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PROGRAM GOALS AND MISSION STATEMENT

A. GOALS

The Fish and Wildlife Science degree program prepares students for careers with federal, state, and local government agencies, private non-profit organizations (NGOs), and private businesses, as well as for post-baccalaureate studies in fish and wildlife science and related fields. The Department strives to upgrade equipment and technology so that students have the opportunity to use state-of-the-art technology in academic and research activities.

B. MISSION STATEMENT

Our faculty is dedicated to providing the courses and applied experiences that will enable Fish and Wildlife Science students to gain employment or continue their education at the graduate level. We seek to educate our students about the theoretical, technical, and ethical aspects of the Fish and Wildlife Science profession.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

Outcome 1: Demonstrate knowledge of basic conservation principles, concepts, theories, and competency in the scientific method and the skills to use it; the acquisition, organization, and evaluation of data.

Assessment Methods

1. ETS Major Field Test in Biology
   a. Given in Senior Seminar
   b. Note: There is not a major field test or nationally-normed test for the Fish and Wildlife Science degree, so we use the ETS test given that the professional societies have not developed a nationally-normed test. Last year we added a Fish and Wildlife Science Program in-house assessment test to directly assess the efficacy of our degree program.

Results

Ten Fish and Wildlife Science majors completed the ETS Major Field Test in Biology during the 2009-2010 academic year in the Senior Seminar. Table 1 compares scores of Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Science students on the ETS Major Field Test in Biology with national averages. Table 2 provides a five-year comparison of ETS test overall scores and subscores for Fish and Wildlife Science students.
Table 1. Comparison of 2009-2010 Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Science graduates with national averages for the ETS Major Field Test in Biology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Mean Score ± SD</th>
<th>Cell Biology</th>
<th>Molecular Biology and Genetics</th>
<th>Organismal Biology</th>
<th>Population Biology, Evolution, Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;W Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150.9 ± 7.0</td>
<td>39.9 ± 8.4</td>
<td>43.5 ± 8.7</td>
<td>54.1 ± 7.8</td>
<td>60.7 ± 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>30,852</td>
<td>153.4 ± 13.2</td>
<td>55.0 ± 13.2</td>
<td>53.7 ± 13.1</td>
<td>53.1 ± 13.5</td>
<td>53.3 ± 13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of 2005-2010 Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Science graduates with national averages for the ETS Major Field Test in Biology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Mean Score ± SD</th>
<th>Cell Biology</th>
<th>Molecular Biology and Genetics</th>
<th>Organismal Biology</th>
<th>Population Biology, Evolution, Ecology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145.0 ± 12.7</td>
<td>40.2 ± 11.6</td>
<td>41.2 ± 10.2</td>
<td>46.4 ± 15.8</td>
<td>53.2 ± 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145.6 ± 6.6</td>
<td>41.5 ± 11.0</td>
<td>47.4 ± 7.0</td>
<td>40.4 ± 8.6</td>
<td>55.3 ± 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140.3 ± 12.0</td>
<td>34.0 ± 10.0</td>
<td>41.0 ± 10.0</td>
<td>45.0 ± 13.0</td>
<td>46.0 ± 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>140.0 ± 8.3</td>
<td>34.1 ± 12.4</td>
<td>42.1 ± 11.9</td>
<td>42.4 ± 10.2</td>
<td>46.9 ± 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150.9 ± 7.0</td>
<td>39.9 ± 8.4</td>
<td>43.5 ± 8.7</td>
<td>54.1 ± 7.8</td>
<td>60.7 ± 9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis and Interpretation

Overall mean ETS scores rose ten points for 2009-2010 by Fish and Wildlife Science graduates. Table 2 shows a comparison of Fish and Wildlife Science major’s scores from 2005-2010. We saw major gains this year in Organismal Biology (up almost 12 points), Population Biology and Ecology (up almost 14 points), and Cell Biology (up almost 6 points). We saw a slight increase in Molecular Biology. We expect higher scores in the Organismal Biology and Population Biology, Evolution, and Ecology areas as students have course work in this area. We expect lower scores in Cell Biology and Molecular Biology and Genetics as students have little course work in this area. This year’s group of graduates was generally a very strong academic pool, so we are pleased but not surprised by the increases in ETS scores.

