Dear John,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President’s Office and the Provost’s team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program: Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</strong> Mature (2.50/3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue):</strong> Mature (2.50/3.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Learning outcomes are clear, measurable, and student-centered.
- Clear information about multiple sources of student learning data for analysis. Using a national exam alongside an internal assessment is a good way to compare student performance to peers nationally as well as to program standards, giving further opportunities for analysis.
- Clear description of student scores on ETS exam and on white papers relative to expectations for performance.
- Good information is provided on how results are shared and how faculty and external reviewers will utilize findings in upcoming curriculum review process associate with external review.
- Department goals align with needs of the students to attempt to meet the rigor of the subject matter.
- Innovative methods and measures of instruction are commendable, as are efforts made in career readiness. Analysis confirms improvements over past measures.

**Recommendations**
- Consider cutting “understand the” from the beginning of the outcomes, and changing “application of” to “apply.” This will directly indicate that you expect your students can apply the concepts described rather than just understand (which is harder to assess because it can mean many things) the concepts. If “apply” is a higher level of cognition than desired, using “describe” would be a more basic way of demonstrating understanding.
- Describe how white papers were evaluated for student learning (rubric, checklist, etc.). Also consider noting why students only need to meet expectations on 1 white paper (is this a developmental writing sequence, for instance?). If there are multiple papers, is there value in creating an expectation and/or reporting data reflecting student performance across the papers?
- Creating plans to address student performance shortcomings are likely missing from the report due to the impending external review – consider how the review and your assessment findings will not only change curricular offerings (ex: possibility of reinstating international economics core course) but also how choices of assignments/tests and evaluation tools can give better information with which to make decisions.
Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).
Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Mature</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Undeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (e.g., it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.). Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditior goals/standards.</td>
<td>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (e.g., it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.).</td>
<td>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</td>
<td>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g., curriculum map) or are not measurable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</strong></td>
<td>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</td>
<td>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</td>
<td>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</td>
<td>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis & Results | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.  
Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).  
Results are shared in relation to performance goals.  
Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards. | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.  
Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).  
Results are shared in relation to performance goals. | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.  
Results are reported with little description of analysis.  
No data is being collected.  
No results are provided. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement | Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice  
Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.  
A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined. | Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.  
Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. | Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.  
Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.  
No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.  
No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn). |
<p>| Overall Rating | Exemplary | Mature | Developing | Undeveloped |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>0 Undeveloped</th>
<th>1 Developing</th>
<th>2 Mature</th>
<th>3 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals/ Objectives</strong></td>
<td>No goals/objectives are identified.</td>
<td>Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.</td>
<td>Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.</td>
<td>Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td>No action steps are identified.</td>
<td>Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.</td>
<td>Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.</td>
<td>Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective</strong></td>
<td>No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.</td>
<td>Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.</td>
<td>Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.</td>
<td>Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement</strong></td>
<td>For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.</td>
<td>For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</td>
<td>For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</td>
<td>For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating**
- □ Undeveloped
- □ Developing
- □ Mature
- □ Exemplary