

Program Plan and Findings: Four Column Layout



Program (AG) - AECL - Agricultural Education (PhD) - 009

Program Mission Statement: The Department of Agricultural Education, Communications, and Leadership faculty are committed to preparing agricultural leaders of national prominence in the areas of education, leadership, and communications.

Within each discipline area, departmental faculty will develop life-long learners who understand science, can think critically and creatively, treat others with honesty and respect, and are prepared to be leaders in the agricultural education, communications, and leadership professions.

The department will offer progressive and dynamic graduate programs that attract outstanding graduate students who will become outstanding educators, communicators, leaders, researchers, and society members.

Program Information

2019 - 2020

Program Information

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Jon Ramsey

Assessment Coordinator's E-mail Address: jon.ramsey@okstate.edu

Number of Students Enrolled in the Program: 12

Total Number of Students Graduated: 4

Number of Student Graduates from Stillwater Campus: 4

Number of Student Graduates from Tulsa Campus:

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities?: Yes

If yes, describe how funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process: Assessment funds were used to fund a graduate assistant to assist the program assessment.

Annual Executive Summaries

2019 - 2020

Program Assessment Coordinator: Jon W. Ramsey

Plan Review and Approval

Date Current Plan Was Reviewed and Approved: 09/12/2020

Date of Future Plan Review and Approval: 09/11/2021

Summary of Assessment Findings

Describe overall assessment findings and faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results: The assessment results indicated that students overall performed at an above-average level or higher on all aspects of the assessment. This indicates the students learned at an acceptable level based on current instructional practices, required programs of study, and established graduate advising and mentoring approaches.

Dissemination of Findings

Describe the individual(s) or committee responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data: The assessment report is reviewed by the department's unit administrator and coordinator of graduate studies and available to AECL faculty members.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment findings with program faculty: See above

Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on data collected this year, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?: No significant changes are being considered at this time. Many AECL faculty members, however, remain strongly committed to introducing MS students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing through their thesis research studies, formal reports, creative components, and related writing projects. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with graduates to transform their written works into research conference papers (or presentations) and/or manuscript submissions to peer-refereed journals. As most faculty who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty members will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write.

Based on this year's findings, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?: The department may need to consider other ways to encourage faculty to complete the assessment rubrics so more data can be reported in the future, especially from faculty members who are not members of graduates' committees but attend their dissertation defense presentations. The department's coordinator of graduate studies has consulted with the unit's head on ways to incentivize faculty to participate more fully in the assessment process.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements:

Program Improvements Made in the Last Year: Increased Rigor

"Other" Improvements:

Goals for the Coming Year:

Is this Summary Report Complete?: Yes

List all individuals associated with this report preparation: Jon W. Ramsey; Chelsey Thompson

