

Academic Program
Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
College of Arts and Sciences
The University of New Mexico

A. College, Department and Date

1. College: *Arts and Sciences*
2. Department: *Economics*
3. Date: *11/28/2016*

B. Academic Program of Study*

PhD Economics

C. Contact Person(s) for the Assessment Plan

Jennifer Thacher, Graduate Director, jthacher@unm.edu

D. Broad Program Goals & Measurable Student Learning Outcomes

[Attach Cover Sheet for Student Learning Outcomes and associated materials.]

OR

[List below:]

1. Broad Program Learning Goals for this Degree/Certificate Program

- A. Students develop a solid understanding of economic theory, methods, and specialized knowledge in field that will prepare them for professional careers.
- B. Students engage in and conduct original, high-quality, policy-relevant research that follows professional norms
- C. Students develop strong written and oral communication skills

2. List of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for this Degree/Certificate Program [Your program should have at least 3 and these should be aligned with the program Goals (as indicated by A, B, C, etc.) and UNM's broad learning goals]

- A.1. By the end of the program, students can explain and manipulate economic models

UNM Goals (___ Knowledge X Skills ___ Responsibility)

* Academic Program of Study is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).

A.2 By the end of the program, students can use appropriate econometrics to explore economic issues and test hypotheses

UNM Goals (___ Knowledge Skills ___ Responsibility)

B.1. By the end of the program, students can conduct original, high-quality economic analysis

UNM Goals (___ Knowledge Skills ___ Responsibility)

C.1 By the end of the program, students can effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists

UNM Goals (___ Knowledge Skills ___ Responsibility)

C.2 By the end of the program, students can effectively present their work and economics ideas to interdisciplinary and general audiences, including undergraduate students

UNM Goals (___ Knowledge Skills ___ Responsibility)

E. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan

All programs are expected to measure some outcomes and report annually and to measure all program outcomes at least once over a three-year review cycle.

1. Timeline for Assessment

Year/Semester	Assessment Activities
Year 1, Fall	SLOs A1, A2 assessed
Year 1, Spring	Results discussed with faculty at grad assessment meeting (2 nd Weds in February) – Calls for action directed to graduate committee
Year 2, Fall	SLO B1 assessed
Year 2, Spring	Results discussed with faculty at grad assessment meeting (2 nd Weds in February) - Calls for action directed to graduate committee
Year 3, Fall	SLO C1 assessed
Year 3, Spring	Results discussed with faculty at grad assessment meeting (2 nd Weds in February) - Calls for action directed to graduate committee

2. How will learning outcomes be assessed?

A1: By the end of the program, students can explain and manipulate economic models

Assessment measure	Description (2.A.I)	Type (2.A.II)	Criteria for success (2.A.III)	Who (2.B)
<i>Measure #1: Comprehensive Exam in Micro and Macro Theory</i>	Consists of two seven-hour written exams. The design of the comprehensive exam allows the examination committee to ascertain if the individual student has a complete knowledge of both microeconomics and macroeconomics. The faculty committee blind-evaluates and scores the exams.	<i>DIRECT</i>	50% pass micro and macro components at PhD level	All second year students
<i>Measure #2: Research Paper Departmental Seminar</i>	Committee on Studies mentors the student work. When the committee deems the research paper ready, the student schedules a departmental seminar. All faculty members attending the presentation complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All 3 rd year students
<i>Measure #3: Doctoral Dissertation Defense</i>	Dissertation committees evaluate student work according to professional standards. Each member of their committee scores their dissertation on substance, methodology, and an evaluation of the work as a whole. Each objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent). It would be expected that a dissertation would have a component dealing with the economic model, so their scores on these objectives provide an indirect measure of this SLO.	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All students in final year

A2: By the end of the program, students can use appropriate econometrics to explore economic issues and test hypotheses				
Assessment measure	Description (2.A.I)	Type (2.A.II)	Criteria for success (2.A.III)	Who (2.B)
<p><i>Measure #1:</i> <i>Field Exam in Econometrics</i></p>	<p>Written eight to eight and a half hour exam in econometrics. The design of the field exam in econometrics allows the examination committee to ascertain if the individual student has a complete knowledge of the material covered in the three-course sequence in econometrics.</p>	<i>DIRECT</i>	80% pass exam at PhD level	All second year students
<p><i>Measure #2:</i> <i>Research Paper Departmental Seminar</i></p>	<p>Committee on Studies mentors the student work. When the committee deems the research paper ready, the student schedules a departmental seminar. All faculty members attending the presentation complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).</p>	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All 3 rd year students
<p><i>Measure #3:</i> <i>Doctoral Dissertation Defense</i></p>	<p>Dissertation committees evaluate student work according to professional standards. Each member of their committee scores their dissertation on substance, methodology, and an evaluation of the work as a whole. Each objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent). It would be expected that a dissertation would have a component dealing with the economic model, so their scores on these objectives provide an indirect measure of this SLO.</p>	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All students in final year

