

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Review is about documenting the discussions and plans you have for improving student success in your program and sharing that information with the college community. It is also about linking your plans to decisions about resource allocations. With that in mind, please answer the following questions.

Program/Department Name:

Division Name:

Please list all team members who participated in this Program Review:

Name	Department	Position
Jay Patyk	Econ	FT Faculty
Brian Evans	Econ	FT Faculty

Number of Full Time Faculty: **Number of Part Time Faculty:**

Please list all existing Classified positions: *Example: Administrative Assistant I*

SECTION 1: PROGRAM REFLECTION

1A. Program Update: Based on the program review [data](#), please tell us how your program did last year. We are particularly interested in your proudest moments or achievements related to student success and outcomes.

Econ enrollments took a large hit with the implementation of a math pre-req in 2014-15 ... and then declined a bit more (6%) between 2014-15 and 2015-16. On the bright side, success rates have risen in general and specifically for targeted groups (from 40% in 2012-13 to 49% in 2015-16. This is still a lower success rate than most departments but is improvement for us.

1B. Program Improvement: What areas or activities are you working on this year to improve your program? Please respond to any feedback from the supervising administrator from last year's program review.

For the first time in several years we had a Fall department meeting with all adjuncts - in addition to our annual Spring meeting. We found this very productive and will continue this going forward. At our meeting we discussed and provided examples of different levels of question difficulty. We hope to achieve a more uniform assessment scale - something us full-time faculty are concerned about. We also discussed different teaching strategies - and how to effectively use class time.

1C. Measures of Success: What data or information will you use to measure your success (e.g. student success rates, changes in student or program learning outcomes)?

SLO assessment scores, course success rates, grade distributions (for consistency concerns)

1D. EMP Goal: The 2015-2020 Educational Master Plan (EMP) includes the following goal:

“Create a culture of equity that promotes student success, particularly for underserved students.”

Based on the program review [data](#), tell us some of the things your program will be doing this year to support this goal. You will be asked to report on any accomplishments on your next comprehensive program review.

As mentioned, success rates are moving in the right direction. As of 2017 we will have quarterly department meetings to share ideas and discuss strategies. In addition, Jay Patyk is involved in the creation of a first generation student club - which will help those students find success at Foothill College. The hope is to find a large list of faculty mentors for club members.

SECTION 2: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES & RESOURCE REQUESTS

2A. New Program Objectives: Please list any new objectives (do not list your resource requests).

Program Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
<i>Example: Offer 2 New Courses to Meet Demand</i>	<i>Winter 2016 Term</i>	<i>Course Enrollment</i>
This academic year we are offering 1-unit Econ honors seminars every quarter.	Fall, Winter, Spring	Course enrollment
Quarterly department meetings	Quarterly	Having the meeting!
Creation of a first generation club (see above)	Spring 2017	Create and grow the club over time

2B. Resource Requests: Using the table below, summarize your program’s unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) [website](#) for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Resource Request	\$	Program Objective (Section 2A)	Type of Resource Request			
			Full-Time Faculty/Staff Position	One-Time B-Budget Augmentation	Ongoing B-Budget Augmentation	Facilities and Equipment
Buying used textbook for classroom use (targeting underserved students). Full-time faculty use the same book for student ease.	500	Create a large quantity of books on reserve	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2C. Unbudgeted Reassigned Time: Please list and provide rationale for requested reassign time.

--

SECTION 3: LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

3A. Attach 2015-2016 Course-Level Outcomes: Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

3B. Attach 2015-2016 Program-Level Outcomes: Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

SECTION 4: FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP

This section is for the Dean/Supervising Administrator to provide feedback.

4A. Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The Economics Department continues to do an outstanding job serving students who are interested in transferring to four-year universities in economics, business administration, and other social science and STEM majors. The introduction of a State mandated prerequisite has hurt enrollment over the last three years. The program has two highly dedicated full time faculty and several adjunct faculty who contribute to the department significantly. The program suffered the loss of one of its outstanding adjunct faculty in August with the tragic passing of David Moglen. As the data indicate, student success rates are improving, but still below the college average. The faculty are committed to quality online instruction and are focused on addressing the achievement gap with online students and targeted students in particular. A noteworthy accomplishment is faculty member Brian Evans efforts in creating a Micro Credit club and his 2015 trip to India along with Adjunct Instructor Yulia Yukina, where students were able to complete a micro credit project.

4B. Areas of concern, if any:

No areas of concern.

4C. Recommendations for improvement:

Continued focus on closing the achievement gap for targeted students and increasing the quality and student success rates in online classes.

4D. Recommended Next Steps:

- ☒ Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule
☐ Further Review / Out-of-Cycle In-Depth Review

Upon completion of Section 4, the Program Review document should be returned to department faculty/staff for review, then submitted to the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. Please refer to the Program Review timeline.