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Use of Findings (Actions)</i>
<p>Scientific Method - Graduates will demonstrate the ability to think critically and apply the scientific method and knowledge of the agricultural education, communications, and/or leadership fields and related disciplines in conducting research and solving the needs of their professions.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p> <p>Planned Assessment Year: 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020</p>	<p>Oral Presentation - Five students were evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10) during the students' dissertation defense presentations.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome</p> <p>Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined.</p> <p>Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on when students perceive, with the agreement of</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient)</p> <p>The overall mean score for this rubric was 4.37/5.00, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. The data did not indicate any "weaknesses"; the score was in the range of high. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5</p> <p>Number of Successful Students: 5</p> <p>How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: Scores were included for the five students who defended their dissertation research studies for which faculty members completed assessment instruments during the academic period assessed.</p>	<p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. Most AECL faculty members remain strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their dissertation</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	<p>Review of Student Research - Five students were evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10) during the students' dissertation defense presentations.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome</p> <p>Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined.</p> <p>Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chair and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved.</p> <p>Other Assessment Type:</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) The overall mean score for this rubric was 4.29/5.00, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. The data did not indicate any "weaknesses"; the score was in the range of high. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5</p> <p>Number of Successful Students: 5</p> <p>How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: Scores were included for the five students who defended their dissertation research studies for which faculty members completed assessment instruments during the academic period assessed.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: Considering the real limits of the scale, this finding indicated faculty members perceived the graduates performed highly regarding these six items, as assessed based on their dissertation defense presentations.</p>	<p>improving their ability to write. (09/13/2019)</p> <p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. Most AECL faculty members remain strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their dissertation documents into conference papers and/or manuscript submissions to peer-refereed journals. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty members will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/13/2019)</p>
<p>Scientific Communication - Graduates will demonstrate the ability to find, evaluate, and communicate scientific findings and issues in writing and through oral/visual presentations</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p> <p>Planned Assessment Year: 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020</p>	<p>Analysis of Written Artifacts - Five students' dissertation documents were evaluated by their graduate committee members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric." The graduate committee members read and critique the students' written dissertation documents before their oral defense presentations; scale, 1</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) The overall mean score for this rubric was 3.34/4.00, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. The data indicated a small decline in quality of writing compared to last year's average for five graduates, i.e., 3.79/4.00. However, if considering the scale's "real limits," the score was in the same range as the previous assessment year, i.e., high. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5</p>	<p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. Most AECL faculty members remain strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Use of Findings (Actions)</i>
<p>Start Date: Archived Date: Outcome Type: Skills Reason for Archival:</p>	<p>= low to 4 = high. * Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chair and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved. Other Assessment Type:</p>	<p>Number of Successful Students: 5 How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: Scores were included for the five students who defended their dissertation research studies for which faculty members completed assessment instruments during the academic period assessed. What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: This finding indicated faculty members perceived the graduates performed highly overall regarding the writing portion of their dissertation defenses; however, some room existed for further improvement.</p>	<p>programs. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their dissertation documents into conference papers and/or manuscript submissions to peer-refereed journals. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty members will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/12/2020)</p>
	<p>Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component - Five students' dissertation documents were evaluated by their graduate committee members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric." The graduate committee members read and critique the students' written dissertation documents before their oral defense presentations; scale, 1 = low to 4 = high. * Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chair and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020 Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) The overall mean score for this rubric was 3.34/4.00, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. The data indicated a small decline in quality of writing compared to last year's average for five graduates, i.e., 3.79/4.00. However, if considering the scale's "real limits," the score was in the same range as the previous assessment year, i.e., high. (09/12/2020) Number of Students Assessed: 5 Number of Successful Students: 5 How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: Scores were included for the five students who defended their dissertation research studies for which faculty members completed assessment instruments during the academic period assessed. What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: This finding indicated faculty members perceived the graduates performed highly overall regarding the writing portion of their dissertation defenses; however, some room existed for further improvement.</p>	<p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. Most AECL faculty members remain strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their dissertation documents into conference papers and/or manuscript submissions to peer-refereed journals. