Instructions
UNM Academic Programs/Unit Combined Assessment Plan and Report Template
The University of New Mexico

Instructions: This assessment plan and report template guides the creation of three-year assessment plans that will be used to assess academic student learning outcomes as well as assists with the reporting of the assessment of student learning outcomes for academic degree and certificate programs at UNM. If you have any questions about either the plan or the report templates, please contact the Office of Assessment at assess@unm.edu or (505) 277-4130.

Note: While developing the plan, consider that not every SLO needs to be assessed every year; however, over a three-year period, every SLO should be assessed.

- Assessment plans should include clear differentiations between degrees (i.e., certificate, bachelor, master's, and/or doctoral).
- Assessment plans should be reviewed and approved at the college/school/branch level by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC) or equivalent.

Overview: The template is divided into three parts:
Part I: Cover Page (Page 3)
Part I of the template serves as the cover page. Please provide all of the information requested for the cover page.

Part II: Assessment PLAN (Pages 4-8)
Part II of the template requests information on the student learning outcomes, program's goal(s), UNM Student Learning Goals, assessment measures, performance benchmarks, and student population(s) within the table. It is followed by a narrative section that contains four questions that inquire about the assessment artifact, the SLO review schedule, plans to review and analyze the data, and how the results will be distributed.

Part III: Assessment REPORT (Pages 9-13)
The first section of Part III requires a narrative response about last year's assessment report, the changes implemented, and the revisions to the assessment process that were generated. Section two is a table that requires the user to copy and paste the SLOs (from the already-completed PLAN), that were assessed this year. The table requests a description of the actual student population that was used, and results. Section 3 of the REPORT template is a narrative section that contains four questions that inquire about participation, data analysis, recommendations, and distribution of information.

Part I: Cover Page
UNM Academic Programs/Unit Combined Assessment Plan and Report Template
The University of New Mexico

SECTION I-1

College, Department and Date:

College/School/Branch Campus: College of Arts and Sciences
Department: Economics
Date: 12/7/2021
Active Plan Years (select the three year cycle that applies):
☐AY16/17-18/19 ☐AY17/18-19/20 ☒AY18/19-20/21 ☐AY19/20-21/22

Academic Program of Study:*

Degree or Certificate level: B.A. Name of the program: Economics
Is the program accredited? ☒

Note: *Academic Program of Study is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).*

Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan (include at least one name, title and email address):

- Cristina Reiser, Senior Lecturer III & Undergraduate Assessment Coordinator, creiser@unm.edu

Dean / Associate Dean / CARC Approval Date: 6/1/2017

* By selecting the date above, you acknowledge that your respective Dean/Associate Dean/or CARC has reviewed and approved this plan.

Part II: Assessment PLAN Body
UNM Academic Programs/Unit Combined Assessment Plan and Report Template
The University of New Mexico

SECTION II-1
Please identify at least one of your program goals:

Program Goal #1: A. THEORY: Mastery of basic economic theory.

Program Goal #2: B. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT: Familiarity with institutions that shape economic behavior.

Program Goal #3: C. DATA ANALYSIS: Use of data sources, methods, tools and analysis used in economics.

Program Goal #4: D. CRITICAL THINKING: Apply, evaluate and critique economic models.

Program Goal #5: E.COMMUNICATION: Communicate economic ideas.

Program Goal #6: F. ECONOMIC CITIZENSHIP: Consideration of alternative viewpoints on policy issues.

**** If you experience column misalignment in the table below after entering your program goals, please save the file and reopen the document. It should portray accurately afterwards. ****

Please use the grid below to align your program goals to your student learning outcomes and assessment plans:

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) *For each row in the table, provide a SLO. If needed, add more rows. A SLO may be targeted by or aligned with more than one program goal. If a program awards more than one degree (i.e., B.S., M.A. etc.), the SLOs for graduate and undergraduate must be different. Graduate degree SLOs must be different (Master ≠ Doctorate).* *For additional guidance on SLOs, click here.*	**Program Goal #** *Please list the Program Goal(s) that the SLOs are aligned under. Use the numbering system (1,2,3..) assigned above.*	**UNM Student Learning Goals** *Check as appropriate: K=Knowledge; S=Skills; R=Responsibility*			**Assessment Measures** *Provide a description of the assessment instrument used to measure the SLO.* *For additional guidance on assessment measures, click here.*	**Performance Benchmark** *What is the program's benchmark (quantitative goal/criteria of success for each given assessment measure)? State the program's "criteria for success" or performance benchmark target for successfully meeting the SLO (i.e., At least 70% of the students will pass the assessment with a score of 70 or higher.)*	**Student Population(s)** *Describe the sampled population, including the total number of students and classes assessed. See note below.*
A.1. Students will be able to explain, graph and analyze key economics models.	1	K ☒	S ☒	R ☐	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any ECON 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
B.1. Students will be able to analyze the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, organizations, localities, industries or firms.	2	K ☒	S ☒	R ☒	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results.

					their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.		2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
C.1. Students will be able to generate and interpret summary statistics and regression models.	3	K ☒	S ☒	R ☐	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
C.2. Students will be able to identify data sources, describe appropriate empirical tools, and perform research on data they retrieve from original surveys, or official and industry sources.	3	K ☒	S ☒	R ☐	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
D.1. Students will be able to evaluate economic issues and public policy by using economic models or data analysis while identifying underlying assumptions of the model(s) and limitations.	4	K ☐	S ☒	R ☒	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are

					2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	"proficient" or better for this SLO.	invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
E.1. Students will be able to effectively communicate economic ideas.	5	K ☐	S ☒	R ☐	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.
F.1. Students will be able to formulate informed opinions on policy issues and recognize the validity of opposing viewpoints.	6	K ☐	S ☒	R ☒	1. Instructor-selected artifact from any 300+ course (required or upper-level elective) scored against a rubric. This is a direct measure. 2. Senior Survey, which asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. This is an indirect measure.	1. 75% of students score "acceptable or better" on the question. 2. 75% of students rate themselves as "proficient" or better for this SLO.	1. Sample size varies depending on course size & faculty participation. All instructors of ECON 300+ courses are invited to submit student results. 2. Sample size varies. All graduating seniors are asked to participate.

SECTION II-2

NOTE: State explicitly whether the program's assessment will include evidence from **all** students in the program or a **sample** (by student, by course section, by milestone). When possible, it is best to study the entire population of students in your program. However, in larger programs it may be more pragmatic to study a sample of the students instead. If sampling, please describe the course sections and/or the milestones. If you have questions about appropriate sampling, please contact your unit's assessment representative or the Office of Assessment at assess@unm.edu or (505) 277-4130.

Please use the area below to elaborate on your assessment plans.

Assessing and analyzing student learning outcomes:

a. Please describe the student artifact/performance that you will use to gather your assessment data:

   Direct Measures: Each SLO includes artifacts from any ECON 300+ course (these are required courses or upper-level elective courses that have pre-requisites for the major) where the instructor chose to participate in assessment. As such, the sample size varies from year to year. Instructors are asked to review SLOs and associated rubrics; and decide if their course reflects any SLO(s) being evaluated for the year. If they decide their course aligns with any SLO(s), they are asked to choose an artifact that they believe best represents the SLO(s), score student submissions against a rubric, and report anonymized results to the undergraduate assessment coordinator This data is aggregated by the Undergraduate Assessment Coordinator and used in the assessment report. Please see Appendix A: BA Assessment Plan - Reporting Form, Rubrics and Sample Assignment.

   The following types of artifacts have been included in past assessment reporting: exam questions, research papers, problem sets, and group projects.

   Indirect Measure: This is an online, anonymous senior survey provided to graduating seniors only via Opinio. The survey asks students to rate their own understanding of each SLO. Sample size depends on number of respondents. Please see the "Senior Survey" in the Appendix.

b. Does your program assess all SLOs every year, or are they assessed on a staggered, three-year cycle? If staggered, please describe which SLOs will be assessed for each year. If a table better describes your response, insert it here.

   Staggered:

   - *Year 1: SLOs A1, C1, C2, & E1*

- *Year 2: SLOs B1, D1, & F1*
- *Year 3: SLOs A1, C1, C2, & E1*

c. What is the process you will use to review, analyze and interpret your assessment data?

(1) Before every semester, the Undergraduate Assessment Coordinator invites all faculty teaching ECON 300 or higher-level courses to participate in program assessment. The invitation includes the rationale for assessment, which SLOs are being reported for the year, and rubrics with a reporting form for each SLO. The reporting form includes space for a description of the assignment and a tally of how many students met or exceeded the benchmark for the SLO out of how many attempted. Reminders are also sent to faculty at mid-semester and end-of-semester.