Unit Course Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College

Department - Economics (ECON)

Mission Statement: The mission of the Economics Department is to provide students with an underpinning of economic theory and critical thinking in preparation for future academic and workplace environments.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>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))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>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))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>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))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS - SLO 1 - Supply and Demand - Employ the supply and demand model to predict market</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Draw Supply and Demand curves for apples in a competitive market. Label the curves, axes and equilibrium price and</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - The average scores of the 4 instructors who taught this course were: a) 8.6 b) 6.9 Students performed well on this SLO. On the graphical portion, the majority of students</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>responses to shocks. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>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 for Success: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>performed quite well. However, on the written portion of the SLO, some of the explanations students provided were inadequate, often omitting key terminology that was associated with the market outcome. Other students failed to provide any explanation.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Spend additional class time on explaining all dynamic elements taking place within a Supply/Demand Model, and provide exercises where students graph the model out and explain what is happening within it. Have students gather in small groups to discuss their findings with each other, and then share their findings with the rest of the class.</p>	<p>04/27/2015 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/26/2013 - The average scores of the 6 instructors who taught this course were: a) 8.2 b) 6.5. Students performed very well on this SLO. On the graphical portion, the majority of students did quite well. However, on the written portion of the SLO, some of the explanations students provided were overly truncated and/or unclear.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Spend additional class time on explaining any dynamic elements taking place within a Supply/Demand Model, and have exercises where students have to not only graph the model, but more importantly explain what is</p>	<p>04/26/2013 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>happening within it.</p> <p>04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 8.1 b) 5.4</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>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>04/27/2012 - The faculty were satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/>
<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:</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>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 for Success: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - The average scores for the 4 instructors who taught this course was: a) 5.8 b) 4.4. Students performed below target on both the first and second part of this SLO. A slim majority of students were often able to graph the model correctly. However, they often mislabeled, confused price ceilings and price floors, and/or failed to provide an adequate explanation regarding the possible responses by both producers and consumers to the price control.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were fairly weak on this particular SLO.</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - Faculty might consider spending additional time on supply and demand concepts, focusing special attention on price ceilings and price floors. Faculty may want to assign exercises where the students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model. Instructors may want to break students into small groups to discuss their findings with each other, and then share their findings with the rest of the class. Upon completion, instructors may want to provide feedback on the exercises to help reinforce the concepts.</p> <hr/> <p>04/24/2015 - Faculty might consider spending additional time on supply and demand concepts, focusing special attention on price ceilings and price floors. Faculty may want to assign exercises where the</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
			students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model. Upon completion, instructors may want to provide feedback on the exercises to help reinforce the concepts.
		<p>04/26/2013 - The average scores for the 6 instructors who taught this course was: a) 5.8 b) 4.8. Students performed below target for this particular SLO. Students were often able to graph the model correctly, but often mislabeled, confused price ceilings and price floors, and often failed to provide sufficient written explanations when it came to consumer and producer responses to the price control.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were a bit weak on this particular SLO.</p>	<p>04/26/2013 - Instructors may want to spend additional time on supply and demand concepts, focusing special attention on price ceilings and price floors. Possibly introduce exercises where the students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model.</p>
		<p>04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 6.5 b) 5.3</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>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>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</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>Target for Success: a) 60% b) 60%</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - The average scores for the 4 instructors who taught this course were: a) 6.6 b) 5.7. Overall, the students performed reasonably well on this particular SLO. They scored above target on both Part A and slightly below target on Part B. The majority of students were able to successfully illustrate the AS/AD Model. However, some students failed to show the correct shifts in the curves. Additionally, some of their explanations lacked sufficient detail and accuracy (i.e., failed to mention a recessionary gap developing as a result of a drop in exports, the effects of the recessionary gap on the U.S. Economy, etc.)</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were somewhat weak on this particular SLO. However, overall, the faculty were satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/> <p>04/26/2013 - The average scores for the 6 instructors who taught this course were: a) 6.6 b) 5.0. Overall, the students performed fairly well on</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - Faculty may want to spend additional time on aggregate supply and aggregate demand concepts, focusing special attention on the aggregate model and what the individual components/curves represent. Additionally, faculty might consider introducing exercises where the students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model. Faculty may want to break students up into small groups to discuss their findings with each other, and then share their findings with the rest of the class. Upon completion, instructors may want to provide feedback on the exercises to help reinforce the key concepts.</p> <hr/> <p>04/24/2015 - Faculty may want to spend additional time on aggregate supply and aggregate demand concepts, focusing special attention on the aggregate model and what the individual components/curves represent. Additionally, faculty might consider introducing exercises where the students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model. Upon completion, instructors may want to provide feedback on the exercises to help reinforce the key concepts.</p> <hr/> <p>04/26/2013 - Instructors may want to spend additional time on</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>this particular SLO. They scored above target on Part A, but below target on Part B. The majority of students were able to successfully illustrate the AS/AD Model. However, some students failed to show the correct shifts in the curves. Their explanation also lacked sufficient detail and accuracy (i.e., failed to mention a recessionary gap developing as a result of a drop in exports to Europe, etc.)</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were a bit weak on this particular SLO.</p>	<p>aggregate supply and aggregate demand concepts, focusing special attention on the aggregate model and what the individual components/curves represent. Possibly introduce exercises where the students not only graph the model out, but also explain what is taking place within the model.</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/26/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 6.3 b) 4.0</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</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>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 Curves.</p> <hr/>
