

# STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM **CY 2019**

Degree and Program Name: **M.A. in Economics**

Submitted By: **Ali R. Moshtagh**

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CGS this year by **October 15**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to Dr. Nikki Hillier and should also be submitted to your college dean.

## 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. Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be able to think critically and solve problems by applying theory to analyze individual and social issues.	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Analysis and Response to Questions.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 2.9 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate thesis. <b>Theory Relevance.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.29 (N = 8). No students under 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

Graduate thesis. <b>Theory Limits.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.19 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Theory Application.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.21 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Analysis and Response to Questions at Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.38 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Theory: Relevance.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Theory Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum and courses.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Theory: Limits.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Theory Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	This is a lot lower than expected. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Theory: Application.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Theory Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum and courses.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.63 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	This is slightly lower than expected. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

<p>Papers in graduate courses.<sup>1</sup>  <b>Quantitative: Model.</b>          Committee/Person responsible:          Quantitative Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").</p>	<p>Average = 3.63 (N = 8).          No students below 2.5.          Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).</p>	<p>No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Papers in graduate courses.<sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Justification.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").</p>	<p>Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).</p>	<p>No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Papers in graduate courses.<sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Hypotheses.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").</p>	<p>Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).</p>	<p>No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Papers in graduate courses.<sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Method.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").</p>	<p>Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).</p>	<p>No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Papers in graduate courses.<sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Conclusion.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.</p>	<p>Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").</p>	<p>Average = 3.0 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. One student rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).</p>	<p>This is slightly lower than expected. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program in economics provided me with a solid foundation in economic theory." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.</p>	<p>Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.</p>	<p>No exit interviews in CY2019.</p>	<p>No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>
<p>Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program in economics developed my capability to apply economic theory to new situations." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.</p>	<p>Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.</p>	<p>No exit interviews in CY2019.</p>	<p>No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.</p>

	Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program in economics developed my ability to formulate good research problems." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program contributed to my ability to select and apply appropriate research methods." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
2.	Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be able to formulate salient research questions.	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Organization.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.9 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum and courses.	
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.13 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Graduate thesis. <b>Research: Justification.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	

Graduate thesis. <b>Research: Hypotheses.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.3 (N = 8). One student below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Research: Conclusion.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 8). One student below 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis <b>Content of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.3 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Organization of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Development of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.3 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Justification.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Hypotheses.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Method.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

	Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Conclusion.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.0 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. One student rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	This is slightly lower than expected. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics contributed to my ability to formulate good research problems." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
3.	Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be able to select and apply appropriate research methods.	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Organization.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 2.8 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum and courses.	
	Graduate thesis: <b>Research: Method.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.49 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.	



Graduate thesis. <b>Quantitative Model.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.46 (N = 8). No students under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate Thesis. <b>Quantitative Data.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Quantitative Procedures.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Quantitative Tests.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Research: Method.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Research Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Paper in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Quantitative: Model.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.63 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum and courses.
Paper in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Quantitative: Data.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.63 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum and courses.
Paper in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Quantitative: Procedures</b> Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.25 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum and courses.

	Paper in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Quantitative: Tests.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Quantitative Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.50 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum and courses.
	Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program in economics contributed to my ability to select and apply appropriate research methods." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5- point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum.
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5- point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise graduate curriculum.
4. Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be able to communicate effectively.	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Focus.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Organization.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 2.8 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.



Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Oral Effectiveness.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.2 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate Forum (non-thesis option). <b>Analysis and Response to Questions.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Advisor and panel of faculty.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 2.9 (N = 3). No students under 2.5. No students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate the curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Content of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.3 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Focus of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Organization of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Development of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.3 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Effectiveness of Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will the revise graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Analysis and Response to Questions at Oral Presentation.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

Graduate thesis. <b>Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Focus.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.6 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Organization.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.4 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Five students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Style.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.2 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Graduate thesis. <b>Mechanics.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Graduate Coordinator and Thesis Committee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 8). One student under 2.5. Two students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Content.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Focus.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4- point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.38 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Organization.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.75 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Development.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 2.6 (N = 8). No student below 2.5. Six students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	This is slightly lower than expected. No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Style.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.5 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Four students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Papers in graduate courses. <sup>1</sup> <b>Writing: Mechanics.</b> Committee/Person responsible: Writing Subcommittee.	Average above 3 on a 4-point scale. Minimum score of 2.5 for all students (no students rated "not competent").	Average = 3.1 (N = 8). No students below 2.5. Three students rated "highly competent" (3.5 or higher).	This is slightly lower than expected. No changes planned. If needed, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Exit interview of MA students. "The graduate program in economics developed my ability to communicate effectively." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned, but we will continue to monitor. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics prepared me well for future employment." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

5. Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be trained to apply economic reasoning and tools to a wide range of economic issues and fields.	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics increased my awareness of real-world economic issues." Committee/Person responsible: Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics made me a better-informed citizen." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
6. Graduates of the MA program in Economics will be well-informed citizens with increased awareness of real-world economic issues.	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics increased my awareness of real-world economic issues." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics made me a better-informed citizen." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Exit survey of MA students. "The graduate program in economics developed my capability to apply economic theory to new situations." Committee/Person responsible: Chair and Survey Coordinator.	Average above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale.	No exit interviews in CY2019.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.
	Septennial external assessment. Committee/Person responsible: Outside evaluator. (Performed in 2015)	Good quality master's degree.	Has major (positive) impact on the lives of its graduates.	No changes planned. If change is necessary, the Graduate Committee and faculty will revise the graduate curriculum.

<sup>1</sup>Copies of all papers written in graduate 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, and 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 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. Overall, "in comparison with SIU's (graduate) program, one which I am quite familiar with, it is significantly better."

## **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 some new curricular changes in the MA program during the past two academic years. We have added a new track in Financial Economics to our existing two tracks and created a new course, ECN 5461 – Seminar in International Monetary Economics. We have also changed the title of ECN 5433 – Applied Econometrics to ECN 5433 - Advanced Econometrics. We are considering the addition of a Mathematical Economics course at the graduate level as well when resources become available.

The Department still continues the process of developing an Alumni Advisory Board (comprised mostly from alumni). Several Economics alumni have been contacted regarding involvement with the Board and they all have shown strong interests. However, the financial woes of the recent past have prevented the process of installation and assembly of the Board. This board will help the Department plan curriculum and instruction in the future. We are also considering ways we can use information from this advisory board in the assessment of our graduate program.

**Student Learning Assessment Program**  
**Response to Summary Form**  
**Graduate Program 2020**  
 January 25, 2021

Department: Economics

Degree and Program Name: M.A. in Economics

Reviewer: Dr. Nikki Hillier, Graduate Assessment Coordinator, Graduate School

<b>Category</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Learning Objectives</b>	The objectives for the program encompass all the graduate learning goals established by EIU's Council on Graduate Studies.
<b>How, Where, and When Assessed</b>	The assessment plan is clear and solid, especially for Objectives 1-4, but it is important to assess each of the objectives regularly, and Objectives 5 and 6 have not been assessed this period, or for the last few years. Students are assessed by submitting a variety of papers completed throughout the program. Then, several teams with differing areas of expertise evaluate several different assignments (pulled at random from papers submitted). If a student writes a thesis, their thesis committee will assess each area. Other pieces of the assessment plan include an exit survey, and finally, the program as a whole is evaluated by an external evaluator every 7 years.
<b>Expectations</b>	Expectations are included and seem reasonable, but in order to make the expectations clearer, it would be helpful to include the rubrics used by the panels and subcommittees.
<b>Results</b>	The program is meeting nearly all assessment goals. It is clear you are recruiting students who are a good fit for the program. Few students exceeded the program's established expectations. Some of the results state that scores were lower than expected, though at other times it is noted that all students are meeting expectations. On measures where some students performed below expectations, the lower scores are not mentioned in summary.
<b>How Results Will be Used</b>	Your report should detail how results are shared with graduate faculty. You make note of places where expectations fall short, but is there a process in place to identify and support students who are having difficulty in the program? Are the assessment results only reported to the Graduate School or are they discussed with graduate faculty or as a department?



<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>The assessment plan is strong in that students submit a portfolio of their work and are evaluated by subcommittees on different learning goals. This is a good way to get a more complete picture of each student and their learning. However, we encourage you to assess students throughout the curriculum to monitor formative performance, and identify possible ways to support struggling students. For your next report it would be helpful to include the rubrics used by the subcommittees to evaluate student work. Finally, as the external program evaluation and exit interviews are the sole means of assessing learning goals 5 and 6, these should be done annually or at least every two years. Establishing a clearer process for engaging graduate faculty in these efforts would also assist the program moving forward. Having subcommittees evaluate a variety of student work is a real strengths of your assessment plan, and we recommend using that piece to assess other learning goals as well.</p>
------------------------	--

The Council on Graduate Studies approved of revised learning goals on December 8, 2020, which included the addition of an Ethical and Professional Responsibility learning goal. Please consult with your graduate faculty members to determine how to incorporate this learning goal into future assessment activities.