(2) Faculty members decide if their course covers any of the SLOs being reported on; and which artifact would best represent the SLO(s).

(3) The faculty member uses the rubric to fill out the reporting form and return to the UAC by the end of the semester.

(4) In addition to the above direct measures, the UAC works with the Undergraduate Advisor to develop a list-serv of pending graduates. Starting towards the end of the fall and spring semesters, the UAC and the Department Chair invites pending graduates to participate in the indirect measure, the "Senior Survey." Reminder emails are also sent. Please see *Appendix B: Senior Survey – Questions Pertaining to each SLO.*

(5) After the academic year ends and all reporting forms and senior survey responses turned in, the UAC organizes and aggregates the results using spreadsheet and data analysis software. The main analysis involves (i) calculating the percentage of artifacts that scored acceptable or better for each SLO and (ii) the percentage of senior survey respondents that self-assessed their knowledge as acceptable or better for each SLO. The year's results are then evaluated against our pre-determined benchmarks. In addition, historical trends are examined.

(6) After the gathering of and initial analysis of assessment data, the UAC hosts an annual "Undergraduate Assessment Workshop" in the fall where all faculty, graduate students, and department academic advisors are invited to join. The workshop includes a presentation of our assessment process, analysis and interpretation of results for the year and a comparison to years' past. All participants provide their own insights and interpretations based on their experiences; and potential recommendations to improve the curriculum, specific courses, and/or the assessment process is discussed.

d. What is the process you will use to communicate and implement your assessment results?

The "Undergraduate Assessment Workshop," (as noted in (c) above) is the primary means of communication. In addition, after the workshop:

(7) The UAC and the Undergraduate Committee convene to develop a list of recommendations for improvement based on the workshop discussions.

(8) The UAC shares a "Brief Report to the Faculty," which includes the main points discussed in the workshop and the list of recommendations that the Undergraduate Committee created.

(9) The Undergraduate Committee (and any other relevant committees or faculty members) will meet to discuss the items on the list of recommendations and any formal proposals will go through the normal rules of governance.

(9) Reports and plans are also made available on our department website, https://econ.unm.edu/undergraduate-program/outcomes.html

Part III: Assessment REPORT Body
UNM Academic Programs/Unit Combined Assessment Plan and Report Template
The University of New Mexico

SECTION III-1

In response to last year's assessment report, please:

a. Describe the program changes that were implemented.

We continued to meet growing demand for courses from both non-traditional and traditional students by adding on to our economics online minor via UNM Online's Accelerated Online Program (AOP). For example, ECON 424: International Trade passed review and was added to the AOP curriculum in the Fall of 2021.

In addition, one of the most prevalent suggestions from the senior survey was to provide data-driven projects in courses earlier on. While not a programmatic change, per se, multiple faculty members were awarded teaching grants to include research, data projects, and best practices in inclusivity into their courses.

b. Describe any revisions to your assessment process that were made for this reporting cycle.

For this year, we made sure to hold our annual Undergraduate Assessment Workshop via Zoom and explicitly invited all graduate student instructors to attend. In addition, we experimented with more collaboration in the workshop this year. This year, the UAC presented results for a short time and participants were then split into smaller groups to discuss different focus areas. We found the process to be more meaningful and productive than past workshops that did not include small group "breakout" rooms.

Please use the grid and narrative responses below to discuss your assessment results from this year:

Part III: Assessment REPORT Body
UNM Academic Programs/Unit Combined Assessment Plan and Report Template
The University of New Mexico