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1A - PRINCIPLES OF MACROECONOMICS	<p>Assessment Method: Instructors are free to choose one of the</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - The average score of the 4 instructors who taught this course were: 4.9.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>- 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>following questions:</p> <p>1) Briefly assess the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policy as it relates to the goals of stabilizing inflation, unemployment and the business cycle.</p> <p>OR -</p> <p>2) Clearly explain the economic significance of the phrase, "You can't push on a string."</p> <p>OR -</p> <p>3) Should the government undertake stabilization policies? Provide arguments for and against.</p> <p>Target for Success: 60%</p>	<p>Overall, students scored below target on this question. Some students struggled with their written responses, often not being able to articulate several pros and cons of fiscal and monetary policy or suggesting fiscal policy is the most frequently used tool to modulate the business cycle, etc.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were somewhat weak on this particular SLO.</p>	<p>04/25/2016 - Faculty might consider spending additional time on monetary and fiscal policy as they relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle. Faculty may want to assign exercises that prompt students to explain how these policy tools relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle. By doing so, these exercises could potentially help students achieve a deeper level of understanding of the material. Instructors may want to break students up into small groups to have them discuss their findings with one another, and then share their results with the rest of the class. Instructors may want to provide solutions and feedback to the exercises so that students can see their errors (if any) and help them improve.</p> <hr/> <p>04/24/2015 - Faculty might consider spending additional time on monetary and fiscal policy as they relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle. Faculty may want to assign exercises that prompt students to explain how these policy tools relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle. By doing so, these exercises could potentially help students achieve a deeper level of understanding of the material. Instructors may want to provide solutions and feedback to the exercises so that students can see</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
			their errors (if any) and help them improve.
		<p>04/26/2013 - The average score of the 6 instructors who taught this course were: 4.9. Students for the most part did not score well on this question. Overall, student scores were on the low side. Students struggled with their written responses by either not being able to articulate the pros and cons of fiscal and monetary policy, or identifying fiscal policy as the most frequently used tool to modulate the business cycle, etc., or both.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students' written communication and critical thinking skills were a bit weak on this particular SLO.</p>	<p>04/26/2013 - Instructors may want to spend additional time on monetary and fiscal policy as they relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle. Possibly introduce exercises where the students will be asked to articulate how these policy tools relate to inflation, unemployment, and the business cycle to help them achieve a deeper level of understanding.</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>Year This Assessment Occurred: 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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
			methods/materials as they see fit to help improve student learning and comprehension with respect to this SLO. <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 1B - PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS - SLO 1 - Supply and Demand - Employ the supply and demand model to predict market responses to shocks. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: a) Draw Supply and Demand curves for apples in a competitive market. Label the 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 for Success: 60%</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - The average score for the 4 instructors who assessed this in their classes was 89% (8.9) for question 1a, and 72% for 1b. In general students understand the foundation of supply and demand Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: success</p> <p>04/29/2015 - Average instructor results for all face to face sections: 1a: 8.7 1b: 7.7</p> <p>Average instructor results for all online sections: 1a: 7.5 1b: 5.5</p> <p>We were clearly happy with the results for part a. The results for part b were less satisfying. One instructor (who got a 3.2 avg for part b) stated he had never done two shifts during class lectures or worksheets. Thus his students were particularly confused... he will address this going forward to see if his students improve. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: none</p>	<p>04/29/2015 - Students met goal <hr/></p> <p>04/20/2014 - Again, one instructor will change his in-class guidance. <hr/></p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>04/28/2013 - The scores for this SLO assessment were 8.3 (part a) and 5.7 (part b). This is the average of results from 6 instructors. The scores for part a were consistently excellent. The scores for part b were lower... ranging from 4 to 6.98. Some struggled with shifting the curves correctly and consistently.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	<p>04/28/2013 - The econ faculty stressed the importance of pencil to paper practice in our annual department meeting (April 2013).</p> <hr/>
		<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> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 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>	<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>04/25/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were: a) 8.4 b) 5.9</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 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>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> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<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?, Is there an allocation problem here (discuss)??)</p> <p>Target for Success: 60%</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - The average score was 64% for 2a and 54% for 2b. The target for 2a was met however it was not met for 2b. Looking at the data it is clear that the online courses markedly brought down the overall scores.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model construction was good. Most students did a good job explaining how consumers and producers would respond to the price ceiling. However, some of the common mistakes were shifting the supply curve or the demand curve, not labeling the shortage, and did not say anything about how consumers and producers would respond. Some additional class time on this might help the students achieve a deeper understanding. • Generally very good for those that got it, but they either got it or they didn't. It was good to see so many students identify the surplus. Not too many made shifts, so they seemed to get the concept of the "ceiling." For those that didn't get it, they often identified a price floor, or talked about points above or below the equilibrium, and several didn't quite grasp the concept of the government creating a control in the market. In (b), the narrative wasn't too bad this term. Will work on helping students describe a narrative to fit the "story" of the graph. Some students just aren't comfortable using narrative. Will work on helping students describe a narrative to fir the "story" of the graph. Worked on that during our discussions, and am seeing some improvement. 	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>04/29/2015 - The average scores for all instructors were: 2a: 5.8 2b: 5.5</p> <p>These scores were slightly off our target of 6.0.</p> <p>Comments: "Many students put the price ceiling in correctly but did not label the resulting shortage." Some students misunderstood the second part of the question and explained how the behavior of buyers and sellers under the ceiling would lead to a shortage."