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	<p>dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved.</p> <p>Other Assessment Type:</p> <p>Review of Student Research - Five students' dissertation documents were evaluated by their graduate committee members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric." The graduate committee members read and critique the students' written dissertation documents before their oral defense presentations; scale, 1 = low to 4 = high.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome</p> <p>Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined.</p> <p>Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chair and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved.</p> <p>Other Assessment Type:</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) The overall mean score for this rubric was 3.34/4.00, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. The data indicated a small decline in quality of writing compared to last year's average for five graduates, i.e., 3.79/4.00. However, if considering the scale's "real limits," the score was in the same range as the previous assessment year, i.e., high. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5</p> <p>Number of Successful Students: 5</p> <p>How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: Scores were included for the five students who defended their dissertation research studies for which faculty members completed assessment instruments during the academic period assessed.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: This finding indicated faculty members perceived the graduates performed highly overall regarding the writing portion of their dissertation defenses; however, some room existed for further improvement.</p>	<p>faculty members will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. Most AECL faculty members remain strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. In some cases, faculty members are working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their dissertation documents into conference papers and/or manuscript submissions to peer-refereed journals. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty members will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/13/2019)</p>
<p>Disciplinary and Specialization Area Knowledge - A. Students demonstrate an in-depth understanding of disciplinary and specialization area knowledge, i.e., Section 1: History and Philosophy of</p>	<p>Analysis of Written Artifacts - A. The students' committee members provide most of the questions for their written comprehensive examinations. In some cases, however, the committee chair may</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) A. Committee members use the "Comprehensive Examination Assessment Rubric" to evaluate and score the students' written answers (1= Low to 5 = High). B. Faculty members who attend students' dissertation defense</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
<p>Agricultural Education (AGED 6103) or Agricultural Communications (AGCM 5103), Section 2: Specialization (courses vary among AGED, AGCM, and AGLE graduate course offerings), Section 3: Research Methods and Statistics (AGED 5983 and/or AGED 5993, and AGED 6983 or an equivalent graduate level course), and Section 4: Change Theory (AGED 5863), Program Evaluation (AGED 6223 or an equivalent graduate level course), and Leadership (AGLE 5303 and/or AGLE 5353).</p> <p>This assessment is done through a written and oral examination procedure over several days. The students' graduate committee members evaluate their written answers. Thereafter, students meet with their committee to answer additional related questions and/or offer further explanation of and rationale for their answers.</p> <p>B. Each student is also evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1,2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) during their respective dissertation defense presentations. Their dissertation research studies and corresponding defenses are a summative outcome of AGED 6000, Research in Agricultural Education (15 credit hours), as well as learning derived from 45 credit hours of other course work.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>ask another faculty member, who is not a member of the student's committee but had the student in a particular course, to provide a question for the examination. The written examination is divided into four 3-hour sessions during which the student answers three questions for a total of 12 responses. It is an "on-demand" writing exercise. Two sessions may occur during one day or the sessions can extend over four days. The students are provided a departmental computer to use; their answers are saved on a USB provided by a staff member who oversees the process. A staff member prints the students' answers for review by members of their respective graduate committees.</p> <p>B. Each student was evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) during their respective dissertation defense presentations.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on a) when he or she has completed at least 40 credit hours of non- AGED 6000 course work and the consent of their graduate committee chair (usually at the end of year two or near the beginning of year three of their program); and b)</p>	<p>presentations evaluate their performance using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16); scale anchor descriptions vary but in all cases 1= Low and 5 = High.</p> <p>A. Data are reported for five students on this measure. Overall, the students averaged 3.92/5.00 on all items assessed by the four sections of the examination. The mean scores by section were Section 1, 3.98/5.00; Section 2, 3.87/5.00; Section 3, 3.70/5.00; and Section 4, 4.11/5.00. These scores reflected the views of 11 evaluators, i.e., faculty members. Although not "weak," the students scored lowest overall on sections 2 and 4 of the examination, and scored highest on sections 1 and 3. This performance varied somewhat -- both higher and lower depending on the section -- compared to data reported the previous year, but in regard to "real limit" ranges, no changes occurred. The examinees scored almost one-half point higher on section 1 assessing their knowledge of the History & Philosophy of Agricultural Education and about one-half point lower on section 4 regarding the assessment of Change Theory, Program Evaluation, and Leadership compared to the previous year's results.</p> <p>B. The overall average score for the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) was 4.74/5.00 for five PhD graduates, and it reflected the views of 10 faculty members. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5 Number of Successful Students: 5 How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: The scores were included for students who completed their comprehensive examinations (see A.) or defended their dissertation research studies (see B.) during the academic period assessed for which faculty members submitted assessment instruments.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: On average, the students understood the questions or problems presented, cited</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