SLOs (copy and paste from PLAN above) *Copy and paste your SLOs from your entries in the PLAN above that were* ***measured during this year****.*	**Student Population** *Describe the sampled population, including the total number of students and classes assessed.*	**Results*** *State whether the performance benchmark was met, not met, or exceeded AND the total number of students assessed (i.e., Exceeded, 95 out of 111 (86%) students)*
B.1. Students will be able to analyze the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, organizations, localities, industries or firms.	<u>Direct Measure</u>: 96 student artifacts submitted from 5 course-sections (ECON 320, 303, 307, 369, 408). Note that a student may have submitted more than one artifact if enrolled in multiple classes. Artifacts included group discussions, exam questions, and research projects. <u>Indirect Measure:</u> 14 graduating seniors participated in the survey out of 53 asked to participate (this represents 26.4% of graduating seniors).	<u>Direct Measure:</u> EXCEEDED. 86 out of 96 (89.6%) student artifacts. <u>Indirect Measure:</u> EXCEEDED. 13 out of 14 (92.9%) graduating seniors.
D.1. Students will be able to evaluate economic issues and public policy by using economic models or data analysis while identifying underlying assumptions of the model(s) and limitations.	<u>Direct Measure</u>: 82 student artifacts submitted from 6 course-sections (ECON 320, 303, 307, 369, 407, 408). Note that a student may have submitted more than one artifact if enrolled in multiple classes. Artifacts included group discussions, critical thinking responses, exam questions, and research projects. <u>Indirect Measure:</u> 14 graduating seniors participated in the survey out of 53 asked to participate (this represents 26.4% of graduating seniors).	<u>Direct Measure:</u> EXCEEDED. 69 out of 82 (84.1%) student artifacts. <u>Indirect Measure:</u> EXCEEDED. 14 students out of 14 (100%) graduating seniors.

F.1. Students will be able to formulate informed opinions on policy issues and recognize the validity of opposing viewpoints.	Direct Measure: 42 student artifacts submitted from 3 course-sections (ECON 307, 369, 408). Note that a student may have submitted more than one artifact if enrolled in multiple classes. Artifacts included group discussions and research projects. Indirect Measure: 14 graduating seniors participated in the survey out of 53 asked to participate (this represents 26.4% of graduating seniors).	Direct Measure: EXCEEDED. 38 out of 42 (90.4%) student artifacts Indirect Measure: EXCEEDED. 13 out of 14 (92.9%) graduating seniors.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) denotes that relevant data/evidence must be included for that column (refer to the "Annual Assessment Cycle Process" diagram for guidance). Evidence associated with program improvements/changes that are actually made or implemented have to be provided the next academic year/assessment period.

Please use the area below to elaborate on your findings.

Please identify the SLOs that did not meet your benchmark defined in the Assessment Plan. Elaborate on what you think contributed to this:

N/A

SECTION III-2

In response to this assessment report, please answer the following questions:

a. Who participated in the assessment process (the gathering of evidence, the analysis/interpretation, recommendations)?

   This is a full faculty effort. While the Undergraduate Assessment Coordinator takes the lead in the coordination with faculty; gathering of and analysis of evidence; and writing of plans and reports, it is the contribution of all faculty members that leads to valuable discussion and recommendations. Faculty members contributed in a variety of ways - by submitting reporting forms, participating in the annual Assessment Workshop, and sharing feedback in post-workshop meetings, including a monthly faculty meeting.

   In addition, we shared our Undergraduate Assessment plans and reports in our recent APR review (Fall 2021). We eagerly await any national guidance on our economics undergraduate program.

b. Data Analysis: *Describe strengths and/or weaknesses of each SLO in students' learning/performance based on the data results you provided in the table above (e.g., Even though the benchmark was met, 40% of the students struggled with Topic X …).*

Students have met or exceeded all assessed SLOs, with each surpassing its benchmark. Relative to the previous reporting cycle (2018-2019), we saw measurable gains in the % of students scoring acceptable or better for SLOs B1 and F1, and a trivial decrease for SLO D1.

Over the years, the top four senior survey responses to "ways to improve the program" are (i) more classes/better scheduling of courses, (ii) prepare students better for post-grad opportunities (including communicating better about graduate school requirements), (iii) add more quantitative analysis into the curriculum, and (iv) ability to earn a concentration.

c. Based on your assessment results from <u>this year and last year</u>, describe the recommendation that you have for improvement:

- Describe any program changes (e.g., curriculum, instruction, etc.) that will be implemented.