</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: None</p>	<p>04/29/2015 - Our scores were only slightly below our target. We will continue to add practice questions to give students more opportunity with hands on practice.</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/20/2014 - Face to face averages: 2a: 5.8 2b: 5.2</p> <p>Online: 2a: 5.2 2b: 4.9</p> <p>These results do not meet expectations. In general while many students got perfect scores many others shifted curves based on a price control - which basically gave them 0s. In addition they had a bit of trouble when it came to explaining unintended consequences (other than surplus/shortage).</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 Resource Request: none</p>	<p>04/20/2014 - Continued effort to create deeper understanding of price controls.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>04/28/2013 - The 6 instructor averages were 6.6 (part a) and 4.6 (part b). Most students put the price ceiling in correctly. The problems were more often related to labeling. It seems there was some inconsistency in grading for this question.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	<p>04/28/2013 - As mentioned, the primary "problem" may be an inconsistency in grading. Some instructors gave their students lower scores for this SLO assessment than they gave for the class exam (based on the same answer).</p> <p>We noted that online scores were much lower than scores for face-to-face students. A "best practices for online teaching" document was produced and provided to all econ faculty as we understand the additional difficulties that online instruction faces.</p>
		<p>06/11/2012 - Average scores of 6.4 for part a and 4.5 for part b.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires critical thinking.</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>
		<p>04/25/2012 - The average scores of the 5 instructors who taught this class were:</p> <p>a) 6.4 b) 4.5</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</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>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>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>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 for Success: a) 60% b) 60% c) none</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - The overall scores were 77%, 74% and 16%. These scores are quite good (note that 3c is designed to be extremely difficult)</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The students did ok on this SLO, though a few really struggled with identifying the profit-maximizing price and quantity. They often selected the minimum of the ATC as the quantity to produce at. Additionally, many students properly outlined and shaded in the profit. However, some students shaded using the point where Demand = MC down to the ATC, or for those that did get MC=MR, they shaded from the AVC instead of the ATC. The majority of students were not able to correctly identify the revenue maximizing price and quantity. • There were reasonably strong scores on parts A and B, with part C as usual being very tough. This is another example where I could probably have room to provide more pointed instruction and still not have crossed into "teaching to the SLO." I do not draw a 	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>bell-curve like Total Revenue graph showing that it is peaking at the same quantity where MR intersects the X-axis in another graph. Nor do I draw the similar concept to show Utility has peaked when Marginal Utility goes through the X-axis. Either or both of these inclusions in a hypothetical future quarter would, I believe, increase scores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students really struggle with the cost curves. In this online class I offered to give a CCC Confer lecture on the topic. A couple showed up. So the students knew they didn't really know it, but didn't know how to figure it out so they could demonstrate it. Students find these chapters (on industrial organization) particularly difficult. It always seems to be the least favorite section of the course. It's a lot of graphs. In (c), a handful of students answered this one correctly. My sense is they are just strong mathematically and not necessarily demonstrating a particularly strong economic sense. <hr/> <p>04/29/2015 - The average scores were: 3a: 6.6 3b: 5.4 3c: 1</p> <p>The results were brought down by one particular online section. The instructor noted there is a "lack of practice drawing graphs on paper in an online class."</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: none</p>	<p>04/29/2015 - The instructor referred to above said, "I will try to come up with some ways to (have students) create graphs on their own."</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>04/20/2014 - Face to face: 3a) 6.9 3b) 5.8 3c) 1.5</p> <p>Online 3a) 5 3b) 3.8 3c) 0.5</p> <p>In general the online students under-performed the face to face students and this was most clear with this assessment question. While f2f students met the success target for 3a and were basically at the target for 3b ... the online students were well below (thus, overall I have determined the target was not met). It is too much to go into detail here the difficulties of teaching effectively online - but clearly we need to continue to explore strategies.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	<p>04/20/2014 - I personally teach an online class and I am going to create short videos illustrating the relevant graphs for my students to watch in the coming year.</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/28/2013 - The averages for the 6 instructors were: 6.3 (part a), 5.3 (part b), and 2.1 (part c). Again there was a split between online and face to face students. Perhaps better alignment between homework and test questions would help for online students. As always, the scores for part c are unsurprisingly low... this concept is technically within the content but it takes very good command of the model to get correctly.</p> <p>Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	<p>04/28/2013 - Better alignment of homework and test questions for online students.</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/25/2012 - The average scores were: a) 6.5 b) 5.3 c) 2.3</p> <p>Result:</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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Target Not Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>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>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 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>Assessment Method: Consider this profit-maximizing firm competing in a perfectly competitive market with a market price of \$5. Should the firm have produced the 40th unit? Explain using economic terminology.</p> <p>Target for Success: 60%</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - Our students collectively scored 61% on this ... just above our success target.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students actually performed quite well on this question. We went over this concept many times in class, completed a couple of worksheets, and completed quite a few homework questions on this. However, there will still some students who did not perform well. A common mistake was "Yes, the firm is maximizing profits where $MC > MR$. They often backed it up by showing the ATC is still below the demand curve at that particular level of output. • Much like I might add to my SLO#3 comments, I feel like there is something more I could do to emphasize some kind of key implication about marginality, but I'm not sure what that pedagogical magic bullet would be. If anyone has any ideas on how better to communicate the principle they need to do this, we should consider it. I would have thought that talking about how that incremental unit of output's profit or loss 	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>is the signal to the firm that they are making too much or too little would be a significant enough piece of the lesson plan. Scores were just a tad low here so I'm not fretting too much but I think some reiteration just prior to the exam could go a long way on this one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was hoping this question would have gone better since we talked at length as they were preparing for the exam how important the basic concepts of how a firm maximizes profits. Mankiw does a really good job verbally and visually explaining these concepts. These topics are at the end of the term, and for the online students, they definitely start to fade towards the end of the term. 	
