

Introduction

Purpose

An effective program review supports continuous quality improvement to enhance student learning outcomes and, ultimately, increase student achievement rates. Program review aims to be a sustainable process that reviews, discusses, and analyzes current practices. The purpose is to encourage program reflection, and to ensure that program planning is related to goals at the institutional and course levels.

Process

Foothill College academic programs that lead to an A.A./A.S. or Certificate(s), or are part of a specialized pathway, such as ESL, Developmental English, Math My Way are reviewed annually with an in-depth review occurring on a three-year cycle. The specialized pathways may be included as part of the program review for the department, or may be done as a separate document if they are not part of a department that offers a degree or certificate. Faculty and staff in contributing departments will participate in the process. Deans provide feedback upon completion of the template and will forward the program review on to the next stage of the process, including prioritization at the Vice Presidential level, and at OPC and PaRC.

Annual review will address five core areas, and include a place for comments for the faculty and the dean or director.

1. Data and trend analysis
2. Outcomes assessment
3. Program goals and rationale
4. Program resources and support
5. Program strengths/opportunities for improvement
6. Dean/Administrator's comments/reflection/next steps
7. Vice President Comments

2012-2013 Submission Deadline:

- Program review documents are due to Dean by December 14 for completion of Section 6.
- Dean completes section 6 and forwards documents to Vice President for completion of Section 7 by January 4, 2013.
 - Vice President completes section 7 and returns documents to program review team by January 18, 2013.
- Program review documents are due to the Office of Instruction by January 25, 2013.

Foothill College Program Review Cycle:

To see which template your department is scheduled to complete, check the Program Review Schedule: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/2012-2013/12-13-prog-rev-schedule.pdf>

Questions?

Contact: Office of Instruction and Institutional Research (650) 949-7240

Website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/index.php>

Basic Program Information

Department Name: Economics

Program Mission(s): To provide students with an underpinning of economic theory and critical thinking in preparation for future academic and workplace environments.

Program Review team members:

Name	Department	Position
Jay Patyk	Econ	Instructor
Brian Evans	Econ	Instructor

Total number of Full Time Faculty:	2
Total number of Part Time Faculty:	6

Existing Classified positions:
None

Programs* covered by this review

Program Name	Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.)	Units**
Economics	AA	30

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review. For example, ESLL, Math My Way, etc. You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

**Certificates of 27 or more units must be state approved (transcriptable). A Certificate of Achievement is state approved (transcriptable).

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program Data:

Data will be posted on <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php> for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. Please attach all applicable data sheets to the final Program Review document submitted to your Dean. You may use the boxes below to manually copy data if desired.

Transcriptable Program	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Economics AA Degree	8	13	62%

Please provide any non-transcriptable completion data you have available. Institutional Research does not track this data.

Non-Transcriptable Program	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
none			

1.2 Department Data (Attach data provided by IR or manually complete chart below)

Dimension	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Enrollment	2374	2934	24%
Productivity (Goal: 546)	699	659	- 6%
Success	1417	1753	24%
Full-time FTEF	3.4	4.1	32%
Part-time FTEF	2.1	3.1	48%

Department Course Data (Attach data provided by IR or manually complete chart below)

Course	2010-2011			2011-2012		
	Enroll.	Prod.	Success	Enroll.	Prod.	Success
Econ 1A	1322	709	765	1578	677	939
Econ 1B	846	705	532	1151	665	700
Econ 9	64	569	32	32	427	18
Econ 25	94	627	52	117	520	54
Econ 34H (54H)	44	483	32	39	300	27
Econ 35				17	258	15

1.3 Using the data and prompts, provide a short narrative analysis of the following indicators.

Program:

Updated:

1. Enrollment trends over the last two years: Is the enrollment in your program holding steady, or is there a noticeable increase or decline? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

Overall enrollment rose 24% as we offered more sections.

