

Designing Quality Student Reports in an Agroecosystems Analysis Course

Introduction

One integrative requirement of a week-long summer Agroecosystems Analysis course hosted by four universities from three states is a final student team document (Wiedenhoeft et al, 2003). After visiting farms and interviewing farmers in the Upper Midwest, teams of three to four students prepare an initial oral presentation for instructors and peers in the learning community, followed by a final written analysis addressing the sustainability of each farm. After extensive group interaction to plan their written reports, the teams return home and communicate electronically for the next month to craft a final written team document. In their written reports the groups explain their methods of evaluation, discuss their results, and present their conclusions about the sustainability of each farm. Although they are free to choose their own parameters, the groups often assess sustainability in terms of productivity, economics, environmental impacts and social viability for farms, families and communities (Rickerl and Francis, 2004).

Methods

For each of the last 16 years, approximately 28 students and four instructors have stayed for a week at Dordt College in Sioux Center, Iowa and traveled out each day to visit eight or nine farms and one or two prairies. Pre-course readings describing alternative models of analysis are used to provide students with some background knowledge (Bland, 2007; Hamiti and Wydler, 2014; Conway, 1990; Olson, 1998). After arriving on campus students are assigned to teams based on gender, university, major of study and life experiences. During the first class session students are encouraged to discuss the merits of each of the models. After the discussion each team determines the model or combination of models they will use to analyze the sustainability of a farm system. They often struggle initially with the “open-ended” method of analysis, i.e. no one universal model and how to include multiple components of the model are recommended by instructors. Additionally, some students struggle with the responsibility of deciding what is important and how to collect information and analyze results in the absence of a clear road map to explain exactly how they are to accomplish the task (Francis et al., 2009). This type of case study has no pre-determined “right” answer. Working in teams students utilize information from the farmers and observations made during the visits to

identify the key issues of sustainability for each farm. Final project reports are evaluated by the four instructors in order to achieve consensus on grades and generate comments that are sent to each of the teams to enhance their learning experience.

Over the years we have noticed some patterns in the reports. We have summarized these by identifying 1) favorable sections, types of analysis, and supporting information, and 2) common shortcomings in the reports. This compilation could be of value to future teams in the summer Agroecosystems Analysis course or other student team activities where time is limited and teams need to reach consensus on what is most important to include in a report. The observations of teachers in this set of reports were reinforced by experiences reading reports over the past 16 years from the teams of students.

Favorable Components

Agroecosystems analysis reports generally are well organized, often linear in pattern with a description of the models employed and definitions of key terms. They cover all the farms visited, as per instructions, and seek to cover the four dimensions listed above: production, economics, environment, and social. Some of the common observations of the positive qualities of reports include:

Some reports demonstrate excellent writing and editing, use of spellcheck, and articulate descriptions of farms and the students’ observations; often the observations are quite complete, even when analyses and evaluation are deficient.

Reports sometimes include a brief history of the region, types of farms, crops and systems, and an overall context that sets the stage for the team’s interviews, data collection and analysis, and evaluation within the context of the watershed and region.

Several reports demonstrate creative modifications and combinations of parts of previously-used models from the literature, as presented in the pre-course readings and introduced with examples on the first day of class. Often the combined models are robust and appropriate, although their implementation is highly variable.

Teams often describe the successes and weaknesses of using their particular model, a higher order idea that helps them as well as readers put the results and conclusions into context; this step suggests to teachers additional areas to emphasize in the future.

Teaching Tips/Notes

Some reports include creative and illustrative models and diagrams that visually support the text and provide a quick guide to understanding an overview of the analysis; tables are also useful to provide a quick overview of results and add to a report's value and clarity.

Conclusions to reports generally are useful as an overview of the analyses and comparisons, although student teams at times do not take full advantage of this section to pull together all of the valuable information that has been assembled and processed. Probably this is the weakest section.

Some reports incorporate additional ideas from the learning community that were gleaned from exercises during the oral presentations; this is seen as a way of validating or extending the work of the team to capture more ideas and observations from their classmates.

Sections and Components that Need Improvement

All of us who write reports or manuscripts can improve what we do. It is especially evident that students preparing team documents for the agroecosystems analysis course could improve their final reports and thus their grades by looking carefully at the following observations:

Some of the reports did not include a title and/or a list of authors, thus introducing confusion at the outset.

A number of reports suffered from poor use of English, lack of careful editing, or other lack of attention to organization and detail; tables of contents and clearly labeled sections of the reports make them more accessible and understandable to readers.

Many reports used terms such as "efficiency" or "sustainability" without providing a clear definition of what was meant in their specific reports. Because these words often have multiple meanings depending on context and the system components used and how they are measured, precise definitions are essential.