		<p>04/29/2015 - Average score: 6.5</p> <p>"For the most part, students did quite well on this question."</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p>	<p>04/29/2015 - no particular action needed</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/20/2014 - Face to face: 6.1 Online: 6.3</p> <p>Decent scores. Target met.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	<p>04/20/2014 - none</p> <hr/>
		<p>04/28/2013 - The average for the 6 instructors was 5.1. This is not sufficient. As with other scores the averages were brought down by our additional online courses this year. We hope that with a bit of</p>	<p>04/28/2013 - As mentioned, an online "best practices" list was created and distributed. We will see if it has an impact next year.</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>experience the scores rise. Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>04/25/2012 - avg score was 5.8 Result: Target Not Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none 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>04/27/2012 - We discussed how the cost-benefit analysis is difficult for many students to master - and how we can ask such questions on multiple tests to help drive home the logic.</p>
<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. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz Target for Success: 6/10</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - 30 students answered with an average of 79% for part a and 52% for part b. This is a split result in terms of our target of 60%. I will not success since the average is above 60% but have noted the students had difficulty assessing the gains from trade. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Need to better illustrate and explain the gains from trade in the model.</p> <p>09/21/2015 - The average score (36 students) for part a was 9.0 and 6.6 for part b. Part a is the easiest of the assessment questions so I expect</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>the scores to be high. Still, this was an excellent result. I think this was a particularly good bunch of students.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Excellent result</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Excellent result</p>	
		<p>04/20/2014 - The average score for part a was 8.0 (n = 22). This is a very acceptable score... the students clearly grasped the conceptual framework to illustrate comparative advantage. The average score for part b was 4.8 ... while this is below 6 (the stated target) this is primarily because of the somewhat "tricky" nature of the answer (one country is neither hurt nor helped by trade... and students were docked points if they did not note this in their graphical answer - most students got the logic correct but did not carefully plot the consumption point correctly - resulting in scores which do not quite reflect their understanding of the underlying concepts.)</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p>	<p>04/20/2014 - The students scored very well. Continue as before.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>04/26/2013 - The first part of the question forces them to calculate which country has the comparative advantage by looking at opportunity costs. The average score (n = 23) here was 7.1. This seems to be a good average. The second part of the assessment forces them to illustrate gains from trade given some specific data. The average here was 4.0 - partly drawn down due to the fact that the terms of trade are identical to one of the countries' PPFs (so they neither gain or lose from trade).</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 Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires both computation and critical thinking.</p>	<p>04/26/2013 - I believe students rushed this part of the problem and did not think carefully about the slopes involved. Most properly showed gains from trade without realizing that one country was neither helped nor hurt. This is a twist to the problem that I do not cover in class. Emphasizing the slopes might help.</p> <hr/> <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/>
<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 for Success: 6/10</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - 30 students answered with an average of 73%.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This is an adequate score for understanding the labor standards argument</p> <hr/> <p>09/21/2015 - The average was 7.2 (36 students). This is actually a pretty good average. Students showed a good understanding of the logic behind the lack of labor standards in WTO agreements.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: None	
		04/20/2014 - The average score was 7.4 (n = 22). Quite good. The scores were somewhat bi-modal... lots of 10 and a few 0s. So while most students "got it" there were a few that missed the main point. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 Resource Request: none	04/20/2014 - Perhaps reinforce these points one more time during the review for the test (?). <hr/>
		04/26/2013 - The average score here was 6.1 (n=23). This is an acceptable score. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This relates to the Global Consciousness Institutional Learning Outcome.	04/26/2013 - I am pleased that students can both explain and illustrate currency market shocks correctly. <hr/> 04/26/2013 - this is an acceptable outcome. It is a complicated argument so I can not expect an average too much higher. <hr/> 06/11/2012 - Most students understood the position and logic of the WTO with respect to labor standards. <hr/>
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 25 - INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL ECONOMY - SLO 3 - Foreign exchange	Assessment Method: Consider the S&D diagram of \$US (in terms of Mexican pesos). Assume the Mexican	12/02/2016 - 26 students scored an average of 73%. Result:	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
market - Analyze shocks to the foreign exchange market using a supply and demand diagram. (Created By Department - Economics (ECON)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Central Bank lowers interest rates. Show and explain the impact on the S&D graph. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz Target for Success: 6/10	Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016 GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This is a good score for understanding a relatively complicated concept and graph.	
		09/21/2015 - The average (15 students) was 7.9. I am very pleased with these results as, for the most part, the students were able to shift the curves correctly and supported this with clear explanations. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: None	
		04/20/2014 - The average score (n = 22) was 6.5. This meets our target... but is a little close. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 Resource Request: none	04/20/2014 - No particular action plan needed. Will reinforce exchange rate graph with in-class worksheet. _____
		04/18/2012 - The average score was 7.4 (n = 23). Quite good. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This SLO requires critical thinking.	04/26/2013 - Quite good results. _____ 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. _____
Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 36 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN ECONOMICS	Assessment Method: This class was used as a way to expose	11/20/2013 - 19 of the 20 students earned either an A or a B. One student did not participate	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>- 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>students to different social entrepreneurs tackling the issue of global poverty - with an aim toward having students assist in some small way.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p> <p>Target for Success: Active participation</p>	<p>effectively and earned an F.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students actively participated.</p>	<p>11/20/2013 - This was a one off course... we will probably not offer it again in this fashion.</p> <hr/>
<p>Department - Economics (ECON) - ECON 36X - 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 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: Students were required to write a research paper on an economic topic. Some students selected current topics such as climate change, income inequality, and current monetary policy.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Research Paper</p> <p>Target for Success: 60%</p>	<p>05/13/2015 - The research papers were, on the whole, exceptional.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>Resource Request: None</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Very satisfied with results. The class is, of course, of small size and filled with honors students.</p>	<p>09/21/2015 - The students seem to be doing quite well. As such, no action is required at this time.</p> <hr/> <p>11/20/2013 - It seems the honors class is working very well.</p> <hr/>