  Based on workshop and at post-workshop meetings, it is recommended that the Undergraduate Committee meet to consider the following:
  1. *combined macro-micro introductory course*
  2. *revisit the course curriculum and long-term course scheduling*
  3. *continue to encourage faculty to include quantitative analysis in their instruction*

  While not directly programmatic but support our teaching mission nonetheless, it is also recommended
  - *that the UAC explore available data to compare academic outcomes based on course characteristics (topics, course delivery mode, faculty vs. grad student instructor, etc.). This would allow a more informed decision on any course scheduling and curriculum changes.*
  - *the Undergraduate Co-Chairs work with the Economics Advisor to find additional ways to communicate pathways for our students (e.g., on our website, on our syllabi, etc.).*
  - *revive the Economics Club*
  - *the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees work together to develop "First Year Teaching" resources, targeted to first-time instructors (graduate students and faculty).*

- Describe any revisions to your assessment process that will be made for the next reporting cycle.
  This current Assessment Plan was re-reviewed and accepted by CARC on 9/13/2021.

d. How, when, and to whom will results and recommendations be communicated in a meaningful way?

The recommendations listed above are an outcome of our Undergraduate Assessment Workshop and any post-workshop meetings with the Undergraduate Committee. Please see Appendix C: Undergraduate Assessment Workshop Agenda and Workshop Group Discussion Prompts.

To summarize our communication process:

- *After the gathering of and initial analysis of assessment data, the UAC hosted an annual "Undergraduate Assessment Workshop" in the Fall of 2021 where all faculty, graduate students, and department academic advisors were invited to join. The workshop included a presentation of our assessment process, analysis and interpretation of results for the year and a comparison to years' past. All participants provided their own insights and interpretations based on their experiences; and potential recommendations to improve the curriculum, specific courses, and/or the assessment process were discussed.*
- *After the workshop, the UAC and the Undergraduate Committee convened to develop a list of recommendations for improvement based on the workshop discussions. These recommendations are also listed above.*
- *Afterwards, the UAC shared a "Brief Report to the Faculty," which included the main points discussed in the workshop; and the list of recommendations developed by the Undergraduate Committee.*
- *The Undergraduate Committee (and any other relevant committees or faculty members) will meet to discuss the items on the list of recommendations and any formal proposals will go through the normal rules of governance.*
- *Reports and plans are also made available on our department website, https://econ.unm.edu/undergraduate-program/outcomes.html*

Appendix A: BA Assessment Plan - Reporting Form, Rubrics and Sample Assignment

Appendix B: BA Assessment Plan - Senior Survey – Questions Pertaining to SLOs

Appendix C: Undergraduate Assessment Workshop Agenda and Workshop Group Discussion Prompts

Appendix A: BA Assessment Plan - Reporting Form, Rubrics and Sample Assignment

Appendix A: BA Assessment Plan - Reporting Form, Rubrics and Sample Assignment

BA Assessment Reporting Form, Rubrics and Sample Submission

Instructor Name:

Course:

Assessment:
What is the assignment or question being used? Feel free to provide a brief summary, attach a screenshot, or attach via email if that is easier. A sample is provided at the end of this document.

Results
Please tally the number of students assessed and the number of those who scored "acceptable or better" for each SLO you assessed. Note that your assignment does not have to cover each SLO. Suggested rubrics are below.

SLO	Number of Students Who Scored Acceptable or Better	Total Number of Students Assessed
A1 (Theory) Students will be able to explain, graph, and analyze key economics models.		
B1. (Institutional Context) Students will be able to analyze the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, organizations, localities, industries or firms.		
C1 (Data Analysis) Students will be able to generate and interpret summary statistics and regression models.		
C2 (Data Analysis) Students will be able to identify data sources, describe appropriate empirical tools, and perform research on data they retrieve from original surveys, or official and industry sources.		
D1. (Critical Thinking) Students will be able to evaluate economic issues and public policy by using economic models or data analysis while identifying underlying assumptions of the model(s) and limitations.		
E1 (Communication) Students will be able to effectively communicate ideas.		
F1. (Economic Citizenship) Students will be able to formulate informed opinions on policy issues and recognize the validity of opposing viewpoints.		

