

Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Report Cover Sheet

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Note: All programs will complete this form.

Academic Program: Economics

Department: Economics

College: Social and Natural Sciences

Date: October 2006

1. Name(s) of Department Assessment Coordinator and/or Assessment Committee Members

Oscar Flores

2. List of All Student Learning Outcomes. (List all outcomes, placing an asterisk (*) by the outcomes you are assessing this year.)

- * Exhibit knowledge of basic economics
- * Communicate effectively in writing and speech
- * Possess basic quantitative skills
- * Apply analytical skills within the field of economics using theoretical, communication and quantitative tools acquired at the university

3. Signatures

Department Chair or Program Director

Dean or Director

Required Attachments:

1. Assessment Reporting Forms
2. Records of department meetings when Assessment Report was discussed and approved.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Reporting Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Instructions: Complete, print, and save a copy of this page for each student learning outcome being assessed during the following two year period.

Academic Program: Economics

1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).

Exhibit knowledge of basic economics

2. Assessment measure used for this learning outcome.

Evaluation of theoretical model used in research paper written in the Economics Seminar

3. Expected Student Performance (from assessment plan)

Not specified

4. Actual Results (attach additional information, if necessary)

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 as excellent, the student average was 4.

5. Proposed action in response to results. (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

No actions proposed.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Reporting Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Instructions: Complete, print, and save a copy of this page for each student learning outcome being assessed during the following two year period.

Academic Program: Economics

1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).

Communicate effectively in writing

2. Assessment measure used for this learning outcome.

Evaluation of the research paper written for the Economics Seminar

3. Expected Student Performance (from assessment plan)

Not specified

4. Actual Results (attach additional information, if necessary)

On a scale of 1-5, where 5 is excellent, the student average was 4.

5. Proposed action in response to results. (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

No actions proposed

**Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Reporting Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Instructions: Complete, print, and save a copy of this page for each student learning outcome being assessed during the following two year period.

Academic Program: Economics

1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).

Effective oral communication

2. Assessment measure used for this learning outcome.

Evaluation of required presentation at Academic Conference

3. Expected Student Performance (from assessment plan)

Not specified

4. Actual Results (attach additional information, if necessary)

On a scale of 1-5, where 5 is excellent, the student average was 4.

5. Proposed action in response to results. (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

No actions proposed.

**Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Reporting Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Instructions: Complete, print, and save a copy of this page for each student learning outcome being assessed during the following two year period.

Academic Program: Economics

1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).

Posses basic quantitative skills in economics

2. Assessment measure used for this learning outcome.

Evaluation of required quantitative analysis of research paper written for Economics Seminar

3. Expected Student Performance (from assessment plan)

Not specified

4. Actual Results (attach additional information, if necessary)

On a scale of 1-5, where 5 is excellent, the student average was 4.

5. Proposed action in response to results. (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

No actions proposed

**Minnesota State University Moorhead
2006-2007 Assessment Reporting Form**

(An electronic version of this form can be accessed at <http://www.mnstate.edu/assess>)

Instructions: Complete, print, and save a copy of this page for each student learning outcome being assessed during the following two year period.

Academic Program: Economics

1. Learning outcome assessed (please include the number of the outcome to correspond with the list on the cover sheet).

Apply analytical skills using theoretical and quantitative tools

2. Assessment measure used for this learning outcome.

Evaluation of proper use of economic theory and quantitative tools to analyse a problem through the paper written for the Economics Seminar

3. Expected Student Performance (from assessment plan)

Not specified

4. Actual Results (attach additional information, if necessary)

On a scale of 1-5, where 5 is excellent, the student average was 4.

5. Proposed action in response to results. (Please note if improvements can be made with existing department resources. If improvements cannot be made with existing department resources, consider applying for an Instructional Improvement Grant.)

No actions proposed

Economics Department Student Assessment Report

Academic year 2005-2006

The Economics Department expects its majors to:

- A. Exhibit knowledge of basic economics
- B. Communicate effectively in writing and speech
- C. Possess basic quantitative skills
- D. Apply analytical skills within the field of economics using theoretical, communication and quantitative tools acquired at the university.

Assessment is done by evaluating a term paper written for the Economics Senior Seminar and students' participation in the Academic Conference. The Assessment form and results for the 2004, 2005, and 2006 are attached. The ratings range from 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and five excellent.

Assessment results are encouraging. Our assessment points to the following weaknesses:

- 1. Some students work did not include sufficient bibliography.
- 2. The appropriate theory was, on occasion, not used for the problem at hand. Also, the level of theory used was occasionally too elementary.
- 3. In addition, in a couple of cases, the theoretical arguments were not clearly expressed.
- 4. While the writing is acceptable, it could improve significantly. Yet there was marked improvement compared to the year before.
- 5. Quantitative skills are acceptable, but could improve.

Generally students' presentations at the Academic Conference are more polished than their paper. We are not sure what the reasons for this may be.

The instructor in charge of the Senior Seminar has enrolled in the *Writing to Learn/Learning to Write* workshop during the summer of 2005 this summer and was able to include some ideas from the workshop in the Economics Seminar. It is not clear whether this contributed to the improvement in writing compared to the 2004-05 academic year.

The department will submit an new assessment plan, we expect to start using the new plan as soon as it is approved.