At times a model is defined and used to evaluate the farms, however, in some cases the utilization is inconsistent causing confusion for the reader; this internal inconsistency may have been the result of multiple authors and a lack of careful editing after assembling the pieces.

Reports often state a number of conclusions without supporting evidence from observations on the farm, information from a farmer interview, or literature citation; this makes for weak statements that could be much improved with some documentation.

Lack of diagrams or figures in a report often leads to a lengthy, repetitive, and boring presentation that is not compelling to the reader; figures can be used to illustrate key components and/or interactions on a farm in the analysis.

Lack of tables often leads to repetitive written summaries of data, e.g. ratings of several indicators, farm by farm, becomes tedious and difficult to grasp, when a simple summary table of the same indicators across farms could be quickly viewed and understood.

Since this is an Agroecosystems Analysis course that is based to great extent on biological and ecological dimensions of the farms, precise mechanistic and engineering-type diagrams showing simple cause and effect relationships may be less appropriate than those that illustrate interactions, complexity, and multiple factors that impact the sustainable workings of a farm.

Ignoring references to the literature suggests that this dimension was not useful to the team in conducting their analysis and evaluation, and including these adds to credibility and completeness.

Using General Observations to Improve Reports

Reviewing the above observations of positive and negative aspects of the reports would be useful for future teams in agroecosystems analysis or in classes where teams are required to develop a written presentation after agreeing on the method of analysis of information and a format for reporting. These observations by instructors represent a careful reading and evaluation of multiple reports, as well as accumulated experience from many years teaching the same course. Teams could first decide on methods and then quickly decide on appropriate sections for a report. The most efficient teams often divide the tasks among members so that it is clear who will do what and when. Once there is agreement and the data and observations are organized and presented in writing or in figures and tables, the entire team can do editing and critique of the document using the above observations as a checklist to emphasize what is positive and fill in the 'potholes' that almost invariably appear in an initial draft of a team document. We hope this reflection on class documents from a summer travel class will be useful to future students and to instructors who provide guidance for such class exercises.

References

- Bland, W. and M. Bell. 2007. A Holon approach to agroecology. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 5:280-294.
- Conway, G. 1990. Concepts. Ch 2. In *agroecosystem analysis for research and concepts*. Winrock International Institution for Agriculture. Morrilton, AK.
- Francis, C., J. King, G. Lieblein, T.A. Breland, L., Salomonsson, N. Sriskandarajah, P. Porter, and M. Wiedenhoef. 2009. Open-ended cases in agroecology: Farming and food systems in the Nordic Region and the US Midwest'. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 15:(4)385— 400.
- Hamiti, S.W. and H. Wydler. 2014. Supporting the integration of sustainability into higher education curricula—A case study from Switzerland. *Sustainability* 4(6):3291-3300; DOI:10.3390/su6063291
- Olson, R.K. 1998. Procedures for evaluating alternative farming systems: A case study for eastern Nebraska. *Extension and Education Materials for Sustainable Agriculture, Vol. 8, Center for Sustainable Agricultural Systems, Univ. Nebraska – Lincoln, NE.* p. 39-44.

- Rickerl, D. and C. Francis, editors. 2004. Agroecosystems analysis. Monograph 43, American Society of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Wiedenhoeff, M, S. Simmons, R. Salvador, G. McAndrews, C. Francis, J. King and D. Hole. 2003. Agroecosystems analysis from the grass roots: A multidimensional experiential learning course. *Jour. Natural Resources and Life Sciences* 32:73-79.

Submitted by:

Robert De Haan, Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa;
rdehaan@dordt.edu

Paul Porter, University of Minnesota – St. Paul;
pporter@umn.edu

Mary Wiedenhoeff, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa;
mwiedenh@isu.edu

Charles Francis, Univ. Nebraska – Lincoln;
cfrancis2@unl.edu

Preparing Job Operation Sheets (JOS) for Laboratory Instruction

Introduction

Having a hands-on laboratory section component to a college course can be both a blessing and a curse. The difference can be what resources are in the instructor's teaching tool box. Providing your students with an opportunity to apply knowledge (cognitive domain of learning) absorbed in the lecture classroom can make the difference between the light bulb turning on in the mind of the student — a sign that they “get it”— and a student who is “lost” because they struggle to make a connection between what they already know (previous knowledge) and what they need to know (new knowledge). The application-stage of learning (psychomotor domain of learning), also referred to as skill development, engages the student to involve multiple senses (sight, sound, smell, and touch) as they complete a task, and the option to reflect on their learning experiences. When the “a-ha” moment is achieved, and student learning is successful, this can have a positively effect on the affective domain of learning (value). This is the “blessing” of the laboratory component. The curse of the hands-on laboratory section component can include extended planning, time to prepare and setup each laboratory meeting, facilitation and supervision of the lab, student engagement, and student safety, responding to individual student needs, assignment assessment and activity closure. If there is no graduate assistance or a preceptor to aid in grading, the supervision and management of the laboratory section can be a daunting task, especially if the instructor attempts to provide one-on-one supervision while other students are requesting assistance.

