

Degree/Certificate Program Assessment Report
The University of New Mexico

Part I: Cover Page

<u>Name of Degree or Certificate Program</u>	<u>Degree Level</u> (Certificate, Associate, Bachelors, Master's, etc.)
Economics	Masters

Name of Academic Department (if not a standalone program): *Economics*

Name of College/School/Branch: *Arts and Sciences*

Academic Year/Assessment Period: *2017-2018*

Submitted By (include email address): *Janie M. Chermak jchermak@unm.edu*

Date Submitted to College/School/Branch for Review: *12/07/2018*

Date Reviewed by College Assessment and Review Committee (CARC) or the equivalent:

State whether ALL of the program's student learning outcomes (SLOs) are assessed over one year, two years, OR three years:

The SLOs are assessed over a three-year period.

If the program's SLO's are targeted/assessed/measured within two years or three years, please state whether this assessment record focuses on SLOs from the first year, second year, or third year of your assessment cycle:

This assessment focuses on the third year of the assessment cycle. This report focuses on SLO B1.

Describe the program changes that were implemented during this reporting period in response to the previous period's assessment results. Please include evidence of implemented changes in an appendix:

None. The department is at the beginning of an external assessment. Consequently, we are evaluating the program as a whole and will assess the need for revisions as a part of that process.

Describe any revisions to your assessment process that you made for this reporting cycle and/or plan to make for future reporting cycles:

None. See above.

Part II: Report Body

Program Goal	SLO	UNM Student Learning Goals
Students develop strong written and oral communication skills.	By the end of the program, students can effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists and economic ideas to interdisciplinary and general audiences, including undergraduate students. (B1)	Mark the UNM goal or goals this SLO aligns with. <input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility

Assessment Measures:

Measure #: MA Thesis Defense

Thesis committees evaluate student work according to professional standards. Committee completes an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=very good; 5=excellent).

The thesis defense can be held anytime of the year.

A score of three (good) or better is the criteria for success.

This is a direct assessment measure for all PLAN I masters students.

Measure #2: Job Placement

Assessment by external job market and graduate institutions. Number of students on the job market/applying the graduate school, and count of placement type.

Students enter the market when they complete their masters degree. Thus, this metric is ongoing and is periodically updated.

The criteria for success for this indirect measure is that at least 75% of graduates are pursuing graduate school or are employed.

This is an indirect measure

Measure #3: Focus Group

Focus group of past MA students. The objective of the focus group is to assess former students' satisfaction of the program. The focus group can take place at any time that a group of student who are assessable in NM can be gathered together.

The criteria for success that the majority of focus group participants believe the program prepared them for this SLO.

This is an indirect assessment measure for all terminal masters students.

Performance Benchmark:

Measure #1: A 50% pass rate is the criteria for success.

Measure #2: Job Placement or Graduate School. A 75% placement rate is the criteria for success.

Measure #3: *The majority of focus group participants believe the program prepared them for this SLO.*

Sampled Population:

Measure #1: All Plan I Terminal Masters students (n =1)

Measure #2: All terminal Masters students (n=1)

Measure #3: Former students assessable in NM for a focus group (n=0)

Results: Describe how the performance benchmark was met or not met.

Measure #1: Thesis Outcome

The terminal masters program in economics is very small, as can be seen by the number of students since 2014. Because n=1 for the 2017-2018 reporting period, in order to not violate a student’s privacy, only the average across the 2014-2018 period is reported.

	2014-2015		2015-16		2016-17		2017-2018		2014-2018	
n =	2		0		0		1		3	
Evaluation of work as a whole	Avg	stdev	Avg	stdev	Avg	stdev	Avg	stdev	Avg	stdev
	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.17	1.04

Measure #2: Job Placement

Measure 2 considers all Plan I and Plan II terminal masters students. Because of the small sample size, again, the information provided is from 2014-2018.

Graduate School	Faculty Positions	Research	Industry	Unknown
2	2	3	1	2

Measure #3: Focus Group

Given the relatively small number of masters students in NM that could be gathered for a focus group, it was not feasible to hold one this year.

Analysis/Faculty Discussion:

Measure #1: Thesis Outcome

The small sample size in any given year makes this assessment difficult. In order to protect individual student information, the average score for the thesis as provided for the 2014-2018 period. This average score exceeded the required metric. That said, the one student who presented thesis research in the 2017-2018 period successfully was successful in the completion of the thesis and the overall faculty evaluation of the work exceeded the 3.00 (good) metric.

Metric #2

Since 2010, there have been a total of 10 students who have completed a terminal masters through either Plan I or II. Of these, eight have either gone on to graduate school or are employed. We have no information for the remaining two. Assuming that these two are neither employed nor pursuing a graduate degree, 80% of our terminal masters students from 2014-2018 are employed or pursuing graduate degrees. This exceeds the 75% metric.

Of the eight, two are in graduate school; two have faculty positions at four-year institutions; three are associated with research endeavors; and one is in industry.

Metric #3

It was not possible to find a time where enough former masters students were available to participate in a focus group and so metric #3 was not assessed this year.

Faculty discussion of these results will take place in a workshop that takes place the second Wednesday of February.

Faculty discussion concerning the graduate program, student progress, and assessment is a normal portion of monthly faculty meetings, as a part of the graduate chair's report. In addition, the results of this assessment will be discussed at a workshop, which will be held the second Wednesday of February 2019. There was not a workshop held last year and so there were no specific changes made to the assessment mechanism.

Recommendations for Improvement/Changes:

The small size of the terminal masters degree provides a challenge in developing a robust assessment method. While the current metrics provide some information, this is a topic that will be considered as we move towards our external review and assess the current strength of the program and if there are improvements that can be made. Any changes to the assessment will be made at the same time.

Appendix 1 – Evidence of changes in response to previous assessment results
N.A.

Appendix 2 – Assessment instruments

Attached are the following assessment instruments

- Evaluation sheet filled out by thesis committee members after thesis defense
- Example of placements, which are available on the departmental website

REPORT ON THESIS OR DISSERTATION

Author: _____ ID#: _____ Graduate Unit: _____

Dissertation or Thesis Director: _____ Reader: _____

Title of Thesis or Dissertation:

1. Please rate the thesis or dissertation on the following:

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Inferior</i>
a. Substance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Style	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>Evaluation of the work as a whole</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Please summarize briefly your reaction to the thesis or dissertation.

3. Do you recommend the acceptance of this manuscript for the degree?

Yes No

Reader: Please sign and pass this form to the committee chairperson.

Reader

Date

Chairperson of Committee

Date


Chairperson, Major Graduate Unit

Date

Graduate Unit Chairperson: Please collect all readers' forms and submit to the Graduate Office in sealed envelope.

Appendix 3 – Evidence of faculty discussion (e.g. meeting minutes)

To: B. Horn, D. van der Goes, B. Jones, K. Villa (Graduate Committee)

From: Janie M Chermak 

Re: Graduate Outcomes Assessment

Date: Dec. 2018

The attached documents are the assessments for our graduate program for the 2017-2018 reporting period. There is a separate assessment for each the PhD and for the terminal masters programs. In addition, the assessment plan for each of these programs is included. Please look through these all of these documents and consider the strengths and weaknesses.

I would like to schedule a meeting the first or second week of spring 2019 semester. The focus of the meeting is consider the changes we've previously discussed concerning the graduate program. This includes the timing of courses, the timing of the core exam, as well as the required field paper. As a part of that discussion, please consider the viability of our assessment tools, relative to the proposed changes. Any concerns or proposed changes to the assessment plan.