Rubrics

SLO	Acceptable or Better	Unacceptable
A1.	Meets *all* of the following: (1) accurate and organized representation of information presented in graphical form, (e.g., title, labels, shapes of curves, any data plotted correctly, etc.); may have 1 or 2 errors. (2) represents information presented in correct mathematical forms; may have 1 or 2 errors. (3) explanation/interpretation is, for the most part, coherent and supports graphing and/or quantitative analysis; may have 1 or 2 errors.	Does not meet all three of the criteria listed in the “acceptable or better” column.
B1.	Displays reasonable and moderately skillful analysis on the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, organizations, localities, industries or firms.	Displays developing or no skill in analysis on the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, organizations, localities, industries or firms.
C1.	For the most part, generates and interprets summary statistics and regression models, but may miss one or two details. Derives reasonable conclusions, although may overstate or oversimplify results.	Draws inaccurate conclusions, too many errors. Derives unreasonable or irrelevant conclusions.
C2.	Demonstrates at least moderately skillful use of retrieving and managing quality data. Most data come from credible and relevant sources that are relevant to the discussion. Includes near complete information about data set and all variables but may miss one or two details.	Demonstrates developing use or no skill of retrieving and managing quality data. Most data come from unreliable and/or irrelevant sources. Fails to provide enough information on data set and variables
D1.	Explicitly or implicitly evaluates public policy and other economic issues using an economic model(s) or data analysis. Identifies underlying assumptions of the model and limitations but may miss one or two details.	Fails to evaluate public policy and other economic issues using an economic model(s) or data analysis. OR uses an irrelevant model or data.
E1.	Meets *all* of the following: (1) Provides a reasonably clear statement of straightforward thesis. Provides supporting evidence, but may not acknowledge limitations, or may leave obvious questions unexplored. (2) Writing or presentation of material is clear but lacks elegance. Weak transitions or organization, or some poor word choices or a few awkward sentences impede flow of ideas. (3) Any visual representations discussed contribute to the reader's understanding, are generally easy to interpret, and are formatted appropriately. Some errors, ambiguities and/or extraneous details exist but do not impede flow of ideas.	Does not meet all three of the criteria listed in the “acceptable or better” column.

F1.	Provides thoughtful and reasonable (perhaps simplistic) policy implications. Opposing views are realistic but may be weakly stated.	Opposing views are not acknowledged. AND/OR Does not provide policy implications or proposes policies that are not relevant to the question, or that ignore obvious economic or moral issues.

SAMPLE SUBMISSION

Instructor Name Cristina Reiser

Course ECON 300: Intermediate Microeconomics

Assessment

(exam question) Vacation time is approaching! Suppose you derive utility from days spent traveling on vacation domestically, D, and days spent traveling on vacation in a foreign country, F. Your utility function over these two "goods" is $U(D, F) = 4D^{0.25}F^{0.75}$. Let your budget constraint be $I(D, F) = p_D D + p_F F$ where I is income, p_D is the price of domestic travel per day, and p_F is the price of foreign travel per day.

a. Determine the demand functions for domestic travel and foreign travel. Make sure you show your work – show the steps used.
b. Suppose that you've saved \$800 for your summer travel, the price of domestic travel per day is \$25 and the price of foreign travel per day is \$100. How many days of each type of travel will you embark on?
c. Illustrate the utility function, budget constraint, and the utility-maximizing bundle associated with (b). Make sure you show the level of utility, the budget constraint intercepts, and the optimizing equilibrium.
d. Suppose the price of foreign travel decreases. Applying what you've learned (think like an economist!), explain in a few sentences and/or a supporting graph, what you expect to happen to the amount of foreign travel days and domestic travel days (note: you do not need to recalculate this problem to answer this).

Results

SLO	Number of Students Who Scored Acceptable or Better	Total Number of Students Assessed
A1	16	18
C1	--	--
C2	--	--
E1	15	18

Appendix B: BA Assessment Plan: Senior Survey – Questions Pertaining to SLOs

Appendix B: BA Assessment Plan: Senior Survey – Questions Pertaining to SLOs

Please rate your ability to explain the following elements of economic theory on a scale of 0-5, where 0 indicates never having been exposed to the subject, 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent"

THEORY	*0*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Supply and demand						
Theory of the firm (production functions, markets, profit-maximization, etc.)						
Comparative advantage						
Opportunity Cost						
Game Theory (simultaneous games, sequential games, Nash equilibria, etc.)						
Externalities						
Public Goods						
Consumer Theory (preferences, budget constraints, demand, etc.)						
Compensating wage differentials (how risk can explain wage differences)						
Determinants of Economic Growth						
Short-Run Economic Fluctuations (or Business Cycles)						
Fiscal and Monetary Policy						
Aggregate Demand and Aggregate Supply						
Inflation and Unemployment (or Phillips Curve)						
Money and Banking System						
IS-LM Model						

The following asks about your familiarity with graphing and explaining key economic models. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

THEORY	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I can graph and interpret graphs of key economics models (e.g., supply and demand, utility-maximization, profit-maximization, AD-AS, IS-LM, externalities, etc.)					
I can explain and analyze graphs of key economics models (e.g., supply and demand, utility-maximization, profit-maximization, AD-AS, IS-LM, externalities, etc.)					