<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</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students are required to participate in all class discussions. Students are assessed based on the quantity and quality of their responses.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type:</p>	<p>05/13/2015 - The students were assigned numerous articles to read and discuss on various economic topics. Topics included income inequality, climate change/environmental degradation, as well as critiquing Economics and whether it is a pure science or not. Students did a</p>	<p>09/21/2015 - The students are performing quite well. No action plan required at this time.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
- Economics (ECON)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Discussion/Participation Target for Success: 60%	phenomenal job. Their responses were lucid and cerebral, and definitely reflected their sound understanding of the material. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Small class of honors students should do quite well... and they did.	11/20/2013 - Honors course seems to be working well.
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)) Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Assessment Method: Oversee individual student work... topics vary with every student and are largely based on student interests. Assessment Method Type: Observation/Critique Target for Success: Faculty determination of individual student work.	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" Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: As seen under the Econ 54H reflections... students met expectations.	09/20/2012 - Continue monitoring student individual research
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)) Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year Start Date: 09/23/2013 End Date:	Assessment Method: Non-honors students were required to write a 15 page research paper. Assessment Method Type: Research Paper Target for Success: The class achieves an average score of 70%.	11/23/2015 - Drop rate was severe in this section-- 8 of 13 econ students dropped. I am going to try to talk to the Econ instructors about the research paper requirement, so they can let their students know in advance of this requirement. Possibly (if schedule works), I can go to their classes and talk about this class myself. We (in poli sci who always teach this course right now) can keep systematic track of when the econ students tend to drop (prior to which assignment). Result: Target Met	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>08/29/2014</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status:</p> <p>Active</p>		<p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p> <p>2014-2015</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <p>For interdisciplinary courses, we need more resources to dedicated to a discussion of results for each discipline. Maybe for example, more general writing tutors are required to help econ. students. Or there may need to be more discussion between econ and poli sci faculty.</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p> <p>For interdisciplinary courses, we need more resources to dedicated to a discussion of results for each discipline. Maybe for example, more general writing tutors are required to help econ. students. Or there may need to be more discussion between econ and poli sci faculty.</p>	
	<p>Assessment Method:</p> <p>Midterm examination consisting of objective-type questions as well as essay questions.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type:</p> <p>Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target for Success:</p> <p>The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>12/13/2013 - "This course taught in Fall Quarter 2013 had the most unusual group of students I have taught at Foothill College since the 1990's. I was so impressed with their overall performance in class activities and assignments that I invited Dean Hueg to visit the class and observe for himself how unusual they were.</p> <p>Both the Honors and Non-Honors students attend the same class, receive the same instruction, participate in the same activities, do the same assignments except for the critical, analytical research paper assignment. Honors students write a 20 page critical, analytical research paper and Non-Honors students a 15 page paper. Flexibility is provided for an Honors and a non-Honors student to write a research paper together. However, if an Honors and a Non-Honors student choose to write a paper together, that paper must be 20 pages of content with Works Cited in addition.</p> <p>Some 80% of the Honors students were well prepared for college. They demonstrated strong analytical, research and writing skills and were</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - Continue to monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide feedback/assistance in a timely manner.</p> <hr/> <p>10/07/2013 - Continue to monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide feedback/assistance in a timely manner.</p> <hr/> <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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>well focused on their academic and professional lives particularly in transferring to some of the finest universities in the US. The majority of non-Honors students on the other hand were inadequately prepared for college: poor study skills, time management problems, difficulties understanding material and unable to undertake research assignments, and inadequate writing and analytical skills.</p> <p>Pairing Honors with Non-Honors within the class and making them work together both in leading specific seminar topics and allowing for the opportunity for groups of two to write the research paper assignment together helped to "raise up" those students who did not have the requisite skill level of preparation for college.</p> <p>Constantly pushing students to strive for excellence in their work and to make excellence the hallmark in all they do, seems to have helped in motivating everyone to work hard at exceeding even the expectations they held of themselves. Working closely with all students in conceptualizing their research paper topic, researching the literature and then formulating the paper coherently and logically seems to have worked well for everyone. In the end, over 80% of students earned letter grades of B and higher. Over 50% of these students enrolled in other classes in Winter and Spring, performed quite well and have now transferred to universities like NYU, UC's, Georgetown, UPenn and others.</p> <p>This unusual group of students have so far remained the finest I have worked with since the 1990's."</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: None.</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection:</p>	<p>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 and the instructor.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		Students seem to be showing improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.	
<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 Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/23/2013</p> <p>End Date: 08/29/2014</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Non-Honors students were required to write a 15 page research paper.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Research Paper</p> <p>Target for Success: The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>12/13/2013 - "This course taught in Fall Quarter 2013 had the most unusual group of students I have taught at Foothill College since the 1990's.I was so impressed with their overall performance in class activities and assignments that I invited Dean Hueg to visit the class and observe for himself how unusual they were.</p> <p>Both the Honors and Non-Honors students attend the same class, receive the same instruction, participate in the same activities, do the same assignments except for the critical, analytical research paper assignment. Honors students write a 20 page critical, analytical research paper and Non-Honors students a 15 page paper. Flexibility is provided for an Honors and a non-Honors student to write a research paper together. However, if an Honors and a Non-Honors student choose to write a paper together, that paper must be 20 pages of content with Works Cited in addition.</p> <p>Some 80% of the Honors students were well prepared for college. They demonstrated strong analytical, research and writing skills and were well focused on their academic and professional lives particularly in transferring to some of the finest universities in the US. The majority of non- Honors students on the other hand were inadequately prepared for college: poor study</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - Continue to monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide feedback/assistance in a timely manner.