We only administer the ETS test to our Fish and Wildlife Science students because prior IAC committees told us to give a nationally-normed test, even though it is not specifically relevant to the course work completed by Fish and Wildlife Science students. We stress that there is no nationally-normed test for the Fish and Wildlife Science degree from either of the two professional societies in the field. To address this need, we now give an in-house Fish and Wildlife Science program assessment test to better assess the effectiveness of our program. We give the new test to Conservation of Natural Resources students as a pre-test (over 30 students have taken the pretest to date) and in Senior Seminar as a post-test (10 students to date).

During 2008-2009, we developed an in-house Fish and Wildlife Science program assessment test to better assess the effectiveness of our program. We feel this is a significant improvement over the past situation, even though the test would not be nationally-normed. We began giving the new assessment exam in Fall 2009 as a program pre-test and also giving it as a program post-test starting in Fall 2009. Drs. Wood and Rice administer the exam in Conservation of Natural Resources and Senior Seminar respectively. We believe this provides us with a better assessment tool for our program. Mean pre-test scores are 37/100 compared to 65/100 post-test. We will make modifications if needed based on a larger sample size of test scores in the coming years.

In 2008-2009, we received approval to change the Conservation degree requirements and renamed the degree Fisheries and Wildlife Science. This change modified our curriculum to include more required courses in specific areas and dropping courses not germane to the student’s professional development based on feedback from employers and stakeholders. We required more classes in zoology, limnology, and technical and professional writing, but dropped courses in genetics and evolution. These changes address deficiencies in organismal biology and population biology as well as emphasizing technical writing skills that employers have requested from our graduates. Genetics and evolution are covered heavily in introductory biology courses and applied in various zoology and management courses. We also attempted to keep aligned with professional certification requirements of The Wildlife Society and The American Fisheries Society. These are the premier professional associations for our graduates and their certifications are valued by employers such as federal and state agencies, private industry, and non-governmental organizations. We believe the increases in ETS scores in Organismal Biology and Ecology will continue to reflect this modification.
Program Modifications

We are making a change in Senior Seminar to be more focused on Fish and Wildlife material rather than Biology. The class will meet separately from the Biology Senior Seminar. We think this will improve the efficacy of the seminar class.

Outcome 2: Manifest both oral and written communication skills in presentation of complex conservation and biological topics.

Assessment Methods

1. Research Paper and Oral Presentation in Senior Seminar

Results

The writing skills of 10 Fish and Wildlife Science majors in Senior Seminar 2009-2010 were assessed by a research paper and an oral presentation. The average score for the research paper was 91%, which is 2% higher than last year. The average score for the presentation was 97%, which is 23% higher than last year.

Five-year Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Paper</th>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Presentations

Fish and Wildlife Students also presented their research data at various conferences and public meetings in the last year. The following is a summary list of student oral presentations in 2009-2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Number Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Association of Naturalists</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Academy of Science Technical Meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Meeting of the Arkansas and Oklahoma Chapter, American Fisheries Society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Alliance for Minority Participation Annual Research Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Ornithological Society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie and Timbers Audubon Society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbuckle-Simpson Nature Festival</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coal County Conservation Fair

Analysis and Interpretation

The research paper scores were slightly higher and the presentation scores were significantly higher than last years. This year’s graduates had consistently high GPAs as a group and we expected an increase in the assessment scores. The five-year summary reflects variation in academic prowess of different groups of graduates. In 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, a couple students failed to complete the presentation and that dropped the averages substantially from the rest of the distribution.

2. Student Questionnaire: students given an exit survey in Senior Seminar

Results

The exit survey, that 9 graduating Fish and Wildlife Science majors completed, indicated that 67% had to write 4 or more short (<5 pages) assignments and 78% had to write 4 or more long (>5 pages) assignments in Fish and Wildlife Science courses. One student did not complete the exit survey. Seventy-eight percent of Fish and Wildlife Science majors indicated that they had to give 4 or more oral and/or poster presentations in their Fish and Wildlife Science courses.

