

Revised Assessment Plan for PhD Economics

1. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.

The following five SLO's were adopted by the faculty Spring 2008.

A1. Students explain and manipulate complex economic models.

B1. Students use appropriate econometrics to explore economic issues and test hypotheses.

B2. Students undertake original economic analysis.

C1. Students effectively present their work to peers and PhD economists.

C2. Students effectively present their work and economics ideas to interdisciplinary and general audiences, including undergraduate students.

2. For each learning outcome, describe a) the measures used (at least one-half of the measures used are to be direct measures, and at least one direct measure must be used for each SLO), b) the sample of students from whom data were collected, c) the timetable for the collection, and d) the setting in which the measures were administered. (Find examples of direct measures at <http://www.unm.edu/~assess/ToolsAndTemplates.html>).

The following table provides an updated timetable for collection, based on modification adopted by the faculty Fall 2008. Modifications were made to either more adequately reflect the procedures in the department to incorporate refined procedural changes that have been adopted by the department and the suggested reduced number of measures and assessment mechanisms.

For each assessment measure, the first line of information includes the SLO category and the assessment instrument. The second line provides information concerning the timetable.

| SLO | DESCRIPTION |
|--|---|
| A1 | Comprehensive Exam in Micro and Macro Theory [DIRECT] |
| PH.D. August 2008 after first year of program. Two six-hour exams administered in the Departmental Conference Room. | |
| A1 | Doctoral Dissertation [DIRECT] |
| Varies with individual student progress. Dissertation or thesis defense scheduled in the Departmental Conference Room individually for each student when their committee has | |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | determined the research adequate to fulfill the requirements. |
| B1 | Comprehensive Exam in Econometrics [DIRECT] |
| | August 2008, January 2009. Eight hour exam administered in the Departmental Conference Room. |
| A1,B1, B2 | Doctoral Dissertation. [DIRECT] |
| | Varies with individual student progress. Dissertation or thesis defense scheduled in the Departmental Conference Room individually for each student when their committee has determined the research adequate to fulfill the requirements for the degree in question. |
| B2,C2 | Doctoral Dissertation. [DIRECT] |
| | Dissertation or thesis defense scheduled in the Departmental Conference Room individually for each student when their committee has determined the research adequate to fulfill the requirements for the degree in question. |
| B2 | Research Paper Requirement (PhD) [DIRECT] |
| | Varies with individual student progress. Research requirement paper will be completed between successful completion of the econometrics exam and dissertation. Term papers vary with student and course schedule. |
| B2 | Student paper submissions and publications. [DIRECT] |

3. Describe the results of the assessment. (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?) If specific results are not available, describe the progress that has been made on the initiatives included in the approved assessment plan.

Objectives for 2008-2009 are to finalize and adopt implementation procedures for the above assessment tools. The following table provides details. The first line provides the assessment method and type. The second line provides detail on the developed procedure and status.

| Assessment Method | Type |
|--|--------|
| Comprehensive Exams | Direct |
| Appointed faculty committees develop the annual core exams, which are administered to Ph.D. students August after their first year of studies.. The microeconomic theory and macroeconomic theory components are standardized in that there are a total of four questions covering each section. Exam questions cover the core theories in micro and macroeconomics, as well as specialty area questions. The core theory questions are designed to test the students' knowledge and ability to apply the concepts and theories necessary to be a practicing economist. The specialty questions are designed to test the students' abilities and knowledge in a broader range of topics that are consistent with our specialty field areas. The design of the exam allows the examination committee to ascertain if the individual student has a complete knowledge, and if not if the problems are in macro or micro theory, Furthermore the design allows the committee to ascertain if an individual student's difficulties are in the required concepts or in application of the concepts. At an aggregate level, the results allow the faculty to assess overall performance of the test cohort to pinpoint systematic problems in the program. | |

The faculty committee blind-evaluates and scores the exams. After individual evaluation and scoring, the committees meet to discuss and assign scores to each individual exam question. Based on a standardized criteria (add grading criteria from exams), exams are assessed a score of "Pass", "Marginal Pass", "Marginal Fail", or "Fail" on each question. An aggregate score for the exam is then determined (Again based on standardized criteria) of "Pass at Ph.D.", "Pass at M.A.", or "Fail at both Ph.D. and M.A." Students receive a letter that provides their overall score, as well as committee assigned scores for each question. At the request of the student, the committee meets with the student to go over the exam performance.

Aggregate performance statistics will be kept concerning the performance on core concept and specialty area questions. The Graduate Director and Academic Advisor will provide an annual report of results.

STATUS: In progress. Exams standardized, evaluation format at aggregate level will begin August 2009.

| | |
|-----------------------|--------|
| Doctoral Dissertation | Direct |
|-----------------------|--------|

Thesis and Dissertation committees evaluate student work according to professional standards and fills out "Yellow Sheet" evaluation of work.

The Graduate Director and the Academic Advisor will provide an annual report of results.

STATUS: Ongoing

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Research Paper Requirement | Direct |
|----------------------------|--------|

Committee on Studies mentors the student work according to professional standards. When the committee deems the research paper worthy of submittal to a peer reviewed journal, the student will:

a) submit the paper. (The journal selection will be determined by the student and committee as an appropriate outlet for the research.). When the paper is in the review process, the student will provide written proof to his or her committee that the paper is in the review process, and

b) schedule a departmental seminar during the designated Wednesday block meeting time.

After the student has provided proof of review process and has completed his or her seminar presentation, the chair of the Committee on Studies will prepare a memo for the student's file indicating that all requirements have been met.

Specific to the seminar, all faculty members attending the presentation will be asked to complete an evaluation form of the research and the presentation. The completed forms will be scored and results provided to the student (as well as any "blind review" comments from faculty), providing direct feedback to the student. Providing this feedback pre-dissertation will allow the student adequate time to assess his or her

individual strengths and weaknesses and work on areas as necessary. Summary sheet will be included in graduate student file.

In addition to individual feedback, an annual review at the end of Spring semester of all research requirement presentations will be made that will include average scores for each category across all research requirement presentations. This will allow a systematic evaluation of the overall performance of the department in our overall education of students. The Graduate Director and the Academic Advisor will provide an annual report.

STATUS: Research requirement on-going. A pilot program of Faculty evaluation of research presentation was used Fall 2008 to assess the effectiveness of the developed form and the feedback mechanism. Evaluation of results in ongoing.