B1: By the end of the program, students can conduct original, high-quality economic analysis				
Assessment measure	Description (2.A.I)	Type (2.A.II)	Criteria for success (2.A.III)	Who (2.B)
<p><i>Measure #1:</i> <i>Research Paper</i> <i>Departmental Seminar</i></p>	<p>Committee on Studies mentors the student work. When the committee deems the research paper ready, the student schedules a departmental seminar. All faculty members attending the presentation complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).</p>	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All 3 rd year students
<p><i>Measure #2:</i> <i>Doctoral Dissertation</i> <i>Defense</i></p>	<p>Dissertation committees evaluate student work according to professional standards. Each member of their committee scores their dissertation on substance, methodology, and an evaluation of the work as a whole. Each objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent). It would be expected that a dissertation would have a component dealing with the economic model, so their scores on these objectives provide an indirect measure of this SLO.</p>	<i>DIRECT</i>	Average score is "good" or better	All students in final year
<p><i>Measure #3:</i> <i>Student publications</i></p>	<p>Assessment by external reviewers. Number of publications by current and recent PhD students.</p>	<i>INDIRECT</i>	5 publications per year	Current and recent PhD graduates

C1: By the end of the program, students can effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists and economic ideas to interdisciplinary and general audiences, including undergraduate students

Assessment measure	Description (2.A.I)	Type (2.A.II)	Criteria for success (2.A.III)	Who (2.B)
<p><i>Measure #1:</i> <i>Research Paper Departmental Seminar</i></p>	<p>Committee on Studies mentors the student work. When the committee deems the research paper ready, the student schedules a departmental seminar. All faculty members attending the presentation complete an evaluation form that asks how well the student performs on this SLO. The objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent).</p>	<p><i>DIRECT</i></p>	<p>Average score is “good” or better</p>	<p>All 3rd year students</p>
<p><i>Measure #2:</i> <i>Doctoral Dissertation Defense</i></p>	<p>Dissertation committees evaluate student work according to professional standards. Each member of their committee scores their dissertation on substance, methodology, and an evaluation of the work as a whole. Each objective is scored out of five points, where a five is best (1=inferior, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent). It would be expected that a dissertation would have a component dealing with the economic model, so their scores on these objectives provide an indirect measure of this SLO.</p>	<p><i>DIRECT</i></p>	<p>Average score is “good” or better</p>	<p>All students in final year</p>
<p><i>Measure #3:</i> <i>Job Placements</i></p>	<p>Assessment by external job market. Number of students on job market and count of placement type.</p>	<p><i>INDIRECT</i></p>	<p>75% of students have job</p>	<p>All students on job market</p>
<p><i>Measure #4:</i> <i>Teaching evaluation scores</i></p>	<p>Assessment by undergraduate students via university teaching evaluations (EvalKit). Instructor is assessed on “overall teaching effectiveness out of five points, where a 5 is best (1=Highly ineffective, 2=ineffective, 3=unsure, 4=effective, 5=Highly effective).</p>	<p><i>INDIRECT</i></p>	<p>Average score is “effective” or better.</p>	<p>All students teaching as independent instructors in in undergraduate and graduate courses and students teaching labs.</p>

3. What is the unit's process to analyze/interpret assessment data and use results to improve student learning?

Briefly describe:

1. *who will participate in the assessment process (the gathering of evidence, the analysis/interpretation, recommendations).*

The assessment data for the direct measures is gathered by specific committees and provided to the Graduate Coordinator. Specifically:

- The Microeconomics and Macroeconomics committee are in charge of creating the comprehensive exam instruments, grading the exams, and providing recommendations. The overall faculty then discusses and votes on final results.
- The Econometrics committee is in charge of creating the comprehensive exam instruments, grading the exams, and providing recommendations. The overall faculty then discusses and votes on final results.
- The Committee on Studies for each student are in charge of evaluating that student's research requirement seminar (with additional feedback provided by other faculty in attendance).
- The Dissertation committee for each student is in charge of evaluating that student's dissertation.

The assessment data for the indirect measures is gathered by the Graduate Coordinator.

The Graduate Director analyzes the aggregated data and assembles a report with initial recommendations. This information is communicated annually via a faculty meeting. In addition, in the case of the core exam and econometrics exam, we have scheduled times to discuss these results during faculty meeting. Each faculty meeting also includes scheduled time for the Graduate Director to provide a brief report on graduate issues. In past years, annual assessment meetings have generated discussion, which then gets sent to the Graduate Committee for more discussion and possible action.

2. *the process for consideration of the implications of assessment for change:*

The process of changing assessment mechanisms depends on specific faculty committees, the Graduate Director, and the faculty. For example, the Microeconomic, Macroeconomic, and Econometrics Committees revise the actual exams each year. Any change in the process of the exam (e.g., conversion from a full-day exam to 2 hour exam or conversion from a written exam to an oral exam) would require discussion and approval by the faculty and a change to the Graduate Handbook. Changes to the mechanisms used for the other direct measures and the indirect measures would occur based on input from the Graduate Committee and/or larger faculty.

Any change to curriculum design goes first through the Graduate Committee, with discussions with any affected groups (i.e., Micro, Macro, or Econometrics committees; departmental fields). They then bring any proposed changes and rationale for these changes to a faculty meeting for discussion. Any curriculum design changes must be approved by the faculty.

Any individual faculty member teaching a class has the right to make their pedagogical decisions. Faculty meetings, assessment meetings, and informal faculty times (lunches, coffee, etc) provide an opportunity for discussions about pedagogy and how assessment results might suggest specific pedagogical methods.

3. *How, when, and to whom will recommendations be communicated?*

Initial recommendations based on the assessment report are communicated to faculty at the annual assessment meeting, in addition to overall results. Inevitably, discussion at these meetings focuses on one or two particular issues that then go back to the Graduate Committee for more discussion. The Graduate Committee then brings recommendations back to the full faculty for a vote.