Degree/Certificate Program Assessment Report
The University of New Mexico

*Part I: Cover Page*

| **Name of Degree or Certificate Program** | **Degree Level** *(Certificate, Associate, Bachelors, Master's, etc.)* |
|---|---|
| Economics | PhD |

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: *12/05/2018*

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 C1.*

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:

*The department is at the beginning of an evaluation of the graduate program as part of our next APR. As such, the information provided by this and previous assessments will be utilized in the evaluation. Changes in the process will be made in conjunction with the evaluation of the program.*

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

*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. (C1) | ___ Knowledge<br>_X_ Skills<br>___ Responsibility |

**Assessment Measures (including whether they were direct or indirect):**

Measure #1: Research Paper and Departmental Seminar

*Committee on Studies mentors the student work. When the committee deems the work ready, the student schedules a departmental seminar. All faculty attending the presentation complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performed this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points where five is best. (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).*

*The assessment is administered when a student is ready to present and so can take place at any time of the year.*

*The is a direct measure.*

Measure #2: Doctoral Dissertation Defense

*The dissertation committee evaluate the student work according to professional standard. Committee complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. Each objective is scored out of five, where five is best. (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).*

*The assessment is administered when a student is ready to present and so can take place at any time of the year.*

*The is a direct measure.*

Measure #3: Job Placements
*Assessment of the external job market. Number of students on job market and count of placement type.*

*Students enter the job market when they have successfully completed their degree. This is an ongoing assessment tool as we continually update job outcomes.*

*This is an indirect method.*

Measure #4: Teaching Evaluation Scores
*Assessment by undergraduate students via university teaching evaluations (EvalKit). Instructor is assessed on "overall teaching effectiveness" out of five points, where five is best.*

*Students teach in our program fall, spring and summer. This tool is based on data from all periods.*

*This is an indirect assessment*

**Performance Benchmark:**

Measure #1: *Average score is "good" (3) or better.*
Measure #2*: Average score is "good" (3) or better.*
Measure #3: *85% of students within 2 years of having PhD have job using their skills*
Measure #4: *Average score is 3 or better.*

**Sampled Population:**

Measure #1:
*All 3rd year students who have completed the requirement during the time period (n = 3)*
Measure #2:
*All students who completed and defended during the time period (n = 8)*
Measure #3:
*Graduates within two years of completion. (n=13)*
Measure #4:
*All students teaching as independent instructors in an undergraduate and/or graduate courses and students teaching labs. (n=24)*

**Results:**

Measure #1: Research Paper and Departmental Seminar

*In addition to the 2017-2018 results, annual results from 2014-2015 are included, as is the four year weighted average in order to provide a comparison.*

| SLO C1 Measure #1: Students effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists (as measured by research requirement presentation) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014-2015 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | | 2017-2018 | | 2014-2018 | |
| n=6 | | n=3 | | n=7 | | n=3 | | n=19 | |
| Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Weighted Avg | Std Dev |
| 4.23 | 0.44 | 3.80 | 0.28 | 4.11 | 0.09 | 4.00 | 0.33 | 4.10 | 0.52 |

Measure #2: Doctoral Dissertation Defense

*In addition to the 2017-2018 results, annual results from 2014-2015 are included, as is the four year weighted average in order to provide a comparison.*

| SLO C1 Measure #2: Students effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists (as measured by dissertation presentation) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014-2015 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | | 2017-2018 | | 2014-2018 | |
| n=5 | | n=2 | | n=5* | | n=7 | | n=19 | |
| Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Weighted Avg | Std Dev |
| 4.44 | 0.39 | 4.63 | 0.53 | 4.03 | 0.74 | 4.46 | 0.37 | 4.36 | 0.51 |

* missing one observation

Measure #3 Job Placement

*Job placements are provided by total placements and by type of placement. In addition to the 2017-2018 results, annual results from 2014-2015 are included, as is the four year weighted average in order to provide a comparison.*

| SLO C1 Measure #3: Job Placements | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014-2015 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | | 2017-2018 | | 2014-2018 | |
| n=5 | | n=2 | | n=6 | | n=7 | | n=20 | |
| Placed | Type | Placed | Type | Placed | Type | Placed | Type | Placed | Type |
| 5/5 | A=1; G=1; R=0; I=3 | 2/2 | A=1; G=0; R=0; I=1 | 6/6 | A=0; G=2; R=2; I=2 | 7/7 | A=2; G=1; R=2; I=2 | 20/20 | A=4; G=4; R=4; I=8 |

A = Academic; G = Government; R = Research; I = Industry

Measure #4: Teaching Evaluation Scores

*In addition to the 2017-2018 results, teaching evaluation scores are provided from 2015-2016 forward, which is when the department switched to EvalKit. The average over the period is also provided.*

| SLO C1 Measure #4: Assessment by undergraduate students via university teaching evaluations (EvalKit) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | | 2017-2018 | | 2014-2018 | |
| n=21 | | n=23 | | n=24 | | n=68 | |
| Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Avg | Std Dev | Weighted Avg | Std Dev |
| 4.02 | 0.28 | 4.14 | 0.50 | 4.20 | 0.40 | 4.12 | 0.40 |