Job Operation Sheets (JOS)

The Job Operation Sheet (JOS) is a document provided to the student following the demonstration of a performance skill in the laboratory and precedes the student engaging in the directed task. An example is the student is to perform a task such as lighting and adjusting the flame on an oxyacetylene cutting outfit. Following the *Three-Step Demonstration* (see *Effective Demonstrations Teaching Tip*, June 2011), the students are tasked to complete the performance skill at their work station. The JOS for lighting and adjusting the flame on the oxyacetylene cutting outfit are distributed to the students. Information found in a JOS includes a description of the skill or activity, Performance Objective, a list of Tools/Materials, and the Steps of Completion. The JOS contains the steps of procedure for completing the skill or activity and includes key points for the student to consider. These may be safety precautions, or visible signs the student needs to take notice that effect the successful completion of the skill or task. A column for a photograph (easy to incorporate with digital pictures from cell phones), illustration, diagram, or text reference for additional information is a third component of the JOS. A well-constructed JOS will serve as a guide for the instructor performing the *Three-Step Demonstration* to the group of students.

Steps to Complete

The first step to developing the JOS sheet is to identify a suggested sequence for completion:

1. Identify the skill or task to complete.
2. List the performance objectives.
3. Describe and list the tools, equipment and materials needed for the student to complete the task.
4. List the Steps to complete task.
5. Identify and include Key Points (how to do it, such as safety points) at each Step.
6. Include pictures, diagrams, or illustrations for clarity.
7. List reference sources for additional information.
8. Create a self-evaluation scoring rubric for students to complete and submit with the completed skill.

Next, attempt to complete the task following the sequence you developed. A useful exercise is to write the steps of making a peanut butter & jelly sandwich and attempting to complete the task by following your sequence of steps.

JOS Template

The following is a suggested format for a JOS.

Teaching Tips/Notes

JOB OPERATION SHEET UNIT: JOB OR EXERCISE: _____	
TOOLS & EQUIPMENT	MATERIALS REQUIRED REFERENCES
WHAT TO DO (STEPS)	HOW TO DO IT (KEY POINTS)

The format for the JOS can be adjusted to fit the needs of the instructor. Distribute to the students at the completion of the Three-Step Demonstration, when students are to begin work. A well-constructed JOS will provide enough information to minimize students asking questions about steps of the procedure. Attach a scoring rubric for each skill or activity. List the scoring criteria and point values for how you will weigh the scoring of the completed task. Include a column for students to complete a self-assessment of their work next to a column for the instructor's column. Be sure to include safety practices to follow, including wearing safety glasses and any other personal protective equipment (PPE)!

Submitted by:
Edward A. Franklin
Department of Agricultural Education
The University of Arizona

Lead with Your History, be Balanced, and Stamp out Ignorance

Over the course of numerous years, I have shared my thoughts on a variety of academic (teaching/learning/advising/career) issues. My thoughts on the squeeze for funding at all levels [1,2,7], use of computers/cell phones in class [3], journal impact factors and citation analysis [4,5,6], optimizing work environments [8,13], job placement and alumni relations [9,14,15], advising graduate students [10,11], and measuring academic success [12] all (basically) relate to obtaining/keeping academic balance over the course of one's career [16,17,18,19]. However, when getting closer to retirement, one's goals and efforts [20] change. It has come to that point for me. I recently submitted my letter of retirement [effective in early 2016]. So, what kind of clever things might I say/share about that?

Never being one to "look back," it seems difficult to do so now. Greater than 30 years ago, students seemed more eager to be in class than they do today. Moreover,

way back when--they seemed to be more apt to come and discuss issues with instructors (face-to-face) in their office.....rather than solicit items (faceless) via electronic means. It used to be that one could write a challenging exam and a student's grade would stand, instead of being challenged to department and upper administration. Also, administrators used to stand-up for faculty, who were in the teaching trenches, in all matters. However, it seems that today-students are more entitled, vocal, less disciplined and more likely to disrupt classrooms than to learn within one. Even with the change in students, administrators and easing university policies-- I have loved my time as a teacher, guidance counselor, mentor, coordinator, advisor, and (in some ways) role model.