<p>Planned Assessment Year: 2016 - 2017, 2017 - 2018, 2018 - 2019, 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Start Date:</p> <p>Archived Date:</p> <p>Outcome Type: Knowledge</p> <p>Reason for Archival:</p>	<p>when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chairs and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved.</p> <p>Other Assessment Type:</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CASNR_AECL_grad_rubric.pdf</p>	<p>appropriate sources and research, logically developed the most important aspects of the problem or issue, and concluded with a cogent position. Considering the real limits of the scale, all four construct means and the grand mean were within the range of above average.</p> <p>B. Considering the real limits of the scale, this finding indicated faculty members perceived the students performed highly regarding the eight items assessed, as based on their dissertation defense presentations.</p>	
	<p>Oral Presentation - A. The students' committee members provide most of the questions for their written comprehensive examinations. In some cases, however, the committee chair may ask another faculty member, who is not a member of the student's committee but had the student in a particular course, to provide a question for the examination. The written examination is divided into four 3-hour sessions during which the student answers three questions for a total of 12 responses. It is an "on-demand" writing exercise. Two sessions may occur during one day or the sessions can extend over four days. The students are provided a departmental computer to use; their answers are saved on a USB provided by a staff member who oversees the process. A staff member prints the students' answers for review by members of their respective graduate committees.</p> <p>B. Each student was evaluated by faculty members using the</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient)</p> <p>A. Committee members use the "Comprehensive Examination Assessment Rubric" to evaluate and score the students' written answers (1= Low to 5 = High). B. Faculty members who attend students' dissertation defense presentations evaluate their performance using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16); scale anchor descriptions vary but in all cases 1= Low and 5 = High.</p> <p>A. Data are reported for five students on this measure. Overall, the students averaged 3.92/5.00 on all items assessed by the four sections of the examination. The mean scores by section were Section 1, 3.98/5.00; Section 2, 3.87/5.00; Section 3, 3.70/5.00; and Section 4, 4.11/5.00. These scores reflected the views of 8 evaluators, i.e., faculty members. Although not "weak," the students scored lowest overall on sections 2 and 4 of the examination, and scored highest on sections 1 and 3.</p> <p>B. The overall average score for the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) was 4.74/5.00 for five PhD graduates, and it reflected the views of 8 faculty members.</p> <p>(09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5</p> <p>Number of Successful Students: 5</p> <p>How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: The scores were included for</p>	<p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. AECL faculty members, however, are strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. Several of the students included in this assessment period had worked with faculty members to co-author multiple research conference paper and poster presentations (regional, national, and international). In some cases, faculty members are also working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their conference papers into manuscript submissions for review by peer-refereed journals. Of note, several students included in this report have co-authored articles with faculty members accepted for publication, i.e., in press, respectively, in three different peer-refereed journals, as appropriate for their scholarly disciplines and career foci. As</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	<p>"Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) during their respective dissertation defense presentations.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on a) when he or she has completed at least 40 credit hours of non- AGED 6000 course work and the consent of their graduate committee chair (usually at the end of year two or near the beginning of year three of their program); and b) when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chairs and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved. Other Assessment Type: Related Documents: CASNR_AECL_grad_rubric.pdf Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component - A. The students' committee members provide most of the questions for their written comprehensive examinations. In some cases, however, the committee chair may ask another faculty member, who is not a member of the student's committee but had the student in a particular course, to provide a question for the examination. The written examination is divided into four 3-</p>	<p>students who completed their comprehensive examinations (see A.) or defended their dissertation research studies (see B.) during the academic period assessed for which faculty members submitted assessment instruments.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: On average, the students understood the questions or problems presented, cited appropriate sources and research, logically developed the most important aspects of the problem or issue, and concluded with a cogent position. Considering the real limits of the scale, all four construct means and the grand mean were within the range of above average.</p> <p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020 Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient) A. Committee members use the "Comprehensive Examination Assessment Rubric" to evaluate and score the students' written answers (1= Low to 5 = High). B. Faculty members who attend students' dissertation defense presentations evaluate their performance using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16); scale anchor descriptions vary but in all cases 1= Low and 5 = High. A. Data are reported for five students on this measure. Overall, the students averaged 3.92/5.00 on all items assessed by the four sections of the examination. The mean</p>	<p>most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. AECL faculty members, however, are strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. Several of the students included in this assessment period had worked with faculty members to co-author multiple research conference paper and poster</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	<p>hour sessions during which the student answers three questions for a total of 12 responses. It is an "on-demand" writing exercise. Two sessions may occur during one day or the sessions can extend over four days. The students are provided a departmental computer to use; their answers are saved on a USB provided by a staff member who oversees the process. A staff member prints the students' answers for review by members of their respective graduate committees.</p> <p>B. Each student was evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) during their respective dissertation defense presentations.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on a) when he or she has completed at least 40 credit hours of non- AGED 6000 course work and the consent of their graduate committee chair (usually at the end of year two or near the beginning of year three of their program); and b) when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chairs and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5</p>	<p>scores by section were Section 1, 3.98/5.00; Section 2, 3.87/5.00; Section 3, 3.70/5.00; and Section 4, 4.11/5.00. These scores reflected the views of 8 evaluators, i.e., faculty members. Although not "weak," the students scored lowest overall on sections 2 and 4 of the examination, and scored highest on sections 1 and 3.