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Recommendation: Continuation of the program at the current level of activity

Rationale:
(If you recommend a program for resource development identify all areas for specific development)

Continuation of AACSB International accreditation awarded January 2012.

The BBA in Economics has an excellent reputation both inside and outside the College of Business. The plan of study for the degree program encourages rigorous development of analytical, technical, and critical thinking skills and the degree program also ensures students graduate with superior oral and written communication skills. With the knowledge base and skill sets acquired in the BBA in Economics, students graduate well-prepared and confident to enter their career path or graduate school.

The survey data and anecdotal comments from graduates serve as a testament to the quality of the degree. Students report high levels of satisfaction with the BBA in Economics and state they attribute a great deal of their success to the plan of study and faculty who worked with them. The degree prepares students for a wide range of possible careers, and data show graduates have, indeed, been successful in various careers including, but not limited to, financial planning, law, corporate governance, research, management, and higher education. Furthermore, graduates have achieved success in all employment sectors including corporate, government, and not-for-profit.

Although not at a critical state, yet, the BBA in Economics will likely require resource development in the near future as the number of majors continues to rise as well as increased dependence upon economics service courses by degree programs across campus. According to Marshall University’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning, courses taught in the BBA in Economics accounted for 1.6% of all MU undergraduate student credit hours (SCHs) in the fall 2011 semester. With only eight faculty in economics, clearly the required, elective, and service course combined enrollment will stretch faculty deployment. In addition, space allocation is already at maximum capacity. Future growth in student enrollment and faculty numbers will require additional office and computer lab space.

__Deanna Mader__________________  __October 15, 2012________
Signature of the Dean                                              Date
Marshall University  
Program Review

For purposes of program review, the academic year will begin in summer and end in spring.

Program: BBA in Economics

College: College of Business

Date of Last Review: Academic Year 2007-2008

1. Accreditation Information

1. Name of Accrediting Organization

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business – International (AACSBI). The AACSBI was founded in 1916 and is the premier accrediting body for colleges and schools of business worldwide. Accreditation is Mission-linked, and managed through a rigorous peer review process.

The standards maintained by AACSBI can be summarized in two key statistics:
1. Only between 25% and 33% of all schools of business, worldwide, have earned AACSBI accreditation.
2. During the 12 months leading up to our latest accreditation visit (November 2011), roughly 25% of the accredited schools that were up for re-accreditation were placed on probation, most often for deficiencies in the Outcomes Assessment program.

2. Date of Most Recent Self-Study and Accreditation Visit

The college’s most recent accreditation visit took place November 6-8, 2011. The Peer Review Team (PRT) consisted of four individuals, led by an experienced Chair who had been a member of the PRT during our last accreditation visit (Fall 2006).

During its visit the PRT evaluated the College of Business’ performance in terms of Strategic Planning, Faculty Sufficiency & Qualifications, and Outcomes Assessment (AOL, or Assurance of Learning), over the five-year period ending in Spring 2011.

3. Accreditation Status: (regular, probationary, etc.)

Regular

4. Accrediting Organization’s Report: (This should include the most recent action taken by the program's accrediting body. Also, provide any significant findings from your most recent self-study and accreditation visit. If weaknesses or deficiencies were noted, please explain how these are being addressed.)
After its November 2011 visit the PRT recommended to the AACSBI Board that the college remain fully accredited, with no deficiencies that would necessitate probation. In December 2011 the AACSBI’s Maintenance of Accreditation Committee concurred with this recommendation, and this recommendation was officially ratified by the AACSBI Board of Directors in January 2012. The College of Business as a whole, which means all degree programs housed within, has earned full accreditation for another five-year period. Our next accreditation visit is scheduled for academic year 2016-17.

Attached, in Appendix X, you will find the official accreditation letter received by the college in January 2012, which summarizes the findings of the PRT and reports the AACSBI Board’s final decision.

One area that the PRT and AACSBI urged the college to focus on heavily, across all programs, during the upcoming five-year accreditation cycle is Outcomes Assessment (i.e., AOL). Since 2004 the AACSBI has made Outcomes Assessment a priority in the accreditation and reaccreditation processes. Deficiencies in Outcomes Assessment, in fact, are currently the number one reason why accredited schools get placed on probation. The fact that we earned full accreditation means that our Outcomes Assessment programs meet current AACSBI standards. But, as the PRT noted, our BBA-level assessment programs are not as mature as AASCBI would like. As you will see in the Assessment Information Section of this Program Review, the economics program has been developing its assessment plans and procedures over the past several years, piece by piece—and is now ready to implement a complete program during 2012-13. To finalize this program and to develop concrete plans for improving this program over time, we made heavy use of the university-wide HLC Open Pathways Demonstration Project. Full details, again, are provided in the Assessment Information Section of this review.

II. Adequacy of the Program

5. Curriculum: (Summarize degree requirements and provide commentary on significant features of the curriculum. In Appendix I, list required courses, elective courses, and total hours required.)