Five-year Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Short Papers</th>
<th>Long Papers</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Interpretation

We are pleased with the exit survey data as it strongly indicated that students were required to write numerous papers and give presentations. Scores less than 100% for the writing and presentation requirements reflect the fact that students taking the survey in the fall had not completed the requisite writing/presentation assignments for classes they were taking that semester or in the spring semester. This demonstrates that the outcome has been met successfully. The five-year summary indicates a strong component of writing and presentation requirements for students. Our stakeholders stress written and oral communication frequently and we have maintained a high level of student experiences in this area. Some lower scores reflect students who may not have completed all these assignments at time they took the survey. All students are required to do at least 4 or more assignments in these areas as part of our curriculum, so the scores should be 100% across the board.
Outcome 3: Show proficiency in library and computer skills in obtaining information and analyzing data.

Assessment Methods

1. Research Paper and Oral Presentation in Senior Seminar - see Outcome 2 above.
2. Capstone Course - see Outcome 1 above.

Outcome 4: Be exposed to methods of recognizing, preventing, and responding appropriately to laboratory hazards or hazardous conditions.

Assessment Methods

1. Student Questionnaire

Results

Safety is an important aspect of many Fish and Wildlife courses. Twelve of our regularly offered courses include both lab and field components and we offer several special topics courses with field components. All professors provide students handouts about lab/field safety at the beginning of the semester and/or also in their syllabi. All labs are up to safety standards upon inspection including MSDS sheets, fire extinguishers, eye washes, deluge showers, goggles, gloves, safety maps on walls, and other safety equipment. These features are discussed at the beginning of each semester.

Students indicated in the exit survey that 100% of them had received excellent information regarding safety procedures in field courses and 88% had received excellent or more than adequate safety information in lab courses.

Five-year Summary. Percent identifying as having excellent or more than adequate safety information provided in lab and field classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Field Safety</th>
<th>Lab Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Interpretation

We believe our assessment tools and data show that our faculty are committed to creating a culture of safety in the lab and in the field. Students clearly stated that they received multiple safety briefings and handouts that emphasized safety. Our safety track record is good in this area
and we are always vigilant. The five-year summary indicates that we have maintained a consistently high student response to our safety instructions in each class.

**Outcome 5:** Qualify for entry-level employment or continuing education in Fish and Wildlife or related fields.

**Assessment Methods**

1. Student Questionnaire

**Results**

We used the data from the 9 students who took the exit survey and answered two primary questions about how they felt about their education in the Fish and Wildlife degree program at Southeastern. In response to the question about overall quality of instruction in the Fish and Wildlife program, 89% stated that they received excellent instruction and 11% indicated more than adequate instructional quality. This represented a 40-50% increase from last year. In response to the question about their overall satisfaction about the Fish and Wildlife degree program, 100% rated their satisfaction as excellent, which is a 50% increase from last year.

**Analysis and Interpretation**

Based on student responses (and post-graduate success - see below), we believe that students feel they received a high quality education in our program that prepared them to compete with graduates of other institutions in the current workforce.

We routinely invite guest speakers to our courses and also take field trips to visit Fish and Wildlife professionals in the field. For example, the CONS 1124 class has 5-6 guest speakers per semester that discuss with our students the merits of our Fish and Wildlife degree in obtaining employment with various agencies or private industry. We share the curriculum we offer with the guest speakers and they offer feedback to us. We often invite students that graduated from Southeastern so the students and faculty get direct feedback on our program from recent and past graduates working with their degree in the Fish and Wildlife field.

Similarly, students who graduate with a Fish and Wildlife degree are contacted informally to see how they are doing and how we could better service our students based on the graduates’ experiences in the workforce. We encourage them to maintain contact with us throughout their career for similar feedback. This has been part of the assessment culture in the Fish and Wildlife program since its inception.

**List of Stakeholders, Employers, and Relevant Constituents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current SOSU students and faculty</th>
<th>SOSU graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Forest Service</td>
<td>U.S. National Park Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Parks and Wildlife
Environmental Consulting companies
Natural Gas and Oil companies
Ducks Unlimited

Oklahoma and Texas high schools
Timber companies
The Nature Conservancy
Quail Unlimited

Graduate M.S. and Ph.D. programs at OU, OSU, LSU, NMSU, Texas Tech among others

3. Professional Placement of Graduates in their Degree Field
   a. Maintain contact with graduates through email, Facebook and other interactive formats.

Results
Post-graduation success of Fish and Wildlife Science majors is a critical measure of a program’s success. We present below some of the early outcomes for our 2009-2010 graduates.