- a. Please analyze the data and comment with regards to student ethnicity, gender, age and highest degree.

67% of our students were White (27%) or Asian (40%). Business is a common major for many international Asian students – this may be due to cultural and familial pressures Asian students tend to face to enter the “business” world.

2. Completion Rates: Has the number of students completing degrees/certificates held steady, or increased or declined in the last two years? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends, including completion rates by student demographic.

- a. AA, AS, transcriptable certificates

While the increase in AA degrees could be due to an increased demand for economics degrees it is hard to draw conclusions when dealing with such a small sample size. The reality is that while economics classes are extremely popular with Foothill students the majority of our "econ" students are meeting transfer requirements as opposed to AA requirements. the AA requirements have not changed but it is too early to know if this increase reflects some fundamental change among our students.

- b. Local, non-State approved certificates

- c. Certificates less than 27 units: All certificates less than 27 units should be reviewed carefully to determine if the certificate provides a tangible occupational benefit to the student, such as a job or promotion or higher salary, and documentation should be attached.

3. Productivity: Please analyze the productivity trends in your program and explain factors that affect your productivity, i.e. GE students, size restrictions. For reference, the college productivity goal is 546.

We have added extra sections over this time period which has led to falling productivity... but productivity remains strong at 659.

4. Course Offerings (Comment on the frequency, variety, demand, pre-requisites.) Review the enrollment trends by course. Are there particular courses that are not getting the enrollment or are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment?)

We try to offer every major course (Econ 1A, 1B, 9, and 25) every quarter. There are no pre-requisites for any of these courses.

Econ 9 is a course that at times has difficulty filling up. We also pushed for many online courses that did not go in the summer of 2012.

Demand for courses other than Econ 9 seems quite robust.

5. Curriculum and SLOs

- a. Comment on the currency of your curriculum, i.e. are all CORs reviewed for Title 5 compliance at least every three years and do all prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories undergo content review at that time? If not, what is your action plan for bringing your curriculum into compliance? (Please use reports from the Curriculum Office to help you complete this prompt)

Econ 1A, 1B, and 9 are compliant. Econ 25 is scheduled for an update this year. Econ 35, 36, and 36X are out of compliance. Brian will do the Econ 25 and 35 Title V update. Jay will do the updates for Econ 36 and 36X this academic year.

- b. As a department/program, how do you ensure that all faculty are teaching to the COR?

We provide all instructors with the COR and we have annual meetings (for SLO reflection) in which we discuss course content. We also do peer evaluations as appropriate for all instructors.

- c. Discuss how the objectives and outcomes in your courses relate to the program learning outcomes and to the college mission. (Recommendation: attach TracDat mapping report)

As for the college mission, our program is oriented toward the transfer goal. We constructed our PLOs by considering the over-arching goals of the SLOs. As such, our SLOs assessments incorporate the basic economic knowledge and critical thinking required to meet our PLOs.

- d. If you are offering both an associate's degree and a certificate of achievement, please provide a rationale for offering both. If you are offering a local associate's degree and a transfer degree in the same discipline, please comment on your rationale for offering both.
- e. If you are offering any interdisciplinary or cross-listed courses or program, please comment on collaborative efforts such as team-teaching or learning communities.

We have one course (Econ 9) which is cross-listed as Poli 9. The two faculty members that teach this course are not full-time Economics instructors and there has not been an effort to team-teach these courses.

- f. Comment on any recent developments in your discipline which may require modification of existing curriculum and/or the development of new curriculum.

In the aftermath of the 2008-09 financial meltdown the Federal Reserve, in particular, has broadened its scope and developed new policy tools. We are incorporating such

concepts as quantitative easing, and discount window being widened and other policies into our curriculum.

