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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 = 3.29 (N = 7). 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: 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 = 3.12 (N = 7). 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: 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 = 2.75 (N = 7). 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 = 3.0 (N = 7). 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:** **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 = 3.1 (N = 7). 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: 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 = 3.2 (N = 7). No students below 2.0. Two 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 2017 | 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 (performed in 2015). | Qualitative review of program: Effective. | Superior. The external reviewer was highly impressed with the quantity of writing in the department’s curriculum. | 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 = 3.23 (N = 13). No students below 2.0. Five 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 = 3.23 (N = 13). No students below 2.0. Five 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 = 3.08 (N = 13). 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 and speaking-intensive courses. |
|  | Primary trait analysis of Research presentations in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Oral Competency: Development**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 = 3.00 (N = 13). 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 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 = 3.23 (N = 13). No students below 2.0. Five 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 = 3.00 (N = 13). 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 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 2017 | 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. | 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 = 3.17 (N = 6). 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. |
|  | 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 = 3.25 (N = 6). 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 = 6). No students 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. |
|  | 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 = 3.29 (N = 7). 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. |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Hypotheses.** Committee/Person Responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.33 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research:** **Method.** Committee/Person Responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Justification.** Committee/Person Responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Four students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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.
 | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Justification**. Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Four students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Hypotheses.** Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.33 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year**. Research**: **Method**. Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research:** **Conclusion.** Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 2.92 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Two students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty would revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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 2017 | 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.
 | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Method.** Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | 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 = 3.33 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Six 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 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 = 3.42 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Six 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 = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Six 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 = 3.00 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five 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 2017 | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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 2017 | 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 research project in capstone course Economics 4689. **Research: Method**. Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | 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 = 3.42 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Six 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 = 3.08 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Six 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 = 3.00 (N = 12). One student below 2.0. Five 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 2017 | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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 2017 | 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.
 | Research project in capstone course Economics 4689 in senior year. **Research: Justification**. Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee. | Average above 2.5 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.0 for all students (no students rated “not competent”). | Average = 3.08 (N = 12). No students below 2.0. Four students rated “highly competent” (3.5 or higher). | No changes planned at this time. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise this course. |
|  | 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 2017 | 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 2017 | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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 2017 | 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 2017 | 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 2017 | 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 2017 | 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 2017 | No changes planned. If needed, the Curriculum Committee and faculty will revise the curriculum. |
|  | Septennial External Assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator (performed 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.**

We decided to keep Objective #8, because we felt that student satisfaction is one outcome that we would like to measure (even though it doesn’t directly correlate with student learning).

We are also still working on developing more detailed expectations – although there has been some debate within the department of why and how we would do this.

**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?**

The capstone class has added an additional requirement for students to participate in an undergraduate research fair (aka EIU @ EIU – Economic Investigations by Undergraduates @ Eastern Illinois University), where they must present a poster of their capstone research project to faculty, invited guests, graduate students, and other undergraduate students. This is in addition to the oral and written components of the class. We are considering ways to assess this presentation as well.

The quantitative courses in the Economics curriculum were revised to emphasize the importance of data analysis and quantitative reasoning in Economics. ECN3971 is the only course in statistics and has a new title: Statistics Applied to Economics. The titles of ECN3972 and ECN4973 were changed to Basic Econometrics and Intermediate Econometrics, respectively.