</p> <p>B. The overall average score for the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) was 4.74/5.00 for five PhD graduates, and it reflected the views of 8 faculty members. (09/12/2020) Number of Students Assessed: 5 Number of Successful Students: 5 How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: The scores were included for students who completed their comprehensive examinations (see A.) or defended their dissertation research studies (see B.) during the academic period assessed for which faculty members submitted assessment instruments.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: On average, the students understood the questions or problems presented, cited appropriate sources and research, logically developed the most important aspects of the problem or issue, and concluded with a cogent position. Considering the real limits of the scale, all four construct means and the grand mean were within the range of above average.</p>	<p>presentations (regional, national, and international). In some cases, faculty members are also working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their conference papers into manuscript submissions for review by peer-refereed journals. Of note, several students included in this report have co-authored articles with faculty members accepted for publication, i.e., in press, respectively, in three different peer-refereed journals, as appropriate for their scholarly disciplines and career foci. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty will continue to advise students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/12/2020)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Findings	Use of Findings (Actions)
	<p>chapters) have been achieved.</p> <p>Other Assessment Type: Related Documents: CASNR_AECL_grad_rubric.pdf</p> <p>Review of Student Research - A. Students demonstrate an in-depth understanding of disciplinary and specialization area knowledge, i.e., Section 1: History and Philosophy of Agricultural Education (AGED 6103) or Agricultural Communications (AGCM 5103), Section 2: Specialization (courses vary among AGED, AGCM, and AGLE graduate course offerings), Section 3: Research Methods and Statistics (AGED 5983 and/or AGED 5993, and AGED 6983 or an equivalent graduate-level course), and Section 4: Change Theory (AGED 5863), Program Evaluation (AGED 6223 or an equivalent graduate-level course), and Leadership (AGLE 5303 and/or AGLE 5353). This assessment is done through a written and oral examination procedure over several days. The students' graduate committee members evaluate their written answers. Thereafter, students meet with their committee to answer additional related questions and/or offer further explanation of and rationale for their answers.</p> <p>B. Each student is also evaluated by faculty members using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1,2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) during their respective dissertation defense</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020</p> <p>Conclusion: 3 - Meets Program Expectations (Proficient)</p> <p>A. Committee members use the "Comprehensive Examination Assessment Rubric" to evaluate and score the students' written answers (1= Low to 5 = High). B. Faculty members who attend students' dissertation defense presentations evaluate their performance using the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16); scale anchor descriptions vary but in all cases 1= Low and 5 = High.</p> <p>A. Data are reported for five students on this measure. Overall, the students averaged 3.92/5.00 on all items assessed by the four sections of the examination. The mean scores by section were Section 1, 3.98/5.00; Section 2, 3.87/5.00; Section 3, 3.70/5.00; and Section 4, 4.11/5.00. These scores reflected the views of 8 evaluators, i.e., faculty members. Although not "weak," the students scored lowest overall on sections 2 and 4 of the examination, and scored highest on sections 1 and 3.</p> <p>B. The overall average score for the "Thesis/Dissertation Defense Assessment Rubric" (Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 16) was 4.74/5.00 for five PhD graduates, and it reflected the views of 8 faculty members. (09/12/2020)</p> <p>Number of Students Assessed: 5 Number of Successful Students: 5</p> <p>How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?: The scores were included for students who completed their comprehensive examinations (see A.) or defended their dissertation research studies (see B.) during the academic period assessed for which faculty members submitted assessment instruments.</p> <p>What do the findings suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?: On average, the students</p>	<p>Use of Findings (Actions): No significant changes are being considered at this time. AECL faculty members, however, are strongly committed to introducing PhD students to the art and practice of communicating scholarship orally and in writing throughout their doctoral programs. Several of the students included in this assessment period had worked with faculty members to co-author multiple research conference paper and poster presentations (regional, national, and international). In some cases, faculty members are also working closely with students (or graduates) to transform their conference papers into manuscript submissions for review by peer-refereed journals. Of note, several students included in this report have co-authored articles with faculty members accepted for publication, i.e., in press, respectively, in three different peer-refereed journals, as appropriate for their scholarly disciplines and career foci. As most faculty members who regularly publish scholarship realize, teaching students to write effectively for a scholarly audience is a "heavy lift." The "lifting" continues in AECL. Finally, AECL faculty will continue to advise</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Use of Findings (Actions)</i>
	<p>presentations. Their dissertation research studies and corresponding defenses are a summative outcome of AGED 6000, Research in Agricultural Education (15 credit hours), as well as learning derived from 45 credit hours of other course work.</p> <p>* Learning Outcome Goal/Benchmark: No goal defined. Timeline for Assessment: The assessment varies by student depending on a) when he or she has completed at least 40 credit hours of non- AGED 6000 course work and the consent of their graduate committee chair (usually at the end of year two or near the beginning of year three of their program); and b) when students perceive, with the agreement of their graduate committee chairs and other committee members, that acceptable drafts of their dissertation documents (all 5 chapters) have been achieved. Other Assessment Type: Related Documents: CASNR_AECL_grad_rubric.pdf</p>	<p>understood the questions or problems presented, cited appropriate sources and research, logically developed the most important aspects of the problem or issue, and concluded with a cogent position. Considering the real limits of the scale, all four construct means and the grand mean were within the range of above average.</p>	<p>students to use the services of OSU's Writing Center and the Edmon Low Library to assist in improving their ability to write. (09/12/2020)</p>