSESSMENT TEMPLATES PROVIDED ON THE PROVOST'S PROGRAM ASSESSMENT WEBPAGE
https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program_assessment.html
CHECK THE WEB SITE ANNUALLY AS THESE DOCUMENTS ARE UPDATED.