

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18 *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

Unit/Program Name: ___Economics___ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** ___John Conant (john.conant@indstate.edu)_____

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p>2.1 Understand the application of microeconomic theory to individuals and firms/agencies</p>	<p>Econ 499 – ETS Exit Exam (Microeconomic subscore) and Senior Capstone White Papers</p>	<p>As a group of students would score at the 25th percentile (mean/median), with 1/3 being in the top half of the national sample (which is 93 schools, 1/3 public and 2/3 private institutions.</p> <p>For white papers, all students would meet expectations on at least 1 white paper.</p>	<p>20 students took the exam over the 3 year period. The median and mean for the group was 16th percentile. Scores were 12th, 9th, and 25th percentile in the 3 years. Only 2 students scored in the top half of the national sample (71st and 72nd percentiles).</p> <p>For white papers, all students met expectations on at least 1 white paper.</p>	<p>Department will be undergoing an external program review over next 2 years. Curricular changes were made in response to the last external review. This date will help inform that review process and the departmental response to the review conclusions.</p>
<p>2.2 Understand the application of macroeconomic theory to governments</p>	<p>Econ 499 – ETS Exit Exam (Macroeconomic subscore) and Senior Capstone White Papers</p>	<p>As a group of students would score at the 25th percentile (mean/median), with 1/3 being in the top half of the national sample (which is 93 schools, 1/3 public and 2/3 private institutions.</p>	<p>20 students took the exam over the 3 year period. The median and mean for the group was 22th percentile. Scores were 22nd, 16th, and 28th percentile in the 3 years. Only 1 students scored in the top half of the national sample (58th percentile).</p>	<p>Department will be undergoing an external program review over next 2 years. Curricular changes were made in response to the last external review. This date will help inform that review process and the</p>

		For white papers, all students would meet expectations on at least 1 white paper.	For white papers, all students met expectations on at least 1 white paper.	departmental response to the review conclusions.
2.3 Understand the application of international economic theory to international issues	Econ 499 – ETS Exit Exam (International subscore) and Senior Capstone White Papers	Only class means are reported by ETS. As a group, students should score in the 33 rd percentile of the national standard. For white papers, all students would meet expectations on at least 1 white paper.	The class means on the international portion of the exam were poor, with all 3 classes falling near the bottom of the national sample. For white papers, all students met expectations on at least 1 white paper.	Department will be undergoing an external program review over next 2 years. Curricular changes were made in response to the last external review. This date will help inform that review process and the departmental response to the review conclusions.

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

1) Students perform better on the critical analysis as measured by the white papers written and discusses in the capstone course than they do in the standardized multiple choice testing from the ETS Exit Exam. The Exit Exam shows that of the three general areas covered in Learning Objective 2 as reported this year, that the students have done better on the Exit Exam for microeconomic theory and macroeconomic theory than they do in the international economic questions on the assessment. The department changed its curriculum after the last external review away from specific core courses and towards more elective courses as recommended by our reviewers. One of these changes was to take the international economics course out of the core and replace it with a listing of internationally themed courses that the students could choose from. We will be discussing the results of this as a part of your next external review process over the next two years. The results of this assessment show a fairly stable student learning outcome. The results for this round do not differ significantly from 3 years ago when we last assessed LO #2.

2) Although our assessment plan calls for us to assess LO #3 (basic understanding of government and how government policies affect economic activity) and LO #4 (analytic ability), we will be doing a more thorough assessment of our curricula as a part of the external review we will be conducting over the next 2 years. In the last external review cycle, the reviewers, although impressed with how much the department faculty were achieving with limited personnel (which has gotten ever more limited), made suggestions about the modification of our core and we did take a number of courses out of the core and created two categories of electives (internationally themed and public policy themed courses). How this has or has not strengthened the program will be looked at more carefully in the current review process.

3) The results of this assessment will be shared with the College of Arts & Sciences and the ISU Assessment officer for posting as they see fit. This assessment, along with the last 2 assessments in our 3 year cycle will be shared with the external reviewers as part of the documentation that they are provided prior to their review visit.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1.To maintain the rigor and academic standards appropriate to the instruction of economics as a behavioral and social science.	Maintaining our standards in course grading, and in our close attention to instructing students in the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods peculiar to economics as a behavioral and social science.	Course DFDr and completion rates (all students), GPAs (majors), Senior Seminar 499 results for majors (standardized exams and White Papers), 4-year graduation rates for students who take economics compared to those who do not.	Roughly 30% DFDR grades, and 77% completion rate, for all 1701 students in econ courses in AY 2017-18. (Overall CAS completion rate is 85%.) Our 23 econ majors had a GPA of 2.71 in Spring 18 with a cumulative GPA of 2.95. Relatively stable standardized test results and successful completion of white paper projects for majors in Econ 499 (see Part 1a). 4-year graduation rate for students who have some econ credit increased from 40.2% to 42.9% in the past year, while the 4-year	All goals continuing.

