

International and Development Economics, M.S. Degree Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes

Section I: Academic Details

1. Assessment Year (Choose one)

- a. AY 2014-2015 **(X)**
- b. AY 2015-2016
- c. AY 2016-2017

2. College/School (Choose one)

- a. College of Arts & Sciences **(X)**
- b. School of Education
- c. School of Law
- d. School of Management
- e. School of Nursing & Health Professions

3. Degree Program Name and Modality of Delivery (e.g., online, on-ground, hybrid)

M.S. International and Development Economics (IDEC)

- a. Online
- b. On-ground **(X)**
- c. Hybrid
- d. Branch Campus

NOTE: Please fill out separate forms if PLO assessment efforts differed by mode of delivery (i.e., if online program underwent different assessment from on-ground program)

Section II: Program Learning Outcomes Assessment

4. Program Learning Outcome Assessed (Write only one PLO)

Conduct original quantitative empirical analysis of an international or development economics problem. Specifically, students should be able to understand the necessary empirical methods needed to identify causal relationships, especially related to international and development issues; determine the appropriate estimation method for an empirical model; utilize statistical software to conduct such estimation; and meaningfully interpret the results.

We assess this learning outcome at the end of the graduating students' second year at the time that they give their masters oral defense and submit their theses to their respective advisors.

5. Indicate how the PLO mentioned in Question #4 aligns with one or more of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) (Check all that apply)

- a. ILO1 (Students analyze their attitudes, beliefs, values, and assumptions...) **(X)**
- b. ILO2 (Students explain and apply disciplinary concepts, practices, and ethics...) **(X)**
- c. ILO3 (Students construct, interpret, analyze, and evaluate information...) **(X)**
- d. ILO4 (Students communicate effectively in written and oral forms...) **(X)**
- e. ILO5 (Students technology to access and communicate information...) **(X)**
- f. ILO6 (Students use multiple methods of inquiry and research processes...) **(X)**
- g. ILO7 (Students describe, analyze, and evaluate global interconnectedness...) **(X)**
- h. It does not currently align with an ILO

6. Indicate which of the following Direct Measures of Assessment were used to assess the PLO mentioned in Question 4 - (Check all that apply)

Please note that a PLO can be assessed using both direct and indirect measures

- a. Published (Standardized) Test (e.g., Major Field Test)
- b. Class Tests & Quizzes with Embedded Questions
- c. Class Presentations
- d. Off-Campus Presentations (NGOs, clients, agencies, etc.)
- e. Research Projects Reports **(X)**
- f. Case Studies
- g. Term Papers
- h. Portfolio
- i. Artistic Performances, Recitals & Products
- j. Capstone Projects
- k. Poster Presentations
- l. Comprehensive Exams
- m. Thesis, Dissertation **(X)**
- n. Pass Rates on Certification or Licensure Exams
- o. Group Projects
- p. In/Out-of Class Presentations
- q. Competency Interviews (e.g., oral exams)
- r. Simulations
- s. Juried Presentations
- t. Other

7. Indicate which of the following Indirect Measures of Assessment were used to assess the PLO mentioned in Question 4 - (Check all that apply)

Please note that a PLO can be assessed using both direct and indirect measures

- a. Student Survey
- b. Student Interview
- c. Focus Groups
- d. Reflection Sessions
- e. Reflection Essays
- f. Faculty Survey **(X)**
- g. Exit (end of program) Survey
- h. Exit (end of program) Interview
- i. Alumni Survey
- j. Employer Survey
- k. Diaries or Journals
- l. Data from Institutional Surveys (e.g., NSSE, SSI, GSS)
- m. Curriculum/Syllabus Analysis
- n. Other: **Official Faculty Evaluations of Masters Student Oral Exams**

Section III: Results

8. Mention KEY Results of the Assessment Process

We assess IDEC students at the end of their program through their defense of their masters theses in front of the other students and all of the IDEC faculty. Every faculty member is provided a rubric for scoring how well a student does in terms of how well they perform under each of the follow criteria in terms of poor, fair, good, or excellent:

- 1) State clearly the purposes, research question(s), and hypotheses appropriate to the topic and area of study?
- 2) Show appropriate preparation and knowledge through the review of literature?
- 3) Clearly and thoroughly explain the data collection methodology utilized, and present descriptive statistics in a useful way?
- 4) Explain, use, and competently implement econometric methods appropriate to the area of study and to the purpose and question(s)?
- 5) Illustrate appropriate means for evaluating and interpreting the results?
- 6) Discuss and arrive at appropriate and logical conclusions from the results?
- 7) Demonstrate fluent verbal communication?
- 8) Respond well to questions?
- 9) Have a clearly understandable and visually useful powerpoint presentation?

Compiled over the 2013-15 years, our students scored good or excellent in 91.1% of these assessed categories over all faculty members. In 2015, the figure was 88.1%, in 2014 it was 89.7%, in 2013 it was 96.9%. A summary of our student scores from the 2013-15 years is given below:

Evaluation Criteria: Did this student's Masters Project defense:	Poor/ Unacceptable	Fair/ Acceptable	Good	Excellent
1) State clearly the purposes, research question(s), and hypotheses appropriate to the topic and area of study?	0	7	93	128
2) Show appropriate preparation and knowledge through the review of literature?	0	14	73	137
3) Clearly and thoroughly explain the data collection methodology utilized, and present descriptive statistics in a useful way?	0	13	88	122
4) Explain, use, and competently implement econometric methods appropriate to the area of study and to the purpose and question(s)?	1	20	81	120
5) Illustrate appropriate means for evaluating and interpreting the results?	1	29	84	107
6) Discuss and arrive at appropriate and logical conclusions from the results?	2	28	96	99
7) Demonstrate fluent verbal communication?	0	16	79	130
8) Respond well to questions?	4	30	65	118
9) Have a clearly understandable and visually useful PowerPoint presentation?	0	13	72	141

Section IV: Continuous Improvement

9. Indicate Actions the Program Faculty Have Taken in Response to Results

(Check all that apply)

- a. Revision of PLOs
- b. Changes in pedagogical practices **(X)**
- c. Revision of program course sequence **(X)**
- d. Revision of course(s) content **(X)**
- e. Curriculum Changes (e.g., addition and/or deletion of courses)
- f. Modified program policies or procedures **(X)**
- g. Designed measurement tools more aptly suited for the task
- h. Improved within and across school/college collaboration
- i. Improved within and across school/college communication
- j. Revised student learning outcomes in one or more courses
- k. Modified rubric
- l. Developed new rubric
- m. Developed more stringent measures (key assessments)
- n. Modified course offering schedules
- o. Changes to faculty and/or staff **(X)**
- p. Changes in program modality of delivery
- q. Other

To add additional PLO or report on the assessment of a different modality, click here.

To save and submit form, click here.