The following asks about your familiarity with institutions that shape economic behavior. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I can analyze the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, localities, organizations, industries or firms.					
As part of my economics coursework, I was required to produce written or oral reports considering the economics and institutional arrangements of specific regions, countries, localities, organizations, industries or firms.					

We would like to know how familiar you are with data methods, tools and sources. Please let us know if you agree with the following statements.

DATA ANALYSIS	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I can generate and interpret summary statistics and regression models.					
As part of my coursework, I identified data sources, described empirical tools, and performed research on data retrieved from original surveys or official and industry sources.					
I can manage data in spreadsheets and statistical software packages.					

Do you agree with the following statements about critical thinking?

CRITICAL THINKING	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I can evaluate public policy and other economic issues using economic models or data analysis.					
I can identify underlying assumptions of these models or data; and potential limitations.					
I can distinguish between positive and normative claims.					

Can you communicate what you learned about Economics? Please let us know whether you agree with the following statements.

COMMUNICATION	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I can effectively communicate economic ideas in writing.					
I can effectively communicate economic ideas orally.					
I was given sufficient opportunity to develop my communication skills through written assignments.					
I was given sufficient opportunity to develop my communication skills through discussion and participation					
I was given sufficient opportunity to develop my communication skills through oral presentations.					

The following asks about "economic citizenship". Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

ECONOMIC CITIZENSHIP	*Strongly Disagree*	*Disagree*	*Neither Agree nor Disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly Agree*
I was encouraged to formulate informed opinions on policy issues.					
I was encouraged to recognize the validity of viewpoints other than my own.					

YOUR FEEDBACK

Overall, how would you rate the Econ Program?

1 (Poor)	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5 (Excellent)*

Why did you choose Economics as your major?

What were some good and/or most helpful things about the program?

What were the most frustrating and/or bad things about the program?

How can we improve the program for future students?

Appendix C: Undergraduate Assessment Workshop Agenda and Workshop Group Discussion Prompts

Appendix C: Undergraduate Assessment Workshop Agenda and Workshop Group Discussion Prompts

Meeting Agenda

Department of Economics Undergraduate Assessment Workshop

Wednesday, October 27th, 2021

2:30pm – 4:00pm MT

via Zoom

I. The What, How, and Why of Program Assessment

II. Gen Ed (Core) Assessment
  a. How Do We Assess Gen Ed Courses?
  b. Are We Meeting Our Standards?

III. BA in Economics Assessment
  a. How Do We Assess Gen Ed Courses?
  b. Are We Meeting Our Standards?

IV. Breakout Groups

V. Reconvene

Discussion Prompts

BA Program

Our Goal: Come up with some ideas for the UG Committee to consider to improve our program. Divergent thinking is encouraged (i.e., the ability to consider many possible solutions!)

Instructions:

1. *Assign someone to be the representative of the group. Have them summarize the ideas of the group to share with all participants.*
2. *On your own, thoroughly read through your group's discussion prompts below. Spend a few minutes re-investigating the BA Assessment data. Write your ideas/responses down.*
3. *Share with your group.*
4. *When time is up, the representative will share your group's suggestions and comments.*

Prompts

1. *Based on the data and your own experiences, if you were to redesign the program and/or assessment for the program what would you do or suggest the UG Committee consider? Possibilities includes changes to learning goals, pedagogy, assignments in particular classes, activities, and curricular requirements and/or structure. Some things to think about:*

2. *Do you think the stated learning objectives are appropriate for the program? If not, why? What's there that shouldn't be? What's missing?*

3. *How do you best engage with students/what excites you when you teach? Share some ideas with your colleagues that you think are effective ways to get our students prepared for post-grad opps.*

4. *Do you think the assessment instrument best represents how to measure success in our department? What would you change if you could?*