All of this will be gone, when I retire. Or....will it? I will have had some impact on a goodly number of students/alumni, who [some already have] will become producers, administrators, teachers, medical professionals and (yes) politicians [to name a few]. Can I live with that? Can I live without the day-to-day grind of driving for 45 minutes each way-sometimes in terrible weather? Can I live without the after hour phone calls; hundreds of emails per day; or hours of grading, writing, discussing and thinking about work? Yes-- I can. It will be easy, as I can (instead) remember the great number of positives obtained from academic work of all kinds [21-26]. Others may now take over, do a better job, and make their mark. My advice to them would be as it always has been: "Lead with your history, be balanced [27] and stamp out ignorance." This has worked well for me for over 30 years. Perhaps, it could work for others for the next 30 years...

References

- Dodson, M.V. 2006. Scholars or bankers? NACTA Journal 50(2):102
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. Funding for enhanced teaching in agriculture. NACTA Journal 52(1):67.
- Dodson, M.V. 2011. Is our next generation of scholars going to be capable of affording us? NACTA Journal 55(3):101.
- Dodson, M.V. 2007. Codger and computers: to "unplug" or not to "unplug?" NACTA Journal 51(2):72.
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. A simplistic view of impact factors: From science to teaching. NACTA Journal 52(3):52-53.
- Dodson, M.V. and A.M. VanDerZanden. 2008. Contributions of science education journals are enhanced by categorizing (journal) impact factors. NACTA Journal 52:50.
- Dodson, M.V. 2010. Publishing and citation analysis: Needed academic partners. NACTA Journal 54(3):55.
- Dodson, M.V., M.E. Fernyhough and J.L Vierck. 2006. Work environments are critical for maximum productivity in teaching and research efforts in animal sciences. NACTA Journal 50(4):64-67.
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. Diversity in academia leads to academic progress. NACTA Journal 52(3):54.

- Dodson, M.V. 2007. In order to recruit animal sciences students into the university, you need to teach them about animal science jobs. *NACTA Journal* 51(2):72-73.
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. Alumni associations help teaching efforts on many different levels. *NACTA Journal* 52(1):66.
- Dodson, M.V. and M.E. Benson. 2010. Where have our Animal Science graduates gone? *NACTA Journal* 54(3):9-13.
- Dodson, M.V., M.E. Fernyhough and B.B. Holman. 2006. Advising graduate students: Mentor or tormentor? *NACTA Journal* 50(4):39-43.
- Dodson, M.V. 2013. It is only about the science. *NACTA Journal* 57(3):72.
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. Practical ways to measure teaching success. *NACTA Journal* 52(2):62-63.
- Dodson, M.V. 2006. Career check-up, rather than check-out. *NACTA Journal* 50(3):67-70.
- Dodson, M.V. 2008. Relax....a little, and then move on. *NACTA Journal* 52(2):60-61.
- Dodson, M.V. and S. Wei. 2013. What are we doing right? *NACTA Journal* 57(1):96-97.
- Dodson, M.V. 2013. A hint of things to come. *NACTA Journal* 57(3):75-76.
- Dodson, M.V. 2014. Git 'er done: Publish those dusty papers. *NACTA Journal* 58(4).
- Bowie, J.M., H.K. Floren, J.K.B. Gentry, L.E. Hansen, C.L. Harris, M.A. Jackson, W.C. Lewis, J.L. Mutch and M.V. Dodson. 2013. Sarcomere in the classroom: Learning with undergraduate groups. *NACTA Journal* 57(2):83-85.
- Lewis, W.C. and M.V. Dodson. 2013. The frustrations of learning how to write a scientific paper. *NACTA Journal* 57(4):79-80.
- Duris, Z.J., M.S. Duarte and M.V. Dodson. 2012. Expectations and realities of my first undergraduate research. *NACTA Journal* 56(2):93-95.
- Dodson, M.V., E.A. Krabbenhoft, B.A. O'Reilly and J.L. Vierck. 1997. Independent studies by undergraduate students: An alternative way to advance research in basic and applied myology. *Basic and Applied Myology* 7(2):145-147.
- Krabbenhoft, E.A., E.A. Greene, R.H. Raub, B.A. Brannon, J. Vierck, J. Sullivan and M.V. Dodson. 1994. IGF regulation of equine satellite cells: An undergraduate research project. *Proceedings of the Equine Nutrition and Physiology Society*, pp 259-264.
- Miller, E. and M.V. Dodson. Overcoming hurdles to graduate with a B.S. degree in Animal Science. *NACTA Journal*
- Dodson, M.V. 2001. Being a balanced teacher. *NACTA Journal* 45 (4):41-45.

Submitted by:
M. V. Dodson
Professor of Animal Sciences and Scientist
Department of Animal Sciences
Washington State University