			graduation rate for those without econ credit only increased from 25.0% to 25.5% (details in Part 1b).	
2.To expand upon our ongoing efforts to build innovative pedagogies, technologies and topical structures into our courses.	New topical and interdisciplinary Foundational Studies and cross-listed courses (Israel, Babb), new team-taught course (Israel, Wayoro), application of “course-flipping” methods in Econ 200 (Richards), introduction of smart phone technology in Econ 100 (Guell), participation in first-year learning communities and FCTE workshops (Israel, Richards).	Student course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, in addition to the data referenced under Goals/Objectives #1 above.	Recent econ student course evaluations in lower level courses have shown scores above the university median. (See Econ 2017-18 Department Student Success Plan Update.) Our peer evaluations confirm that all our instructors are highly competent and professional. For econ majors, we just had our largest graduating class in many years, as we conferred 10 degrees in AY 2017-18 (Blue Reports). Our four-year graduation rate for majors (2014 cohort) was 40%, which compares favorably to 27% for CAS as a whole (Blue Reports).	Several Econ faculty, led by Richards, are exploring increased participation in the University Honors Program. An initial exploratory meeting has been held with the director of the Honors Program Greg Bierly.
3.To build upon and diversify our recent career readiness initiatives in our instruction.	Helping students to complete requirements for the Career Readiness Certificate within courses they take for the Econ Major or Econ Minor (Israel, Babb), working on several levels with the Career Center to enhance students’ use of the Center as a resource, increased emphasis on career-oriented research activities and field trips in our upper-level courses (e.g. trips to conferences, conference presentations, visits to the Chicago Federal Reserve) (Israel, Babb), strong	Econ Senior Seminar 499 White Paper results, other data included under Goals/Objectives #1 and #2 above.	See Column d under Goals/Objectives #1 and #2 above.	Working toward increasing student contacts with successful Econ alumni and other economics professionals. Possible internship and/or practical research courses in Economics. (Both currently under discussion.)

	emphasis on the reading and writing competency component of courses at all levels (Burkett, Richards).			
--	--	--	--	--

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

1. The main discovery from our attention to the various dimensions of student success is the unique opportunity that the discipline of economics provides for the interpretation and fulfillment of the University’s overriding mission of *inclusive excellence*. Toward this end, student success indicators and their assessment must be informed by, and balanced against, the goals of pedagogical rigor and maintenance of academic standards, to ensure quality and not just quantity of outcomes. Economics, with its peculiar combination of qualitative and quantitative (as well as behavioral and social) analyses, is well placed to demonstrate how such a balanced contextualization can be conceptualized and carried out. Despite the methodologically demanding nature of economics, and our department’s emphasis on strong academic standards, we graduated 10 majors last year – the most in many years. Moreover, the 4-year graduation rate for Econ Majors (40%) actually exceeded that for CAS students as a whole. As per Econ students as a whole (not just Majors), the relative difficulty of economics courses is perhaps reflected in the 77% completion rate in our lower level courses compared to 85% for all CAS lower level courses. For upper level courses, our completion rate is 80% compared to the CAS rate of 89% (Blue Reports data). We interpret these differentials as surprisingly small given the demanding nature of both our lower level and upper level courses. However, the most important evidence for Economics instruction as a path to inclusive excellence is that students who take economics courses are much more likely to graduate “on time,” as shown by the following data from the ISU Office of Institutional Research:

Cohort	Total Students	Number with Econ Credit (4-year graduation rate)	Number with No Econ Credit (4-year graduation rate)
2013	2650	655 (40.2%)	1995 (25.0%)
2014	2731	630 (42.9%)	2101 (25.5%)

2. We are responding to the challenge of inclusive excellence by enhancing the variety of pedagogical approaches that our students have access to in different Econ courses, and by bolstering the practical/career orientation of student course experiences. The department now realizes that a variety of instructional approaches developed by different faculty can potentially enhance student success in both academic outcomes and career readiness. This matches the variety of qualitative and quantitative methods (as well as normative angles) employed

within the economics profession itself. It also matches the variegated character of work and life experiences that students will face upon graduation from ISU. Hence while some of our faculty emphasize more-or-less traditional “chalk and talk” approaches to instruction (with lots of reading and writing), others place relatively more emphasis on new classroom technologies, group-participatory discussions, and outside-classroom experiences (field trips, participation on conferences, enhanced engagement with the Career Center, etc.). This helps create well-rounded educational experiences for our majors as well as for non-majors who take more than one Econ course. To repeat: such well-rounded experience and learning ability is arguably a key element in today’s hyper-flexible and uncertain labor markets.

Within this overall orientation, the Economics Department remains committed to maintaining instructional standards through biennial reviews of peer teaching observations and of student course evaluations. Econ faculty all abide by University rules on Blackboard reporting, syllabus information, maintenance of adequate and regular office hours, and other basic elements of professionalism in instruction. We are confident that Econ student course evaluation results will continue (as they always have) to compare favorably with CAS- and University-wide averages once the new data reporting system has come on line.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.

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)

Program: Economics	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.50/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.50/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 rigors 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>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.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	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.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	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 in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	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.	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.	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.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	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.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	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. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	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.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary