

Ph.D. in Food and Resource Economics Academic Assessment Plan 2013-14

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

Dr. Sherry Larkin, Graduate Coordinator, slarkin@ufl.edu
Dr. Rodney Clouser, Chair, rclouser@ufl.edu

Office of the Provost

*University of
Florida*

*Institutional
Assessment*

*Continuous Quality
Enhancement*

Table of Contents

2013-14 Academic Assessment Plan for Ph.D. in Food and Resource Economics	3
A. Mission	3
B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures	4
C. Research	5
D. Assessment Timeline.....	5
E. Assessment Cycle.....	6
F. Measurement Tools	6
G. Assessment Oversight.....	7
Appendix A: PhD Checklist	8
Appendix B: Evaluation Criteria for Presentations in Workshop II.....	11

2013-14 Academic Assessment Plan for Ph.D. in Food and Resource Economics

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

A. Mission

Through a distinctive tradition of core-discipline excellence, interdisciplinary collaborations and productive partnerships, the Food and Resource Economics Department (FRED) teaches students to think critically, objectively and creatively and to be lifelong learners, engaged leaders and productive citizens; pursues research to advance knowledge and to address state, national and global challenges; and engages and educates the public.

The Food and Resource Economics Department supports the missions of the college and university to serve the nation's and state's critical needs by contributing to a well-qualified and broadly diverse citizenry, leadership and workforce through graduate education and to expand our understanding of the natural world, the intellect and the senses through graduate student research.

B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

SLO Type	Student Learning Outcome	Assessment Measures	Degree Delivery
Knowledge	Explain relevant economic principles and apply economic theory to address problems relevant to agriculture and natural resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Minimum GPA in core economic classes. (2) Pass comprehensive exam over core classes. (3) Pass comprehensive exam over primary field courses. 	Campus
Skills	Identify relevant economic problem, propose and complete an original research project, and present results to appropriate audiences (including off campus).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Successful presentation of research in Workshop II. (2) Successful presentation and defense of proposal. (3) Successful presentation and defense of dissertation. 	Campus
Professional Behavior	Display honesty and integrity in research and professional activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Attends UF Student Services Honesty and Ethics training. (2) Adheres to the University of Florida's Honor Code. 	Campus

C. Research

Prior to the start of formal classes, doctoral students are required to attend a two-week intensive math class with new students in the Economics and Finance PhD. programs.

During new student orientation in the department, students are required to visit with at least three Graduate Faculty to share research background and interests, and seek advice on potential funding opportunities. Students are encouraged to identify their supervisory committee chair as quickly as possible (but no later than at the end of their second semester of classes), and begin to work with these faculties as research mentors.

Students in the Ph.D. program are expected to conduct an original research project, the results of which contribute to the discipline's knowledge, and communicate those results to appropriate audiences including: (1) presentation of research paper(s) on campus, (2) presentation of research paper(s) to off-campus audiences (e.g., industry workshops, professional meetings, etc.), and, ideally, (3) publish at least one research article in a peer-reviewed journal.

Students prepare for their research project by completing core classes in Food and Resource Economics and courses in two elective field areas (e.g., agribusiness, international development, natural resource and environmental economics). In all AEB courses, students are exposed to current peer-reviewed literature and applied applications of economics to agricultural and natural resources issues. Students take exams over both the core material and their electives and must pass both to continue in the program. In addition, students take two research workshops, one at the end of their first year and one at the end of their second year; during the latter class, students give their first formal research seminar.

Finally, to facilitate and encourage presentation of research results at professional conferences, students are eligible for a portion of travel expenses to be paid by the department when the student is an author and presenter. Students are encouraged to augment these internal funds with matching support from the college and university.

D. Assessment Timeline

Ph.D. in Food and Resource Economics

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

Assessment: SLOs	GPA in core courses	Exams (core and field)	Presentations (workshop, proposal, defense)	Honesty and ethics training	Honor code
Knowledge #1	X	X			
Skills #2			X		
Professional Behavior #3				X	X

E. Assessment Cycle

Assessment Cycle for:

PhD, Food and Resource Economics

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

Analysis and Interpretation:

August 31

Program Modifications:

Completed by October 15

Dissemination:

Completed by December 15

Year:	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2016-17
SLOs				
Knowledge #1	X	X	X	X
Skills #2	X	X	X	X
Professional Behavior #3	X	X	X	X

F. Measurement Tools

SLO #1 is assessed using the “Ph.D. Checklist” in Appendix A. The graduate coordinators office maintains the checklist and will identify (during May) students that do not have a 3.0 in the six core courses, which include: AEB 7571 Econometric Methods I, ECO 7115 Microeconomic Theory I, ECO 7408 Math Methods of Applied Economics, ECO 7404 Game Theory for Economists, AEB 7108 Microeconomic Theory II, AEB 7240 Macroeconomic Theory II, AEB 7572 Econometric Methods II and AEB 6933 Advanced Econometrics. The grades of these core classes are summarized on the Checklist and are reflective of knowledge as follows: C=improvement needed, B=satisfactory skills achieved and A=superior skill achievement. An overall skill level of B, measured by cumulative GPA in the core classes, is required to indicate a sufficient level of knowledge. Any student failing to achieve either standard is counseled by the graduate coordinator to discuss options, such as re-taking the course. At the completion of the core and achievement of satisfactory skills, students take the core exam, which is developed and graded by instructors in the core courses and is administered early during Summer C. Each student meets with the chair, associate chair and the core exam chair to discuss performance on the exam. If performance on the second attempt at the core exam (administered late during Summer C) remains below performance expectations, this group that informs the student of dismissal from the program. Successful completion of the field exam(s) is determined collectively by the students’ graduate committee and recorded on the Checklist.