Outcomes:
1 graduate entered the Fish and Wildlife Science Masters program at Texas Tech University.
1 graduate entered the Biology Masters program (thesis option) at Southeastern Oklahoma State University.
1 graduate entered the Biology Masters program (non-thesis option) at Southeastern Oklahoma State University.
1 graduate entered the Biology Masters program at Black Hills State University in South Dakota.
1 graduate of our program was already self-employed and has returned to his business post-graduation.
1 graduate of our program finished the Texas Wildlife Law Enforcement Academy and is working as a game warden in southwestern Texas.

Although we do not have a long-term monitoring method to study post-graduate outcomes of our students, we receive frequent feedback from alumni about their career successes. We periodically try to contact students and see if they are using their degree in their career. We estimate approximately 70% of our graduates in the last five years are working in their degree field; either as graduate students or employed in the Fish and Wildlife Science field in some capacity.

Analysis and Interpretation

We are pleased at the high percentage of students entering graduate programs post-graduation. We have strongly encouraged students to obtain a graduate degree to be more competitive in a challenging job market. Most fish and wildlife biologist jobs now require or strongly suggest at least a masters degree. We believe our program has been successful in placing graduates consistently in the job market and graduate programs. We will continue to try and monitor post-graduate success of our majors.
ASSESSING IETV AND/OR WEB-BASED INSTRUCTION

No classes are offered via IETV or web-based instruction in the Fish and Wildlife Science degree program. We do not offer distance learning in this degree program because labs, field trips, and field projects are required in these classes. Field skills can’t be taught online (e.g., handling snakes, mammals etc), so we focus on in-person learning rather than distance learning.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES - INTERNAL

In 2009-2010, the Fish and Wildlife Science degree program underwent external program review. Our external reviewers ranked the program "Excellent" and the faculty "Outstanding". They emphasized our curriculum requirements, field experiences, and technologies (e.g., GIS) as strengths. Weaknesses included absence of departmental vehicles, limited degree-specific library resources, and heavy teaching loads.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES - INTERNAL

We gathered information from the Fish and Wildlife Science faculty, student exit surveys, and recently graduates. We will continue to gather data in these areas as appropriate and evaluate. Summary data is listed in Appendix 1.

Strengths:
1. Small class sizes are optimal for field courses
   - Student exit surveys indicated 100% of graduates felt class sizes were just right.
2. Many field trips and labs
   - 78% of graduates indicated field trips and labs were best experiences of the program.
3. Access to faculty research projects
   - 67% of graduates indicated that they benefitted from participating in faculty research.
4. Elective classes that are field-based
   - Full enrollments in special topics classes like River Ecology, Field Ornithology indicate strong student support of this part of our program.
5. Good diversity of classes in the curriculum
   - 58 hours of required course work across broad spectrum of Fish and Wildlife Science.
6. Numerous presentations by guest speakers who are biologists
   - 89% of our students indicated they had at least 4 or more guest speakers in their classes.
7. Opportunities to attend professional conferences with faculty
   - Last year students attended professional meetings of the American Fisheries Society, Oklahoma Ornithological Society, Oklahoma Academy of Science, and the Oklahoma Ornithological Society among others. Many of these students presented an oral or poster presentation.
8. High level of job placement in the field.
   - Most of our graduates last year earned a place in graduate school.
9. Frequently receive positive feedback from our graduates.
100% of our graduates last year indicated an Excellent rating of our program

10. Good interaction among Fish and Wildlife faculty
   - See #7 above

11. Strong professional work ethic among most students
   - Graduates endure a lengthy degree with many hours outside class spent on field trips, projects, and elective field classes.

12. Access to internships in the field
   - Students last year interned locally with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oklahoma Department of Conservation, and the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Employers emphasize students need better communication skills
   - Feedback from guest speakers have emphasized this in multiple classes

2. Enrollment numbers low
   - Graduating 8-10 students/year, but typically start with double that number as incoming freshman

3. Academic quality of students low upon admittance to Southeastern
   - 50% drop in students majoring in Fish and Wildlife by junior year.