</p> <hr/> <p>06/28/2013 - Continue to monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide feedback/assistance in a timely manner.</p> <hr/> <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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>skills, time management problems, difficulties understanding material and unable to undertake research assignments, and inadequate writing and analytical skills.</p> <p>Pairing Honors with Non-Honors within the class and making them work together both in leading specific seminar topics and allowing for the opportunity for groups of two to write the research paper assignment together helped to "raise up" those students who did not have the requisite skill level of preparation for college.</p> <p>Constantly pushing students to strive for excellence in their work and to make excellence the hallmark in all they do, seems to have helped in motivating everyone to work hard at exceeding even the expectations they held of themselves. Working closely with all students in conceptualizing their research paper topic, researching the literature and then formulating the paper coherently and logically seems to have worked well for everyone. In the end, over 80% of students earned letter grades of B and higher. Over 50% of these students enrolled in other classes in Winter and Spring, performed quite well and have now transferred to universities like NYU, UC's, Georgetown, UPenn and others.</p> <p>This unusual group of students have so far remained the finest I have worked with since the 1990's."</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: None.</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students are showing an improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.</p>	<p>share their responses with fellow students and the instructor.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<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: 09/23/2013</p> <p>End Date: 08/29/2014</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Honors students were required to write a 20 page research paper.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Research Paper</p> <p>Target for Success: The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - "This course taught in Fall Quarter 2013 had the most unusual group of students I have taught at Foothill College since the 1990's. I was so impressed with their overall performance in class activities and assignments that I invited Dean Hueg to visit the class and observe for himself how unusual they were. Both the Honors and Non-Honors students attend the same class, receive the same instruction, participate in the same activities, do the same assignments except for the critical, analytical research paper assignment. Honors students write a 20 page critical, analytical research paper and Non-Honors students a 15 page paper. Flexibility is provided for an Honors and a non-Honors student to write a research paper together. However, if an Honors and a Non-Honors student choose to write a paper together, that paper must be 20 pages of content with Works Cited in addition. Some 80% of the Honors students were well prepared for college. They demonstrated strong analytical, research and writing skills and were well focused on their academic and professional lives particularly in transferring to some of the finest universities in the US. The majority of non-Honors students on the other hand were inadequately prepared for college: poor study skills, time management problems, difficulties understanding material and unable to undertake research assignments, and inadequate writing and analytical skills. Pairing Honors with Non-Honors within the class and making them work together both in leading specific seminar topics and allowing for the opportunity for groups of two to write the research paper assignment together helped to "raise up" those students who did not have the requisite skill level of preparation for college. Constantly pushing students to strive for excellence in their work and to make excellence the hallmark in all they do, seems to have helped in motivating everyone to</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - Continue to closely monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide timely feedback/assistance.</p> <hr/>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>work hard at exceeding even the expectations they held of themselves. Working closely with all students in conceptualizing their research paper topic, researching the literature and then formulating the paper coherently and logically seems to have worked well for everyone. In the end, over 80% of students earned letter grades of B and higher. Over 50% of these students enrolled in other classes in Winter and Spring, performed quite well and have now transferred to universities like NYU, UC's, Georgetown, UPenn and others. This unusual group of students have so far remained the finest I have worked with since the 1990's."</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: None.</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students appear to be showing great improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.</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> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/23/2013</p> <p>End Date: 08/29/2014</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status:</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Honors students were required to write a 20 page research paper.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Research Paper</p> <p>Target for Success: The class achieves an average score of 70%.</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - "This course taught in Fall Quarter 2013 had the most unusual group of students I have taught at Foothill College since the 1990's. I was so impressed with their overall performance in class activities and assignments that I invited Dean Hueg to visit the class and observe for himself how unusual they were. Both the Honors and Non-Honors students attend the same class, receive the same instruction, participate in the same activities, do the same assignments except for the critical, analytical research paper assignment. Honors students write a 20 page critical, analytical research paper and Non-Honors students a 15 page paper. Flexibility is provided for an Honors and a non-Honors student to write a</p>	<p>10/09/2014 - Continue to closely monitor and assess student progress related to the SLO, and provide timely feedback/assistance.</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Active		<p>research paper together. However, if an Honors and a Non-Honors student choose to write a paper together, that paper must be 20 pages of content with Works Cited in addition. Some 80% of the Honors students were well prepared for college. They demonstrated strong analytical, research and writing skills and were well focused on their academic and professional lives particularly in transferring to some of the finest universities in the US. The majority of non-Honors students on the other hand were inadequately prepared for college: poor study skills, time management problems, difficulties understanding material and unable to undertake research assignments, and inadequate writing and analytical skills. Pairing Honors with Non-Honors within the class and making them work together both in leading specific seminar topics and allowing for the opportunity for groups of two to write the research paper assignment together helped to "raise up" those students who did not have the requisite skill level of preparation for college. Constantly pushing students to strive for excellence in their work and to make excellence the hallmark in all they do, seems to have helped in motivating everyone to work hard at exceeding even the expectations they held of themselves. Working closely with all students in conceptualizing their research paper topic, researching the literature and then formulating the paper coherently and logically seems to have worked well for everyone. In the end, over 80% of students earned letter grades of B and higher. Over 50% of these students enrolled in other classes in Winter and Spring, performed quite well and have now transferred to universities like NYU, UC's, Georgetown, UPenn and others. This unusual group of students have so far remained the finest I have worked with since the 1990's."</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		2013-2014 Resource Request: None. GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Students appear to be showing improvement in the areas of critical thinking and communication from a year ago.	