SLO #2 is assessed by the student’s graduate committee with feedback from department members present during the proposal and defense; students that “pass” the proposal and defense are deemed to have the described research skills. In addition, students give a formal seminar (with guidelines that match a job interview seminar) in the Workshop II and are evaluated with a detailed rubric (Appendix B). Average scores for the presentation are

recorded on the Checklist. Ph.D. students are also expected to attend all departmental seminars to glean and enhance their professional skills.

SLO #3 is assessed by (a) required attendance at a UF Student Services Honesty and Ethics training offered during FRED graduate student orientation and recorded on the student checklist, and (b) noting whether any comments were recorded on the Checklist (e.g., violations of the UF Honor Code had been reported to the Dean of Students Office). In summary, the Checklist will contain any notations regarding observations of adverse professional behavior and any concerns that arise on an annual basis.

G. Assessment Oversight

Name	Department Affiliation	Email Address	Phone Number
Sherry Larkin, Graduate Coordinator	Food and Resource Economics	slarkin@ufl.edu	352-294-7676
Rod Clouser, Chair	Food and Resource Economics	rclouser@ufl.edu	352-294-7623
Jim Seale	Food and Resource Economics	jseale@ufl.edu	352-256-5917
Gulcan Onel	Food and Resource Economics	gulcan.onel@ufl.edu	352-294-7657
Diego Valderrama	Food and Resource Economics	dvalderrama@ufl.edu	352-294-7678
Pilar Usche	Food and Resource Economics	useche@ufl.edu	352-294-7665

Appendix A: PhD Checklist

Name: _____ UFID: _____

First Term/Year: _____ Final Term/Year: _____

Funding: ____ Yes ____ No ____ State ____ Grant \$ _____

Comments: _____

Year 1	1 st Semester	Math Camp	_____
	Fall	FRED Orientation	_____
		Bio for website	_____
		Assistantship Hire	_____
		Signed LOA	_____
		Performance Evaluation	_____

Student completed UF Student Services Honesty/Ethics Training that will help them to understand and display Professional Behavior during their graduate program (SLO #3):

Achieved:	Yes	No	
	2 nd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Spring	Transfer of Credit from MS	_____
		Performance Evaluation	_____
	3 rd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Summer	Supervisory committee	_____
		Program of Study Complete	_____
		Chosen Fields (2)	_____

		Core Complete (includes AEB 6921)	_____
		Core Exam #1 (SLO #2)	_____
		Core Exam #2 (SLO #2)	_____
	Performance Evaluation	_____	

Comments regarding professional behavior during year 1 (SLO #3):

Year 2	1 st Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Fall	Performance Evaluation	_____
	2 nd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Spring	Performance Evaluation	_____
	3 rd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Summer	Workshop II Presentation (AEB6934)	_____
		Performance Evaluation	_____

Comments regarding professional behavior during year 2 (SLO #3):

Year 3	1 st Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Fall	Performance Evaluation	_____
	2 nd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Spring	Performance Evaluation	_____
	3 rd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Summer	Proposal Seminar (SLO #2)	_____
		Admission to Candidacy	_____
		Field Exam(s) (SLO #2)	_____
Performance Evaluation		_____	

Comments regarding professional behavior during year 3 (SLO #3):

Year 4	1 st Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Fall	Performance Evaluation	_____
	2 nd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Spring	Performance Evaluation	_____
	3 rd Semester	Signed LOA	_____
	Summer	Degree Application	_____
		Graduation Check	_____
		Defense (SLO #2)	_____
		Submit Defense/Pub Agreement	_____

First Submission ETD	_____
Final Submission ETD	_____
ETD Signature Page	_____
Exit Survey	_____
Performance Evaluation	_____
Assistantship Termination	_____

Comments regarding professional behavior during year 4 (SLO #3):

Comments: _____

Core Courses

Grade (SLO #1)

AEB 7571	_____
ECO 7115	_____
ECO 7408	_____
AEB 7108	_____
AEB 7240	_____
AEB 7572	_____
AEB 6933	_____

List of additional presentations:

Appendix B: Evaluation Criteria for Presentations in Workshop II

Presenter: Topic:	Scale (0 – 10) (10 = best)
RESEARCH	
Problem Statement How well did the presenter outline the research problem they are examining. Was it clear to you? Did they explain why it is relevant and what are the implications of their research?	
Objectives Did the presenter clearly describe the goals of their research? Do you understand what they hope to achieve with this project? Are their objectives testable?	
Use of Economic Theory Did the presenter clearly outline the economic theory behind their research (i.e., utility maximization, calculation of consumer demand, etc.)? Did they apply the right theory to the problem?	
Model Did the presenter provide a model that allowed them to test their objectives? Was the model accurate? Clear?	
Data Did the presenter provide information on their data (or the data they plan to gather)? Did they explain how it is used in their model? Is their data right for their research problem and model?	
Results/Expected Results Did the presenter provide clear results (or expected results) for their analysis? Did they explain why the results/expected results did, or did not, conform with economic expectations?	
Conclusion Did the presenter outline what the results/expected results imply for the research problem and research objectives? Was the conclusion complete, in that it tied the entire presentation together?	
PRESENTATION	
Slides Were the slides legible (font was large enough, not too much information on a slide, colors on graphics were ok)? Were the slides ordered correctly? Overall, did the slides seem professionally prepared to you?	
Delivery Were you able to understand the speaker? Did they speak loud enough? Did they have a thorough grasp of the material they were presenting?	
Time Management Was the presenter able to cover all of their material in the time allotted? Did they spend too much, or too little, time on some parts of their research?	
Q&A Was the presenter able to adequately answer all questions related to their topic? Did they seem receptive to suggestions on their research?	