6. Basic Skills Programs (English, ESLL and Math). For more information about the Core Mission of Basic Skills, see the Basic Skills Workgroup website:
<http://foothill.edu/president/basicskills.php>
 - a. Please describe existing ladder programs, alternative pathways, Non-credit to credit transitions within your program.
 - b. Please comment on progression in sequenced courses.
7. Transfer Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Transfer, see the Transfer Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/transfer.php>
 - a. Please analyze and discuss Transfer data regarding this program.
 - b. Please analyze and discuss Articulation data regarding this program.
 - c. Please discuss the status of your program's AS-T or AA-T degrees.
8. Workforce Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Workforce, see the Workforce Workgroup website:
<http://www.foothill.edu/president/workforce.php>
 - a. Education Code section 78016 requires that colleges review the effectiveness of Career Technical Education (CTE) programs. Verify that this program:
 - i. Continues to meet a documented labor market demand as referenced by industry/occupational report provided.
 - ii. Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the college's service area.
 - iii. Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.
 - iv. Please analyze and comment on average salary/wage data in the region.
 - b. Program accreditation (Please describe your program accreditation: the agency, the frequency of the process and the current status of the program by the accrediting body.
 - c. Service to the community: Please describe community service, outreach and special projects or initiatives that the program provides.
 - d. Outcomes assessments: Please describe additional means of outcomes assessment for the program, such as graduate surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, national and state licensing board exams, etc.
 - e. Please attach minutes from your advisory board meeting(s) and discuss key issues, outcomes and action plans as a result of these meetings.
9. Student Equity: Foothill-De Anza Community College District Board policy and California state guidelines require that each California community college submit a report on the college's progress in achieving equity in five specific areas: access, course completion, ESLL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. For the latest draft of the Student Equity Report, please see the ESMP website:
<http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/ESMP/index.php>
 - a. To better inform the Student Equity efforts at Foothill College, please comment on any current outcomes or initiatives related to increasing outreach, retention and student success of underrepresented students in your program.

10. Innovation: Please comment on any innovative initiatives within your program, this could include areas regarding sustainability, stewardship of resources, collaboration, grants and/or curriculum.

The Honors Seminar routinely updates and changes its focus. In the 2011-12 academic year the seminar focused on the US Housing and Financial Crisis of 2008-09. In the Fall of 2012 the seminar was on the Economic Policies of the Presidential Candidates. In the Spring of 2013 it may be on Microcredit.

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

2.1. Attach 2011-2012 Program Level – Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

2.2 Attach 2011-2012 Course-Level – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat

Section 2 Continued: SLO Assessment and Reflection

2.3 Please provide observations and reflection below.

2.3.a Course-Level SLO

1. Give an assessment of the past three years of annual Course Level SLO reflections.

We have slightly modified our questions every year – and I anticipate us continuing that going forward. For us, it is the annual meeting of all Econ faculty that matters (more than the data generated). In these meetings we use the SLOs as a springboard to discuss what and how we teach our courses. I believe all members find these meetings useful.

2. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the course level, comment on the findings.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

1. What summative findings can be gathered from the Program Level Assessments?

We only have one year of data So the sample set is too small to make any statements. For the small sample, it is clear that the students at the end of the program have a much firmer grasp of basic economics than those entering the program.

2. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

Again, probably too early to have much impact. Maybe in 3 years or so we will reflect on the findings more carefully.

3. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the program level, comment on the findings.

2.4 Annual Action Plan and Summary: Using the information above, list the program’s action steps, the related [Core Mission objective](#), SLO assessment data and the expected impact on student success.

Action Step	Related SLO assessment (Note applicable data)	Related ESMP Core Mission Goals (Basic Skills, Transfer, Work Force, Stewardship of Resources)	How will this action improve student learning/success?
1 Continue to refine our teaching pedagogy	All	Transfer	Improve student comprehension of basic economics
2 Meet with all econ teachers as a group	All	Transfer	Continue to improve instruction
3			

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to Foothill’s core missions, [Educational & Strategic Master Plan \(ESMP\)](#), the division plan, and SLOs. Goals will be linked to resource requests.