Below are the Student evaluation form and the tabulation of results for 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Student Assessment Form
Capstone Course

Student's name _____

Title _____

Evaluation criteria

- 1 Very Poor
- 2 Poor
- 3 Good
- 4 Very Good
- 5 Excellent

• Term Paper

Writing

Grammar _____

Clarity of writing _____

Succinctness _____

Bibliography _____

Organization _____

Clarity of Purpose _____

Analysis

Appropriate theory _____

Clarity of arguments _____

Logic _____

Quantitative Skills

Appropriate hypothesis _____

Data _____

Appropriate specification
(e.g. real variables, etc) _____

Appropriate interpretation _____

- **Academic Conference**

Speaking

- Grammar _____
- Clarity of exposition _____
- Succinctness _____
- Organization _____
- Clarity of Purpose _____

Analysis

- Appropriate theory and level _____
- Clarity of arguments _____
- Logic _____

Quantitative Skills

- Appropriate hypothesis tests _____
- Data _____
- Appropriate specification (e.g. real variables, etc) _____
- Appropriate interpretation _____
- Overall Evaluation _____

Student Assessment Form Capstone Tabulations Spring 2004

Term Paper

	1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Good	4 Very Good	5 Excellent	Average
Writing						
Grammar		1	3	3	2	3.8
Clarity of writing			5	2	2	3.7
Succinctness			5	2	2	3.7
Bibliography		1	3	3	2	3.8
Organization			3	4	2	3.9
Clarity of Purpose			3	3	3	4
Analysis						
Appropriate theory and level		1	2	3	3	3.9
Clarity of Arguments			1	5	2	3.7
Logic			3	3	3	4
Quantitative Skills						
Appropriate hypothesis tests			2	3	4	4.2
Data			2	4	3	4.1
Appropriate specification			2	3	4	4.2
Appropriate interpretation			2	2	5	4.3
Overall			2	4	3	4.1

Academic Conference

	1	2	3	4	5	Average
Speaking						
Grammar			1		8	4.8
Clarity of writing			3	4	2	3.9
Succinctness			3	4	2	3.9
Bibliography			2	1	6	4.4
Clarity of Purpose				6	3	4.3
Analysis						
Appropriate theory and level		1	3	3	2	3.7
Clarity of Arguments		1	1	5	2	3.9
Logic			3	4	2	3.9

Quantitative Skills

Appropriate hypothesis tests	3	2	4	4.2
Data	2	5	2	4.2
Appropriate specification	2	2	5	4.3
Appropriate interpretation	2	1	6	4.4
Overall	1	5	3	4.2

**Student Assessment Form
Capstone Tabulations
Spring 2005**

Term Paper	1	2	3	4	5	Average
	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	
Writing			6	2	2	3.6
Grammar			6	2	2	3.6
Clarity of writing			6	2	2	3.6
Succinctness			5	2	2	3.7
Bibliography		2	5	2	2	3.8
Organization			6	2	2	3.9
Clarity of Purpose		1	4	2	2	4
Analysis		1	3	2	4	3.9
Appropriate theory and level		4	1	1	4	3.9
Clarity of Arguments		2	3	1	4	3.7
Logic		2	3	1	4	3.7
Quantitative Skills		2	1	3	4	3.9
Appropriate hypothesis tests		2	4		4	3.6
Data		2	2	2	4	3.8
Appropriate specification		2	2	3	3	3.5
Appropriate interpretation		2	2	3	3	3.5
Overall		2	2	3	3	3.5
Academic Conference	1	2	3	4	5	Average
	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	
Speaking			3	4	3	4
Grammar			3	3	4	4.1
Clarity of Exposition			3	5	2	3.9
Succinctness			4	3	3	3.7
Organization			2	3	5	4.1
Clarity of Purpose			3	1	6	4.3
Analysis			3	4	3	4
Appropriate theory and level		1	4	1	4	3.6
Clarity of Arguments			3	4	3	4
Logic				6	4	4.4

Quantitative Skills		4	1	5	
Appropriate hypothesis tests	1	2	4	3	4.2
Data		1	3	6	4.2
Appropriate specification		3	2	5	4.3
Appropriate interpretation		2	2	6	4.4
Overall		3	4	3	4

**Student Assessment Form
Capstone Tabulations
Spring 2006**

Term Paper	1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Good	4 Very Good	5 Excellent	Average
Writing			1	3	2	4.2
Grammar				4	2	4.6
Clarity of writing			1	3	2	4.2
Succinctness		1		3	2	4
Bibliography			1	3	2	4.2
Organization			2	1	3	4.2
Clarity of Purpose			1	1	4	4.5
Analysis			1	3	2	4.2
Appropriate theory and level		1	2	1	2	4.6
Clarity of Arguments				2	4	4.6
Logic			1	1	4	4.5
Quantitative Skills				3	3	4.5
Appropriate hypothesis tests			2	1	3	3.6
Data				1	5	4.8
Appropriate specification				3	3	4.5
Appropriate interpretation			1	3	2	4.2
Overall			1	3	2	4.2
Academic Conference	1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Good	4 Very Good	5 Excellent	Average
Speaking				3	3	4.5
Grammar					6	5
Clarity of Exposition			1	1	4	4.5
Succinctness			1	1	4	4.5
Organization				1	5	4.8
Clarity of Purpose			1	1	4	4.5
Analysis			1	2	3	4.3
Appropriate theory and level		1	1	2	3	4.6

Clarity of Arguments	1	4	4
Logic	1	4	4
Quantitative Skills	6		4
Appropriate hypothesis tests	3	3	4.5
Data	3	3	4.5
Appropriate specification	4	2	4.3
Appropriate interpretation	4	2	4.3
Overall	4	2	4.5