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College

Program (BSS-ECON) - Economics AA

PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Program (BSS-ECON) - Economics AA - 1 - Have a working understanding of the role of prices in a market economy, the benefits of trade, economic growth and stability, market structures and competition, market failures and the economic role of government.</p> <p>SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: We have a 14 point quiz consisting of 10 multiple choice questions (1 pt each) and 2 2-point questions - one a supply and demand shift and one a marginal benefit-marginal cost assessment.</p> <p>We are giving the exam to one intro class at the beginning of the quarter ONLY to students that have not had any college economics yet. We are then giving the same exam to students in Econ 25 toward the end of the quarter who have also completed both Econ 1A and Econ 1B at Foothill. Obviously the 2nd pool of students will be much smaller.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Standardized</p> <p>Target: For students that have completed our econ courses we expect to achieve at least 60% on the quiz.</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - Our 8 incoming students (no college-level economics) had a 32.8 average on the quiz. Our 12 outgoing students (took Econ 1A, 1B, and 25 at Foothill) had an average of 82.4%. This demonstrates a high level of economic literacy for Foothill Econ "graduates"</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Very satisfied</p> <p>09/24/2014 - Econ students (n=11) scored 75% on the exam while incoming students scored 34% (n=37). We feel this magnitude of improvement shows that our students are retaining basic economic principles.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>Resource Request: none</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This degree addresses all four Cs, but this assessment specifically targets Computation, whereas ECON students use decision analysis (synthesis and evaluation) and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning, and ability to analyze and use numerical data.</p>	<p>09/24/2014 - no action needed as we satisfied.</p>
<p>Program (BSS-ECON) - Economics AA - 2 - Employ economic reasoning to explain the world around them and make objective</p>	<p>Assessment Method: We have a 14 point quiz consisting of 10 multiple choice questions (1 pt each) and 2</p>	<p>12/02/2016 - Our 8 incoming students (no college-level economics) had a 32.8 average on the quiz. Our 12 outgoing students (took Econ 1A, 1B, and</p>	

PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
decisions based on assessments of costs and benefits. SLO Status: Active	<p>2-point questions - one a supply and demand shift and one a marginal benefit-marginal cost assessment.</p> <p>We are giving the exam to one intro class at the beginning of the quarter ONLY to students that have not had any college economics yet. We are then giving the same exam to students in Econ 25 toward the end of the quarter who have also completed both Econ 1A and Econ 1B at Foothill. Obviously the 2nd pool of students will be much smaller.</p> <p>Target: Students finishing their Foothill Econ studies: 60%</p>	<p>25 at Foothill) had an average of 82.4%. This demonstrates a high level of economic literacy for Foothill Econ "graduates"</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2015-2016 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: Very satisfied</p> <hr/> <p>09/24/2014 - Again, econ students scored significantly higher than their non-econ peers on the assessment test.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 Resource Request: none GE/IL-SLO Reflection: This degree addresses all four Cs, but this assessment specifically targets Computation, whereas ECON students use decision analysis (synthesis and evaluation) and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning, and ability to analyze and use numerical data.</p>	<p>09/24/2014 - no action needed as we are satisfied with the results.</p> <hr/> <p>09/24/2014 - We were satisfied with the clear improvement that Econ students showed in the exam.</p> <hr/>