3.1 Previous Program Goals from last academic year

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
1 Transfer students to 4-yr schools	Long	Continue to refine our teaching pedagogy	Good transfer rates
2 Increase student interest and understanding of the world around them	Long	Continue to refine our teaching pedagogy	In process
3 Encourage active application of critical thinking skills	Long	Meet with all econ teachers as a group	Though a small sample size it seems our students are actually learning the content as demonstrated by our outgoing PLO assessment.

3.2 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	Supporting Action Steps from section 2.4 (if applicable)	How will this goal improve student success or respond to other key college initiatives
1 Ensure all Econ faculty assess not only but positive but also normative aspects of economic logic (e.g. are tariffs good? Are price controls good? Is exploiting economies of scale a good idea?...)	Long	Faculty meeting in Spring; potentially amend SLOs	Better understanding of economics
2			
3			

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Using the tables below, summarize your program's unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee website: <http://foothill.edu/president/operations.php> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2
One full-time instructor	Tbd	all

Unbudgeted Reassigned Time (calculate by % reassign time x salary/benefits of FT)

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2
none		

One-time B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2
none		

Ongoing B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2
none		

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2
none		

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Use the matrix provided below and reflect on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities and challenges to the program. Consider external and internal factors, such as demographic, economic, educational, and societal trends. Some considerations may include current and future demand for the program, similar programs at other comparable institutions, and potential auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	Friendly full and part-time instructors passionate about the topic and approachable for students. We have hired a few new high-quality part-time instructors.	Program has success at transferring students and is well thought of by former students (anecdotal)
Weaknesses	No obvious weaknesses at this time	
Opportunities	Continued opportunity to encourage faculty conversations to create a more dynamic and appealing curriculum	
Threats	Budget problems??	State budget

5.2 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles.

No particular concerns.

5.3 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

None.

5.4 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

We have an extremely popular program with strong and growing enrollment. Our students repeatedly tell us they enjoy our classes and learn a lot. The full-time and part-time faculty love teaching and helping students both in the classroom and on an individual basis.

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:
 The Foothill College Economics Program is enjoying robust enrollment, high productivity and high levels of student achievement. The program enrollment has surged 24 percent in one year alone, and as a core transfer program, the program is preparing many students for entrance

Program:

Updated:

into universities. The strength of the program is the quality of the teaching and the dedication of the two full-time faculty members, to high quality course outlines, SLO work and curriculum development. Faculty are focused on maintaining currency in the field, and have made efforts to communicate with part-time faculty to ensure consistency in course outlines is followed and that quality extends across the department. The department recently hired several new part-time faculty, which is allowing it to expand enrollment. Given the high enrollment in the program, and the fact that full-time overload FTEF was 2.1 for the previous year, the department request for a new full-time position has merit and data to back up the need.

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

No areas of concern. High level of enrollment justifies need for new full-time position in the future.

Student success among targeted populations is somewhat lower than non-targeted populations. In general, success is lower overall than college average, but due to the quantitative nature and academic rigor of the courses, coupled with the fact there are no pre-requisites for the program, the non-success rate is understandable.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

Continue efforts and complete plan to modify courses that are not in state compliance as outlined. The department should hold a Spring faculty meeting as outlined to revise its SLOs.

6.4 Recommended Next steps:

- Proceed as planned on program review schedule
 Further review/Out of cycle in-depth review

Section 7: Feedback and Follow Up
--

This section is for the Vice President to provide feedback.

7.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The program has enjoyed enrollment increases, as well as an increase in student success. In addition, the faculty participate in robust discussions regarding SLO assessment, student learning and pedagogy. They have shared their data and process with the college, as well as with the accreditation team, and their dedication to student learning is exemplary.

7.2 Areas of concern, if any:

The program seems to be highly functional and to serve our transfer population very well.

7.3 Recommendations for improvement:

None.

