| | 2021 Academic Program Assessment Report | | Program current assessment plan here: | https://www.csupueblo.edu/asses | sment-and-student-learning/_doc/ | 2019/report/wildlife-natr-res-bs | -assessment-plan-2019.pdf |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| PUEBLU | Wildlife and Natural Resources | | Program prior assessment report here: | | sment-and-student-learning/_doc/ | | |
| Report Completed By: | Nate Bickford | | | | | | |
| Date Report Completed: | May 19, 2021 | | | | | | |
| aculty members involved in this Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Please describe this year's assessment ertificate, and graduate program in yo 'he reports will be available to the Dea | ur department.) Please also su | bmit any addenda such as ru the Executive Director for A | brics which are not available ssessment as well as faculty p | in your assessment plan. peer reviewers. | | | |
| Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals: | education courses in biology are a Resources Program emphasizes an laboratory and field exercises. Gra conservation organizations or high Program Goals • To provide students with the nec and natural resources; • To prepare students upon gradu: | vailable to meet a wide range of ir understanding of fish and wildlife duates are prepared for positions ier academic degrees. Carefully su cessary background to successfully ation to enter field positions in go | nterests, backgrounds and needs. T e ecology and management with pr with state and federal agencies, tri pervised career planning is provide y pursue graduate study towards a | The Wildlife and Natural ractical skills obtained during ibal departments, and ed to all students. professional career in wildlife | | | |
| . Assessment of Student Learning C | Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| esults, and recommendations for in mprovements planned for the year | Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle mproved student learning. U based on the assessment p | Jse Column H to describe rocess. | D. Who was assessed? | E. What is the expected | F. What were the results | G. What were the | H. What |
| esults, and recommendations for it | Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle mproved student learning. U based on the assessment p | Jse Column H to describe rocess. | D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N). | • | F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.) | conclusions about | H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment? |
| A. Your program SLOs are pasted nere verbatim from your program SLOs are pasted nere verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter info n columns B-H only for those | Dutcomes (SLOs) in this cycle mproved student learning. Leased on the assessment public based | Jse Column H to describe rocess. C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment | Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or | proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level? 75% of students at 50th percentile nationally in organismal biology and ecology | of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.) 57% (4/7) of students were above the 50th percentile for organismal biology and 86% of students (6/7) were above the 50th percentile for Population Biology, Evolution and Ecology. | department's conclusions about student performance? Scores on the Population Biology, Evolution and Ecology portions of the MFAT were above our goal, however we were below our goal for organismal biology. Our samples very small and this may not represent a consistent pattern. | changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this |
| A. Your program SLOs are pasted nere verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter info n columns B-H only for those assessed during this annual cycle. Students will develop a broad-based movinedge of concepts and terminology in | Dutcomes (SLOs) in this cycle improved student learning. Use based on the assessment public based on the assessment public based on prior to this cycle? (semester and year) | Jse Column H to describe rocess. C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process. | Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N). 7 WANR students enrolled in | proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level? 75% of students at 50th percentile nationally in | of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.) 57% (4/7) of students were above the 50th percentile for organismal biology and 86% of students (6/7) were above the 50th percentile for Population | department's conclusions about student performance? Scores on the Population Biology, Evolution and Ecology portions of the MFAT were above our goal, however we were below our goal for organismab ibiology. Our samples very small and this may not represent a consistent pattern. The student score well in | changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment? There are no plans to change the program at this point until |
| results, and recommendations for in improvements planned for the year A. Your program SLOs are pasted here verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter inform columns B-H only for those assessed during this annual cycle. Students will develop a broad-based mowledge of concepts and terminology in organismal, and ecological biology. | Dutcomes (SLOs) in this cycle mproved student learning. L based on the assessment pi B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year) 2020 | C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process. MFAT | Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N). 7 WANR students enrolled in BIOL 493 in Fall 18 and Spring 19 In herpetology there was 30 WANR students In omithology there was 16 | proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level? 75% of students at 50th percentile nationally in organismal biology and ecology In herpetology 21 students need to score greater than 70% Ornithology 12 students need to | of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.) 57% (4/7) of students were above the 50th percentile for organismal biology and 86% of students (6/7) were above the 50th percentile for Population Biology, Evolution and Ecology. Herpetology 80% of the WANR students scored greater than 70% Omithology 44% of the WANR students scored greater than | department's conclusions about student performance? Scores on the Population Biology, Evolution and Ecology portions of the MFAT were above our goal, however we were below our goal for organismal biology. Our samples very small and this may not represent a consistent pattern. The student score well in herpetology but did not do as well in ornithology. There is not enough data to show | changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment? There are no plans to change the program at this point until we collect more data. There are no plans to change the program at this point until |

| Students will demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving skills using experimental design and the scientific process. | Never | Critical thinking scenario | Enrolled in Wildlife Management (WANR 305) and in Senior Seminar (BIOL 493) | Our goal is to have 75% of our students in BIOL 493 receive an average score of proficient from the faculty | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| Comments on part I: | This is our third year assessing this are still in development and will be patterns but with some small samp of WANR SLO's I think we are doin based on the overall patterns. | completed in the next year. We are le sizes it is difficult to make any cl | e however starting to see some hanges. Looking at the outcomes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least during the year cycle. These are those the results of assessment from previous process. | se that were based on, or in | | | | | | | | |
| A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan, as above. | B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year. | recommendations for | D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon? | E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations? | | | | | |
| We did not make any changes | none | none | none | none | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments on part II: | We added classes to the WANR degree and made a few changes that we feel will be positive for our SLO outcomes. Otherwise, there is not enough data to make new changes. I want three years of data to start looking at the need for changes. | | | | | | | | |