4. No freshman orientation course

5. No entomology course

6. Southeastern van requirements impede our ability to deliver our field classes as easily as in the past
   - Classes with 24 students require 3 vehicles and 3 van safety certified drivers that are employed by university

7. Senior seminar class needs to be more focused on Fish and Wildlife Science rather than Biology
   - Changed curriculum to make this more focused on Fish and Wildlife Science

8. Poor professionalism and lack of work ethic among incoming students
   - See #3 above

9. Little experience in systematic botany in summer and fall due to lack of courses during those semesters

10. High number of transfer students that have poor preparation for Fish and Wildlife courses prior to Southeastern

11. Poor math and writing skills of incoming students

**HOW HAS FACULTY HAD INPUT INTO THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS?**

All Fish and Wildlife faculty assisted in the development of the assessment plan. Each faculty member has the opportunity to review/edit the assessment report. The Department is very open and collaborative when faculty feel that changes need to be made in the program (e.g., recent degree program curriculum changes. Listed below are specific duties of faculty members:

1. ETS Major Field Test in Biology given by Dr. Rice in Senior Seminar. Analyzed by
Dr. Wood.

2. Writing assignments and oral presentations given and graded by Dr. Rice in Senior Seminar.

4. Senior Seminar content designed by all conservation faculty members and taught by Dr. Rice.

5. Exit survey given to graduating seniors during Senior Seminar by Dr. Rice. Analyzed by Dr. Wood.

6. Feedback of professional job placement by graduates by all Fish and Wildlife Science faculty.

7. All Fish and Wildlife Science faculty participated in developing the new Fish and Wildlife Science mission statement.

9. All Fish and Wildlife Science faculty were consulted and had input on our safety procedures, handouts, and syllabi statements.

10. All Fish and Wildlife Science faculty collaborated on developing our new curricula for the Fish and Wildlife Science Senior Seminar starting in Spring 2011.

RESPONSE TO IAC COMMITTEE EVALUATION 2009-2010

1. We do not agree with two scores we received. One, we received a 1.80 out of 4.00 for identifying our stakeholders and constituents. We provided an extensive detailed list of our constituents and stakeholders in our report. We are not sure how this score could have been given when we provided exactly what the rubric calls for and no comment was provided as to why this score was so low. Two, we received a 0.00 score out of 4.00 for how assessment data is shared with stakeholders and their implications. We provided a detailed explanation of how we meet and share information with our stakeholders. No comments were provided to explain this score. How could we receive a zero when we provided the information specified by the rubric?

2. We provide reasons for the decision not to provide distance learning in the Fish and Wildlife Science curriculum. Labs, field trips, field skills, and field projects cannot be conducted online safely or effectively for this degree field. Our stakeholders will not hire our students if they are taking Fish and Wildlife courses online as they will not have the needed field experience provided by in person courses.

3. We provided documentation on strengths and weaknesses section as requested.

4. We modified Table of Contents.

5. Committee mentioned "over-use of surveys." We are not sure if this means too many surveys or citing them frequently. We are comfortable with the number of surveys and the data they generate.
SIGNATURES

Chair, Department of Biological Sciences

Date 9-8-10

Dean, School of Arts and Sciences

Date 09/08/10

Prepared by:

Date 9/8/10

Associate Professor, Department of Biological Sciences

Question Number:
1. This question identified the student’s major.
2. What is your approximate undergraduate grade point average?
   A. 3.60-4.00 (22%)  B. 3.20-3.59 (44%)  C. 2.80-3.19 (33%)  D. 2.40-2.79 (0%)  E. 0%
3. What is your approximate grade point average in your major?
   A. 3.60-4.00 (11%)  B. 3.20-3.59 (56%)  C. 2.80-3.19 (22%)  D. 2.40-2.79 (0%)  E. 0%
4. What is your gender?
   A. Female (11%)  B. Male (89%)
5. What is your race/ethnicity?
   A. African American (0%)  B. Caucasian (67%)  C. Hispanic (0%)
   D. Native American (11%)  E. Other minority (11%)
6. Did you complete your entire undergraduate education at Southeastern?
   A. Yes (11%)  B. No (89%)
7. Overall, how well did syllabi for courses in your program reflect the objectives of each course?
   A. Very Well (33%)  B. Well (44%)  C. Adequately (22%)
8. Overall, how well did syllabi of courses in your program reflect grading policies of each course?
   A. Very Well (33%)  B. Well (56%)  C. Adequately (11%)
9. Overall, how well did syllabi of courses in your program reflect attendance policies of each course?
   A. Very Well (44%)  B. Well (44%)  C. Adequately (11%)
10. How many papers (~5 typed pages + lit. cited) did you have to write in your program courses?
    A. 0 (0%)  B. 1 (22%)  C. 2 (0%)  D. 3 (0%)  E. 4 or more (78%)
11. How many writing assignments <5 pages did you have to write in your program courses?
    A. 0 (0%)  B. 1 (0%)  C. 2 (11%)  D. 3 (22%)  E. 4 or more (67%)
12. How many oral/poster presentations did you have to give by yourself in your program courses?
    A. 0 (0%)  B. 1 (22%)  C. 2 (0%)  D. 3 (0%)  E. 4 or more (78%)
13. How many oral/poster presentations did you have to give with others in your program courses?
    A. 0 (22%)  B. 1 (11%)  C. 2 (11%)  D. 3 (22%)  E. 4 or more (33%)
14. How many oral/poster presentations did you have to give at professional meetings (state to national)?
    A. 0 (56%)  B. 1 (11%)  C. 2 (0%)  D. 3 (0%)  E. 4 or more (33%)
15. How many field trips did you take in courses taken in your program?
    A. 0 (0%)  B. 1 (11%)  C. 2 (0%)  D. 3 (0%)  E. 4 or more (89%)
16. How many outside speakers gave presentations to classes that you completed in your program?
    A. 0 (0%)  B. 1 (11%)  C. 2 (0%)  D. 3 (0%)  E. 4 or more (89%)
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17. Were you provided information concerning safe laboratory procedures in your program courses?
A. Exceptional (44%)  B. More than Adequate (44%)  C. Adequate (11%)

18. Were you provided information concerning safe operating procedures in the field?
A. Exceptional (44%)  B. More than Adequate (56%)

19. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the program you completed?
A. Excellent (89%)  B. More than Adequate (0%)  C. Adequate (0%)  D. Fair (11%)

20. Overall, how would you rate the lecture portion of the classes in the program you completed?
A. Excellent (44%)  B. More than Adequate (56%)

21. Overall, how would you rate the laboratory portion of the classes you completed in your program?
A. Excellent (56%)  B. More than Adequate (33%)  C. Adequate (11%)

22. Overall, how would you rate the use of educational technology by professors in your program?
A. Excellent (33%)  B. More than Adequate (67%)

23. Overall, how would you rate the laboratory facilities and equipment in your program?
A. Excellent (22%)  B. More than Adequate (22%)  C. Adequate (44%)  D. Fair (11%)

24. Overall, how would you rate the lecture facilities in your program?
A. Excellent (33%)  B. More than Adequate (56%)  C. Adequate (11%)

25. This question was left blank on the Scantron form.

26. Overall, how would you rate the number of students in individual classes in your program?
A. Way too few (0%)  B. Too few (0%)  C. About right (100%)

27. Overall, how would you rate the number of students in your program?
A. Way too few (11%)  B. Too few (33%)  C. About right (56%)

28. Overall, how would you rate the qualifications of faculty in your program?
A. Excellent (89%)  B. More than Adequate (11%)

29. Overall, how would you rate the quality of instruction in your program?
A. Excellent (89%)  B. More than Adequate (11%)

30. Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the program you completed?
A. Excellent (100%)

31. Overall, how would you rate the concern for students of faculty in the program?
A. Excellent (56%)  B. More than Adequate (33%)  C. Adequate (11%)

32. Overall, how would you rate curricular/academic advising provided by faculty in the program?
A. Excellent (56%)  B. More than Adequate (44%)

33. Overall, how would you rate the career advising provided by the faculty in the program?
A. Excellent (44%)  B. More than Adequate (33%)  C. Adequate (0%)  D. Fair (22%)

34. What was your favorite course(s)?
Fish and Wildlife Techniques (2), Ichthyology (2), Fisheries and Wildlife Management (2), Limnology (2), Herpetology (1), Ornithology (1)
35. What was your least favorite course(s)?
Evolution (3), Systematic Botany (3), General Botany (2), Mammalogy (1)

36. What was your most difficult course(s)?
Fish and Wildlife Techniques (6), Limnology (2), Fisheries and Wildlife Management (1), Genetics (1)

37. What was your least difficult course(s)?
Evolution (3), Environmental Policy and Law (2), General Botany (2), Conservation of Natural Resources (1), Systematic Botany (1), Bat Special Topics class (1)