7.4 Recommended Next steps:

- Proceed as planned on program review schedule
 Further review/Out of cycle in-depth review

Upon completion of section 7, the Program Review should be returned to department faculty and staff for review, then submitted to Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. See timeline on page 1.

Unit Course Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College

Mission Statement: A well-educated population being essential to sustaining and enhancing a democratic society, Foothill College commits itself to providing access to outstanding educational opportunities for all of our students. Whether through basic skills, career preparation, lifelong learning, or transfer, the members of the Foothill College community are dedicated to the achievement of learning and to the success of our students. We affirm that our unwavering dedication to this mission is critical to the prosperity of our community, our state, our nation, and the global community to which all people are members.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 18 - CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC ISSUES - Master supply and demand - Employ the supply and demand model to predict market responses to shocks. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 18 - CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC ISSUES - Unintended Consequences - Illustrate and explain unintended consequences resulting from government interference in well-functioning markets. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 18 - CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC ISSUES - Critical Thinkings - Explain and critically assess competing strategies to resolve contemporary economic issues. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS - SLO 1 - Supply and Demand - Employ the	Assessment Method: a) Draw Supply and Demand curves for apples in a competitive market. Label the	04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 8.1 b) 5.4	04/27/2012 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>supply and demand model to predict market responses to shocks. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>curves, axes and equilibrium price and quantity. b) Illustrate the short-run response if experts discover that the pesticide used on apples (only) causes cancer, and the price of pears increases. Identify the new equilibrium price and quantity. Explain your shifts. (Instructors are free to change the market and the shifters but should continue to use 2 shifters in the assessment.)</p> <p>Target: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO incorporates critical thinking - particularly part b. Students must filter the information given to determine which curve(s) are affected.</p>	
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS - SLO 2 - Government Interference - Illustrate and explain unintended consequences resulting from government interference in well-functioning markets. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Illustrate an effective price ceiling on milk in a supply and demand diagram. Clearly indicate any shifts of curves (if any). Clearly label any excess supply or demand (if any). (Instructors are free to change the market and may also ask about a price floor.) b) In addition to what is evident from the graph, provide at least one more example of how consumers or producers will respond to the price control. (Instructors may ask about a specific consequence if they choose for this question. For example, is this price floor well-targeted to low-income families? Is there an allocation problem here?)</p> <p>Target: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 6.5 b) 5.3 Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires critical thinking.</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - Overall, the faculty were satisfied with the results. However, if possible, faculty are encouraged to spend more time discussing some of the possible responses from consumers and producers as a result of the price ceiling/price floor.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS - SLO 3- Aggregate economy - Illustrate and critically assess the aggregate economy using a macroeconomic model or models. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Draw the AS/AD Model used in class assuming the U.S. economy is in long-run equilibrium. Label all curves and axes. b) Illustrate and explain what happens in the U.S. AS/AD Model if an economic expansion occurs in Europe.</p>	<p>04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 6.3 b) 4.0 Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - Overall, the faculty were satisfied with the results. However, if possible, faculty are encouraged to spend more time discussing possible macroeconomic scenarios/outcomes that may arise as a result shifts in the AD/SAS/LAS</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Target: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Some students were unable to successfully create a complete AS/AD Model. Additionally, some students had difficulty in illustrating and explaining what would occur if a shift factor was introduced. This requires critical thinking. Faculty discussed these outcomes and some felt they could allocate more class time for worksheets and discussion to help improve student success in this area.</p>	<p>Curves.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS - SLO 4 - Fiscal and monetary policy - Analyze and critically assess the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policy and their relationship to inflation, unemployment, and the overall business cycle. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Instructors are free to choose one of the following questions:</p> <p>1) Which Macro policy is more frequently used to stabilize the economy: discretionary monetary policy or discretionary fiscal policy? Explain your answer by providing at least 2 relative strengths for the policy you have chosen.</p> <p>OR -</p> <p>2) Clearly explain the economic significance of the phrase, "You can't push on a string."