

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program Name: BA/BS in Economics

Due to Dean by June 1

Contact Name and Email John Conant, john.conant@indstate.edu

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
4.1 Apply economic theory to practical economic problems encountered by individuals and households	Senior Capstone White Papers Econ 499	90 percent of students will be evaluated as at least having "met expectations" wrt the LO by the final (relevant) white paper in Econ 499.	95% of the 22 students scored at least "met expectations" on this LO (10 exceeding, 11 meeting and 1 not meeting).	Senior capstone instructor (Dr. Conant) collects the results during the course, analyzes the data and presents a report to the faculty in a fall department meeting.
4.2 Apply economic theory to practical economic problems encountered by firms	Senior Capstone White Papers Econ 499	90 percent of students will be evaluated as at least having "met expectations" wrt the LO by the final (relevant) white paper in Econ 499.	95% of the 22 students scored at least "met expectations" on this LO (9 exceeding, 12 meeting, and 1 not meeting).	Senior capstone instructor (Dr. Conant) collects the results during the course, analyzes the data and presents a report to the faculty in a fall department meeting.
4.3 Apply economic theory to practical economic problems	Senior Capstone White Papers Econ 499	90 percent of students will be evaluated as at least having "met expectations" wrt the LO by the final (relevant) white paper in Econ 499.	91% of the 22 students scored at least "met expectations" on this LO (10 exceeding, 10 meeting and 2 not meeting).	Senior capstone instructor (Dr. Conant) collects the results during the course, analyzes the data and presents a report to the faculty in a fall department meeting.
5.1 Possess a basic understanding of statistical techniques	Senior Capstone Research Paper and Presentation Econ 499	90 percent of students will be evaluated as at least having "met expectations" wrt the LO on their Capstone research paper and presentation.	91% of the 20 students scored at least "met expectations" on this LO (6 exceeding, 12 meeting, and 2 not meeting). 2014 class exceeded, 2015 class met, and 2016 class did not meet expectations on the Quant Exit Exam Sub-score (class average).	Senior capstone instructor (Dr. Conant) collects the results during the course, analyzes the data and presents a report to the faculty in a fall department meeting.
5.2 Possess a basic understanding of how to conduct and present economic research	Senior Capstone Research Paper and Presentation Econ 499	90 percent of students will be evaluated as at least having "met expectations" wrt the LO on their Capstone research paper and presentation.	95% of the 20 students scored at least "met expectations" (8 exceeding, 11 meeting, and 1 not meeting).	Senior capstone instructor (Dr. Conant) collects the results during the course, analyzes the data and presents a report to the faculty in a fall department meeting.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

In 2015-2016, the department's assessment plan calls for a 3 year evaluation cycle, and as the 3rd year of this cycle, the plan calls for the evaluation of LO's 4 and 5. LO 4 in Analytic Ability and LO 5 is Economic Research. The department expects that 90% of the students in the Senior Capstone course where the data is collected on each LO will be evaluated on each Learning Objective as having "met expectations". The chart above indicates that we have met this level of success in each of the measures evaluated this year.

Outcomes 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3: Apply theory to practical econ problems encountered by individuals and households (4.1), by firms (4.2) and by encountered by governments (4.3). This outcome is evaluated through the assessment of a number of white papers on current economic issues/problems written in the Capstone course. Each of the three objectives of LO 4 (4.1 – 4.3) was assessed in at least 2 different white papers in each year of the evaluation period (2014-2016). Student work was evaluated as "superior, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, unsatisfactory, or failing" in regards to each LO relevant to a particular white paper. The student was then judged overall in terms of the best evaluation mark they received on the white papers relevant to each of the three learning objectives of LO4. The chart above indicates the number of each students earning each category of success for each of the three sub-objectives of LO4, and shows that 95% were evaluated as at least "meeting expectations" on 4.1 and 4.2 and that 91% of students were evaluated as at least "meeting expectations for 4.3.

Outcomes 5.1 and 5.2: Understanding of statistical techniques and conducting and presenting economic research are evaluated in the Capstone course by the Quantitative subscore on the ETS Exit Exam and through the writing and presentation of a major research paper. The Quantitative subscore is only provided by ETS as a class average. The class average on this score was "exceeding" for the 2014 class, "meeting" for the 2015 class, and "unsatisfactory" for the 2016 class. This trend is troubling but not completely unexpected as the department has reduced the quantitative requirements of the program significantly in recent years. This result will be the subject of a departmental meeting in the fall. LO 5 was also assessed by the Capstone research paper, and the table indicates that 91% and 95% of students were evaluated as having at least "met expectations" on the statistical understanding and an understanding of how to conduct and present economic research. Again, this aspect of the program will be discussed by the entire department in the fall.

No changes were made to the assessment program for the 2015-2016 AY, although the department did discuss the LO utilized in our plan. That discussion is on-going. The department assessment plan has now evaluated all 5 of our Learning Objectives and the emphasis in 2016-2017 will be on LO 5 and the assessment plan as a whole. The department has used a program evaluation survey by all graduates for the past 3 years and the results of this survey will also be utilized to inform the assessment plan discussions during 2016-2017 AY.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA/BS in Economics Date: 8.19.16

	Level 0 - Undeveloped	Level 1 - Developing	Level 2 - Mature	Level 3 - Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. Most are. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty

				<p>and other stakeholders.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics,</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required</p>

			<p>checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p>to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are</p>

	<p>provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p>provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p>provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p>4. Engagement & Improvement</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <i>Will be?</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other</p>

		<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 - Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 - Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 - Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

The five outcomes listed in the report generally are clear and specific (with exception of 5.1 and 5.2: We really cannot measure the knowledge students “possess,” only that they demonstrate in some fashion).

2. Measures & Performance Goals

Multiple measures are used to assess student performance, including white papers and a presentation students complete in the capstone course, and a Major Field Test (which is not referenced in Part I). Expectations for achievement are appropriately high for the capstone projects. What is the expectation for the exam?

3. Results

Students met the standards set for the capstone course projects but not, I assume, for the exam. Part I clearly depicts the numerical results of the assessments. In Part II, I would like to know more about what the results tell you about what students know and can do well (and less well). Since you use a rubric to assess the papers (and thank you for providing it!), you can use it to frame this analysis.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Since all assessments are conducted in the capstone course, a single faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing the results. Because the faculty have not yet had the opportunity to discuss these results, no plans for improvement were provided. Please incorporate the results of this discussion in next year’s report. I am particularly interested in knowing if actions are recommended that could reverse the decline in quantitative sub scores.

Thanks for sharing this information about your program’s student learning assessment program!