

## REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

**Submission date:** 11/15/2023

**Assessment Plan covered in the report:** Natural Resources Technician OEC

**College:** College of Arts and Sciences

**Campuses where the program(s) is delivered:**  Anchorage  KOD  KPC  MSC  PWSC

**Submitted by:** Amanda Glazier, Asst Professor of Environmental Sciences, aeglazier@alaska.edu

*After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.*

- 1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

***Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.***

1. Complete basic techniques in natural resource management - exceeded faculty expectations
2. Demonstrate an understanding of concepts and principles in natural resource management - exceeded faculty expectations
3. Identify and describe the important physical processes that shape the surface of the earth and produce global patterns - exceeded faculty expectations
4. Demonstrate proficiency in small group communication and collaboration - exceeded faculty expectation

- 2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)**

The assessment process involved discussions with faculty and collating data from the individual classes. The faculty were asked for the grades for the assessment measure outlined in the Assessment Plan addressing specific SLOs. They were also asked for the overall grade for the student. The grades

of the assessment measure were then changed to the 10 point scale described in the Assessment Plan, with a grade of A being 10. These numbers were averaged within the assessment measure to determine the class average and this was related to the percentage scale in the Assessment Plan. For example, two grades of C and three of A would equate to two 7.5s, three 9.5s, and an average of 8.7. Equating this to the percentage scale (8.7=87%) gives a total score of “superior.” All of the assessment measures fell into the “exceptional” category on this scale.

We also had a follow-up meeting with the advisory board after the first cohort during which we described the first year of the program, the topics covered, and the skills taught. We took feedback on if these skills are still relevant to their positions and what else we should be covering. This feedback is incorporated into planning for future cohorts.

**3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)**

These findings tell us that the SLOs were met during the first cohort of the program. This cohort had four students and they all exceeded expectations and set a high bar for the coming years. Faculty also wrote short synopses about the cohort, all of which emphasized that the group did exceedingly well, using phrases such as “exceeded expectations” and “committed to the course and completed all assignments with quality efforts and responses.” This shows that the SLOs and assessment measures used to address each were effective in engaging the students with the material and conveying needed skills.

**4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Select Yes or No.**

- i. Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. (1000 words or less)**

No recommendations were made. This being the first cohort of the program and a small group, they were a very motivated group and set a high bar. Assessment of future cohorts will provide more data on assessment measures and SLOs. A change that may be made at this point is changing which assessment measures are used in which course. The Assessment Plan has “Lesson about natural resource management concept or principle” in Conservation of Natural Resources. This was substituted for another major assignment as the SLO addressed with this assessment measure was also being assessed with the “Demonstration of techniques of natural resource management.” Student-led lessons are part of the Biota of Alaska course, so this assessment measure may be changed to that course. This would take the place of the “Course project” as an assessment measure in Biota of Alaska. Another change may be refining the 10 point scale on which the assessment measures are rated. In carrying out this first assessment, it is clear that there needs to be more clarification to what

this scale is. For example, a grade reported by the faculty member of A may be a 10 or a 9. In future years faculty grading the assessment measure may be asked to report the grades on a 10 point scale, as opposed to reporting the letter grade to standardize these measures.

**5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.**

- Course curriculum changes
- Course prerequisite changes
- Changes in teaching methods
- Changes in advising
- Degree requirement changes
- Degree course sequencing
- Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
- Changes in program policies/procedures
- Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
- College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
- Faculty, staff, student development
- Other
- No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

**If you checked "Other" above, please describe. (100 words or less)**

No changes were made because this was the first year of assessment for the program.

**6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. (1000 words or less)**

NA

---

**DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)**

*After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy [uaa\\_ooo@alaska.edu](mailto:uaa_ooo@alaska.edu) for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.*

- 1. Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)**

This assessment was made of the first cohort which consisted of 4 students. The faculty are congratulated for implementing this program and are encouraged to continue to monitor the progress of students in the program to get a larger sample size.

- 2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)**

The program is encouraged to investigate modifications to the assessment process as described in the report in order to improve and streamline the process.

Dean's signature: Jenny McNulty

Date: 1/12/2024