</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>04/26/2012 - The average score of the 5 instructors who taught this class was: 5.5</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Some students were unable to critically assess and explain the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policy and their relationship to inflation, unemployment, and the overall business cycle. This requires critical thinking. Faculty discussed these outcomes and some felt they could allocate more class time for worksheets and discussion to help improve student success in this area.</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - Overall, the faculty were somewhat satisfied with the results. However, the target of 60% was not met. Therefore, the faculty are encouraged to spend more time discussing some of the strengths and weaknesses of both Fiscal and Monetary Policy to ensure students have a better grasp of the concepts. Furthermore, an inclass worksheet on the topic, or perhaps additional homework questions on the topic, may help improve student understanding and their overall performance on this particular SLO. In the end, faculty are encouraged to employ additional methods/materials as they see fit to help improve student learning and comprehension with respect to this SLO.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1B - PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS - SLO 1 - Supply and Demand - Employ the</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Draw Supply and Demand curves for</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - Avg scores were 8.4 for part a and 5.9 for part b. We are content with these results.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>supply and demand model to predict market responses to shocks. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>apples in a competitive market. Label the curves, axes and equilibrium price and quantity.</p> <p>b) Illustrate the short-run response if experts discover that the pesticide used on apples (only) causes cancer, and the price of pears increases. Identify the new equilibrium price and quantity. Explain your shifts. (Instructors are free to change the market and the shifters but should continue to use 2 shifters in the assessment.)</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO incorporates critical thinking - particularly part b. Students must filter the information given to determine which curve(s) are affected.</p> <hr/> <p>04/25/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 8.4 b) 5.9 Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students did very well in setting up the supply and demand framework and did just ok in correctly implementing both shifts.</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - We were content with these scores. It seems our students have a good grasp of the supply and demand model.</p> <hr/> <p>04/27/2012 - We were very pleased with the students ability to set up the model. We find their performance on shifting just acceptable. A number of students did quite poorly which brought the overall average down.</p> <hr/> <p>04/27/2012 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1B - PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS - SLO 2 - Government Interference - Illustrate and explain unintended consequences resulting from government interference in well-functioning markets. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Illustrate an effective price ceiling on milk in a supply and demand diagram. Clearly indicate any shifts of curves (if any). Clearly label any excess supply or demand (if any). (Instructors are free to change the market and may also ask about a price floor.) b) In addition to what is evident from the graph, provide at least one more example of how consumers or producers will respond to the price control. (Instructors may ask about a specific consequence if they choose for this question. For example, ?Is this price floor well-targeted to low-income families?,</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - Average scores of 6.4 for part a and 4.5 for part b. Result: Target Not Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires critical thinking.</p> <hr/> <p>04/25/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were:</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - The econ faculty discussed this question and felt that the directions for part b were potentially ambiguous. Many students started down the right path but stopped short - meaning only partial credit. We will try to be more explicit about what is expected in future years.</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
	<p>Is there an allocation problem here (discuss)??)</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>a) 6.4 b) 4.5 Result: Target Not Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students did just ok in correctly showing a price ceiling (floor). They did not succeed to our standards in discussing the unintended consequences of the policy. Part of this may have been the lack of clear indication of what we were looking for from the students. Some instructors felt the way they asked the question was not very clear. We discussed this and collectively agreed that we could guide students a bit more as to what is expected in their answer to part b.</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - The first portion of this assessment was ok ... but students had difficulty with the second portion. We discussed this and felt that some of the blame might be in the vague manner in which we worded the assessment. We decided that it would be better to give the students a bit more guidance in what we are looking for.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1B - PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS - SLO 3 - Market structures - Analyze different market structures from both a short-run and long-run perspective. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Consider the following profit maximizing monopolist. (graph)</p> <p>a. Show the profit maximizing price and output. b. Carefully outline and shade in the profits. c. At what price would revenue be maximized (indicate on graph with Pr)</p> <p>Target: a) 60% b) 60% c) none</p>	<p>04/25/2012 - The average scores were: a) 6.5 b) 5.3 c) 2.3 Result: Target Not Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Some students that could find the correct price-qty combination had difficulty properly shading in profits. This requires critical thinking. We discussed and some felt they could do more practice of this with their students...</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - Part a was satisfactory ... but perhaps more practice is needed in drawing out graphs as we believe more student should have successfully illustrated profits. Part c is purely for information on how many students show true mastery. This is a difficult question so we do not have any official target or expectation.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1B - PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS - SLO 4 - Cost-benefit analysis - Effectively</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Consider this profit-maximizing firm competing in a perfectly competitive market</p>	<p>04/25/2012 - avg score was 5.8 Result: Target Not Met</p>	<p>04/27/2012 - We discussed how the cost-benefit analysis is difficult for</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>employ marginal cost-benefit analysis to arrive at an efficient outcome. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>with a market price of \$5. Should the firm have produced the 40th unit? Explain using economic terminology.</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: The scores were extremely varied between instructors: 2.9, 4.6, 5.8, 6.7, and 9.2.</p> <p>So clearly there were differences in how prepped the class was for this question... and it makes it difficult to come to conclusions. The graph has been clarified a little bit for future years... maybe we will see more consistency in the future. This answer requires computational ability.</p>	<p>many students to master - and how we can ask such questions on multiple tests to help drive home the logic.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 25 - INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY - SLO 1 - Free Trade - Employ economic models to illustrate the benefits of free trade. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Consider the two-country world below. Point A represents autarky production and consumption for each.... Which country has a comparative advantage in wine? Explain using numbers.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target: 6/10</p>	<p>04/18/2012 - The first part of the question forces them to calculate which country has the comparative advantage by looking at opportunity costs. The average score here was 6.2. Generally most students got the concept while a minority was lost and pulled down the overall average.</p> <p>The second part asks them to calculate consumption for each country given a terms of trade and the quantity traded. Avg score here was 4.5. Many more 0s than in the first part.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires both computation and critical thinking.</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - It was surprising that students had so much difficulty with the second part of this question. Perhaps because I felt it was straightforward I did not focus enough on it during class. Action plan is to teach this a bit more slowly in the future.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 25 - INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY - SLO 2- Protectionist arguments - Assess the relative merits of protectionist arguments. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Aside from universally deplorable policies such as slavery and apartheid, explain the WTO position and logic concerning the inclusion of labor standards in trade agreements.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target: 6/10</p>	<p>04/18/2012 - The average score here was 6.2. 12 students got it perfect. 7 got 0. (There were 25 students in the class).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This relates to the Global Consciousness Institutional Learning Outcome.</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - Most students understood the position and logic of the WTO with respect to labor standards.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 25 - INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY - SLO 3 - Foreign exchange market - Analyze shocks to the foreign exchange market using a supply and demand diagram. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Consider the S&D diagram of \$US (in terms of Mexican pesos). Assume the Mexican Central Bank lowers interest rates. Show and explain the impact on the S&D graph.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target: 6/10</p>	<p>04/18/2012 - The average score was 7. Quite good.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires critical thinking.</p>	<p>06/11/2012 - This is not an easy question so I was happy to see that most students sailed through with the appropriate logic backing up the appropriate graph.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 36 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN ECONOMICS - 1 - Critical Economic Thinking - A successful student will be able to use economic thinking and logic to explain and critically assess different perspectives pertaining to the issue under study. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 36X - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN ECONOMICS - 1 - Critical Economic Thinking - A successful student will be able</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>to use economic thinking and logic to explain and critically assess different perspectives pertaining to the issue under study. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 54H - HONORS INSTITUTE SEMINAR IN ECONOMICS - SLO 1 - Economic reasoning - Students will be able to employ economic reasoning to a current economic topic. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes based on the lectures and readings covering the current topic will be created. (Note that topics change frequently in this class)</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Of the 16 students that took the course, 15 succeeded with at least a 60% average and the overall class average was 84%</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Very satisfied with these results. The class is, of course, of small size and filled with honors students.</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - It seems the honors class is working very well.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 54H - HONORS INSTITUTE SEMINAR IN ECONOMICS - SLO 2 - Understanding - Students will be able to exhibit understanding of an economic concept discussed in class. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes based on the lectures and readings covering the current topic will be created. (Note that topics change frequently in this class)</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - The class had an overall quiz average of 84% and 15/16 of all students averaged higher than 60%.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Small class of honors students should do quite well... and they did.</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Honors course seems to be working well.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 70H - DEPARTMENT HONORS PROJECTS IN ECONOMICS - Critical economic thinking - Use economic thinking and logic to explain and critically assess different perspectives pertaining to the issue under study. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Oversee individual student work... topics vary with every student and are largely based on student interests.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Observation/Critique</p> <p>Target: Faculty determination of individual student</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - In the 2011-12 academic year this class was coupled with Econ 54H to create, effectively, a 2-unit course on "The US housing and financial crisis"</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Continue monitoring student individual research</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>work.</p>	<p>Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: As seen under the Econ 54H reflections... students met expectations.</p>	
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 9 - POLITICAL ECONOMY - SLO 1 - International political economy - Critically analyze contending theoretical formulations of the International Political Economy. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Midterm examination. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz Target: The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>06/01/2012 - The exam tested students on objective and written questions regarding the following concepts: comparative and absolute advantage and the consequences for the international division of labor, as well as outsourcing and insourcing; mercantilism and the associated concepts of monopoly, self-sufficiency, and protectionism; Adam Smith and market forces and the limited role of government; the spatial division of labor and the associated concepts of agglomeration and dispersion.</p> <p>Students did reasonably well on the objective questions with 77%-82% correct responses, but decreased on the written questions to a range of 70%-75% responding correctly.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Reporting Year: 2011-2012 Resource Request: None. GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students seem to be showing slight improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Continue monitoring student ability to master the SLOs</p> <hr/> <p>10/07/2011 - To help improve student success on the written questions, there will be more emphasis placed on discussion of key concepts in the course, as well as inclass exercises to provide students an opportunity to articulate their understand/comprehension of the concepts in written form, and share their responses with fellow students an the instructor.</p>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 9 - POLITICAL ECONOMY - SLO 2- development and underdevelopment - Critically analyze contending theoretical formulations on Development and Underdevelopment. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Midterm examination. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz Target: The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>06/01/2012 - The exam tested students on objective and written questions regarding the following concepts: natural monopoly; subsidization; socialism; capitalism; diminishing returns; increasing returns and path dependency; and the impact of international threats on internal poli/econ policies.</p>	<p>09/20/2012 - Continue monitoring student ability to master the SLOs</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Students, again, did reasonably well on the objective questions with a 75% - 85% correct responses, but dropped somewhat on the written questions to a range of 65% - 75% responding correctly.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: None.</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students are showing slight improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.</p>	<p>10/07/2011 - To help improve student success on the written questions, there will be more emphasis placed on discussion of key concepts in the course, as well as inclass exercises to provide students an opportunity to articulate their understand/comprehension of the concepts in written form, and share their responses with fellow students an the instructor.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 9H - HONORS POLITICAL ECONOMY - SLO 1 - International political economy - Critically analyze contending theoretical formulations of the International Political Economy. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/24/2012</p> <p>End Date: 08/30/2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 9H - HONORS POLITICAL ECONOMY - SLO 2 - Development and Underdevelopment - Critically analyze contending theoretical formulations on Development and Underdevelopment. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/24/2012</p> <p>End Date: 08/30/2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			