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***SUMMARY FORM CY 2016***

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 15**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to [cskjs@eiu.edu](mailto:cskjs@eiu.edu) and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.
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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What are the Learning Objectives?** | **How and when are they assessed? Committee/person responsible.** | **Expectations** | **Results** | **How will results be used? Committee/person responsible.** |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be able to write effectively. | Primary-trait analysis of upper- division course papers.1 **Writing:** **Content.**  Committee/Person Responsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.93 (N = 14). One student below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of upper- division course papers.1 **Writing: Focus.** Committee/PersonResponsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.71 (N = 14). No students below 2.0. One student rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of upper- division course papers.1 **Writing: Organization.** Committee/Person Responsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.86 (N = 14). No students below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of upper-division course papers.1 **Writing:** **Development,** Committee/Person Responsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.36 (N = 14). One student below 2.0. No students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of upper- division course papers.1 **Writing:** **Style.** Committee/PersonResponsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.79 (N = 14). One student below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of upper- division course papers.1 **Writing: Mechanics.** Committee/Person Responsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.93 (N = 14). One student below 2.0. Four students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | This is a bit lower than desired. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. The Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses if they consider the results substandard or if the average continues to fall below 2.5. Students with substandard writing will be required to work with the Writing Center or to take more writing-intensive courses by the undergraduate advisor. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exit Survey of Seniors. "My undergraduate degree improved my ability to write effectively." Committee/Person Responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person Responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Qualitative review of program: Effective. | Superior. The external reviewer was highly impressed with the number of student participations and presentations in professional conferences. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and writing-intensive courses. |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be able to speak effectively. | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Content**  Committee/Person Responsible: Oral Competency Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.96 (N = 27). Two students below 2.0. Eight students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Focus**  Committee/Person Responsible: Oral Competency Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.15 (N = 27). No students below 2.0. Eleven students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Organization**  Committee/Person Responsible: Oral Competency Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.17 (N = 27). One student below 2.0. Twelve students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Oral Effectiveness**  Committee/Person Responsible: Oral Competency Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.15 (N = 27). No students below 2.0. Thirteen students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Analysis and Response to Questions**  Committee/Person Responsible: Oral Competency Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.77 (N = 27). One student below 2.0. Seven students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Exit Survey of Seniors. "The Economics Major has improved my ability to speak effectively." Committee/Person Responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed in 2015). | Qualitative review of program: effective. | Superior. The Department has been innovative in its approach to educating its students. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum and speaking-intensive courses. |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will understand basic economic concepts. | Papers written in upper-division courses.1 **Theory relevance.** Committee/Person Responsible: Theory Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.25 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Three students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Papers written in upper-division courses.1 **Theory limitations.**  Committee/Person responsible: Theory Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.89 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. One student rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned, but will continue to monitor. If the average remains below 2.5, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Papers written in upper-division courses.1 **Theory application.**  Committee/Person responsible: Theory Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.2 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Three students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Papers written in upper-division courses.1 **Writing: Content**. Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.93 (N = 14). One student below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major has given me a solid understanding of basic economic concepts." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale (no students rated “not competent”). | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Qualitative review of program: effective. | Superior. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be able to apply economic concepts to individual and social issues. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major has shown me how to apply economic concepts to analyze new situations." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty would revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Qualitative review of program: effective. | Superior. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be able to apply quantitative tools to analyze individual and social issues. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division courses.1 **Computer and Quantitative**: **Model.** Committee/person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.33 (N = 24). One student below 2.0. One student rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division courses in economics.1 **Computer and Quantitative:** **Data** Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.38 (N = 24). No students below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division economics courses.1 **Computer and Quantitative: Procedure.** Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.33 (N = 24). One student below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division economics courses.1 **Computer and Quantitative:**  **Tests.**  Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.00 (N = 24). Nine students below 2.0. Three students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The Economics major taught me how to use statistical methods to analyze economic problems." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. " The Economics major improved my ability to use statistical software." Committee/Person responsible: Survey Coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Effective | Superior. The Department does a good job in effectively providing the undergraduate degree in Economics. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | Average = 4.31 (N = 24) | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be able to utilize basic computer skills. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division courses in economics.1 **Computer and Quantitative: Data.** Committee/Person responsible. Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.38 (N = 24). No students below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division economics courses.1 **Computer and Quantitative: Procedure.** Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.33 (N = 24). One student below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Primary-trait analysis of papers written in upper-division economics courses.1  **Computer and Quantitative: Tests.**  Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.00 (N = 24). Nine students below 2.0. Three students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The Economics major improved my computer skills." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. " The Economics major improved my ability to use statistical software." Committee/Person responsible: Survey Coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Effective | Superior. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will know the philosophical roots of the discipline including its values and ethics, its relationship to other disciplines, and its national and international implications. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major has given me an understanding of the historical and philosophical roots of economics." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | Results are low, but have risen over recent years. No changes currently planned, but will continue to monitor. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major has shown me how economics relates to other disciplines." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major increased my awareness of real world economic issues." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Effective. | Superior. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be provided training in a variety of areas within the economics discipline. | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major increased my awareness of real-world economic issues." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "Overall satisfaction with course content.” Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "Overall satisfaction with variety of economics courses available.” Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students who complete the undergraduate program in Economics will be well-informed citizens with increased awareness of real-world economic issues. | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major made me a better-informed citizen." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Exit survey of seniors. "The economics major increased my awareness of real-world economic issues." Committee/Person responsible: Survey coordinator. | Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. | No Exit Survey in 2016 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (completed in 2015). | Effective. | Superior. | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |

1Copies of all papers written in upper-division economics courses are provided to the Survey Coordinator. A sample of these papers is then chosen randomly for assessment purposes in each of four primary trait categories: Writing, Theory, Research, Quantitative Methods. It is possible for a paper to be assessed in more than one category.

**PART TWO**

**Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.**

Unlike previous assessment reports, we did not use three-year averages for calendar year 2015 due to the timing of this report and the unusual circumstances surrounding CY2016. In addition, we conducted an external review in spring 2015. Dr. Richard Grabowski, emeritus professor of Economics and former department chair, Southern Illinois University (SIUC), reviewed our graduate and undergraduate programs in April 2015. His overall assessment was that the Department of Economics at EIU is doing a good job at both levels in terms of teaching. He added that an impressive amount of research is being done here, given the teaching loads.

**PART THREE**

**Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?**

There have been no new curricular changes in the BA Program in Economics during the past calendar year. Some undergraduate courses have been made available online to attract new students, however. The Department has lost all unit B faculty members and will not be able to replace the retired unit A faculty members.