**Analysis/Faculty Discussion:**

Measure #1: Research Paper and Departmental Seminar

*The average score for Measure #1 for the 2017-2018 period is 4.00 (out of 5.00), or "very good." This exceeds the requirement of 3.00, ("good"). While, the score is slightly below the weighted average of the last four years, it is above the 2015-16 result and below the 2014-15 and 2016-17 scores. However, there is not a statistical difference across these results (evaluated at 95% CI).*

Measure #2: Doctoral Dissertation Defense

*As with Measure #1, the average score for Measure #2 of 4.46 for the 2017-2018 period exceeds the requirement of 3.00 ("good"). The score is consistent with prior years and is not statistically different then the previous years.*

Measure #3 Job Placement

*Perhaps one of the strongest signals a department can have is the placement of the students. Our metric for job placements is that 85% of our students are placed within 24 months of entering the market. The results exceed the requirement. All students who have completed their PhD's have been placed within 24 months in positions utilizing their economic skill sets. This is consistent with placement statistics since 2014-2015 – all PhD graduates have been placed, well within the 24 month horizon. Categorizing placements by academic (tenure-track, visiting, or post-docs), governmental (state or federal), research (national laboratories, institutional, or governmental), or industrial (all private business placements), we see fluctuations, but over the full period 20% of graduates have gone into academic positions, 20% to governmental, 20% to research, and 40% to industry.*

Measure #4: Teaching Evaluation

*The average score for teaching effectiveness for students who teach as independent instructors in undergraduate and graduate courses and student teaching labs for the 2017-2018 period was 4.12, which exceeds out metric of 3.00 ("good"). For comparison, the average scores are provided since 2015-2016, when the department switched to EvalKit. The teaching score has remained fairly constant with no statistical differences between the years.*

*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:**

*Overall, students are performing well on all metrics developed for SLO C1. The faculty continue an ongoing conversation about the graduate PhD program, student performance, and our evaluation of that performance. As discussed in the revisions section of this document, the department is at the beginning of an evaluation of the graduate program as a part of our anticipated APR. As such, the information provided by this and previous assessments will be utilized in that evaluation. Changes in the process will be made in conjunction with the evaluation of the program. As a part of that, the annually scheduled graduate assessment workshop (second Wed in February) will focus on the metrics from the last three years and will develop a comprehensive plan.*

**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 all faculty in attendance at research requirement seminars
- Evaluation sheet filled out by dissertation committee members after dissertation defense
- Example of placements, which are available on the departmental website

# OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESEARCH REQUIREMENT FIELD PAPER

**Author:** _____

**Date:** _____

**ID#:** _____

**Graduate Unit:** _____

**Committee of Services Chair:** _____

**Reader:** _____

**Title of Field Paper: -**

_____

_____

1. **Please rate the field presentation on the following:-**

| | Excellent (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Inferior (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. By the end of the program, students demonstrate mastery of economic models and their application | | | | | |
| b. By the end of the program, students demonstrate mastery in applying appropriate econometrics to explore economic issues and test hypotheses | | | | | |
| c. By the end of the program, students can conduct original, high-quality economic analysis as evidenced by their research, publications, and technical presentations | | | | | |
| d. 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 | | | | | |
| e. Evaluation of work as a whole | | | | | |
| **STANDARD DEVIATION** | **MEAN** | | **STD** | | |

## 2. Briefly summarize your reaction to the presentation.

ECONOMICS

**THESIS OR DISSERTATION OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

**Author:** _____ **Date:** _____

**ID#:** _____ **Graduate Unit:** _____

**Dissertation or Thesis Director:** _____ **Reader:** _____

**Title of Thesis or Dissertation:**

_____

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

| | Excellent (5) | Very Good (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Inferior (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. By the end of the program, students demonstrate mastery of economic models and their application | | | | | |
| b. By the end of the program, students demonstrate mastery in applying appropriate econometrics to explore economic issues and test hypotheses | | | | | |
| c. By the end of the program, students can conduct original, high-quality economic analysis as evidenced by their research, publications, and technical presentations | | | | | |
| d. 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 | | | | | |
| e. Evaluation of work as a whole | | | | | |
| **STANDARD DEVIATION** | **MEAN** | | **STD** | | |
| **2. 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** |

**Chairperson: Please collect all readers' forms and submit to Economics Main Office.**

List of PhD Student Placements 2014 – 2018

| Year | Initial Placement |
|---|---|
| 2014-2015 | Sandia National Laboratories |
| | Khatmandu University (Visiting Faculty) |
| | Price Waterhouse |
| | Lenoir Ryne University |
| | New Mexico Public Regulatory Commission |
| 2015-2016 | University of Oklahoma |
| | EZ BOO |
| 2016-2017 | U.S. Food and Drug Administration |
| | Wells Fargo Bank |
| | NDP Group |
| | Fannie May |
| | Montana Bureau of Business and Economic Research |
| | SE Asian Institute for Policy Analysis |
| 2017-2018 | Auckland University of Technology |
| | National Council of Applied Economic Research, India |
| | New Mexico Bureau of Business and Economic Research |
| | Anthem, Inc. |
| | Presbyterian Healthcare |
| | Presbyterian Healthcare |

**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.