All students currently pursuing the BBA in Economics must complete 120 hours of coursework. One required component of this program, of course, is the 34-hour University General Education (Core I and Core II) Curriculum. The College of Business also requires students to complete the 36-hour BBA Core Curriculum (which includes two economics courses required in the major), along with ENG 204 (Writing for the Workplace), a CMM Elective, and an International Business Elective. The economics major itself includes 18 hours of required economics courses and 9 hours of upper-level electives. Full details are provided in Appendix I.

6. Faculty: (Summarize significant points relating to faculty teaching courses within the major—percentage of faculty holding tenure, extent of use of part-time faculty, level of academic preparation, faculty development efforts, books & journal articles, papers & attendance at state, regional and national professional organization meetings).

The Department of Economics faculty are well-regarded instructors, accomplished scholars in their field, and committed to service at the college and university levels. For example, those faculty who served fulltime during the program review period have earned, over the course of their
careers, a total of 17 college-level and 4 university-level awards for teaching, service, and research. Three current members of the faculty have won the college’s Outstanding Teacher of the Year award (with one member winning the award twice). Three current faculty have been honored as the college’s Outstanding Non-Tenured Professor of the Year (one earning the award twice). One current faculty member has earned the College of Business Outstanding Service Award two times so far in his career. And during the program review period two current faculty members were recognized with a Named Professorship: one was awarded the Richard D. Jackson professorship in 2008; another currently holds an appointment as a Kermit E. McGinnis Distinguished Professor of Business.

At the university level, one current faculty member won the Distinguished Artists & Scholars Award for 2010-11 and another was named one of the 2009-10 recipients of the prestigious Distinguished Service Award.

During the program review period our faculty compiled an extensive record of service at the college and university levels. For example, one faculty member served as the College of Business AOL (Assurance of Learning, or Assessment) Director, and played a key role in our college’s reaccreditation exercise during 2010-11. Another faculty member served the college as Chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee. Economics teaching faculty also served as advisors to two major student organizations: Delta Sigma Pi (a professional business fraternity) and Beta Gamma Sigma (the official academic honor society of the AACSBI and hence of the college). At the university level our faculty have represented the College of Business, for the past 15 years, on the Honors Council. And two of our faculty serve as Name Readers at MU’s December and May Commencement Ceremonies.

Collectively, the economics faculty have always considered research an important part of their jobs. The table below, which presents the cumulative scholarly work of the full-time faculty during the review period, reflects this focus. The numbers of publications and other achievements are noteworthy given the limited resources of time and financial support available to the faculty.

**Economics Faculty Intellectual Contributions Summary — May 7, 2007 through May 6, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual Contributions</th>
<th>Learning &amp; Pedagogical Research</th>
<th>Contributions to Practice</th>
<th>Discipline Based Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewed Paper Presentations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Students:

a. **Entrance Standards**: (Describe the admission standards and procedures employed for making the admission decision.)

   The College has no separate admission requirements for entry into any of its programs. Admission to the University constitutes admission to the College of Business, hence into the BBA program in Economics.

b. **Entrance and Exit Abilities of past five years of graduates**: (Use Appendices III and IV to list the entrance abilities (ACT, SAT, high school GPA, undergraduate GPA for graduate programs, etc). Then, list the same students' exit abilities: College GPA, licensure exam results, etc.).

   Our graduates’ entrance abilities are reported in Appendix III, using data obtained from Institutional Research. Our graduates’ exit abilities are shown in Appendix IV. Overall, the 104 Economics graduates during the program review period had an average GPA of 3.28, with a range of 2.04 to 4.0. Many of these graduates completed a second major as well. The economics & finance double major, in particular, is becoming more popular. As of Spring 2010, 15 of our enrolled majors listed finance as their second major. By the end of the program review period that number had doubled, to 31.

8. **Assessment Information**:

   a. **Summary Information [see also Appendix V]**:

   1. **The College-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes**

   In accord with the dictates of the AACSBI (the COB’s accrediting body), in the Fall of 2006 the faculty of the COB established a set of four Program Learning Outcomes that apply to all undergraduate (BBA-level) degree programs—including Economics. These are:

   #1: **Oral Communications**: The student will be able to communicate orally in an effective and professional manner.

   - To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of five Measurable Objectives:

   1. **Topic & Organization**: Given purpose, time constraints, and audience, the student will deliver a well-organized, focused presentation moving logically from an introduction to a coherent conclusion.
   2. **Audience Appropriateness & Grammar**: The student will use grammatically correct language that is clear and appropriate for the audience.
   3. **Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact**: The student will enhance his/her delivery with the appropriate use of his/her voice as well as nonverbal communication.
   4. **Communication Aids**: The student will choose communication aids that enhance the message.
   5. **Personal Appearance**: Given the audience and topic, the student will dress professionally as defined by the instructor.

   - **The Assessment Instrument**: The BBA Oral Communications Rubric, which was developed by COB faculty in consultation with members of the Communication Studies faculty.
# 2: **Written Communications**: The student will be able to communicate effectively in writing within a business environment.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of four Measurable Objectives:

  1. **Purpose**: The student’s writing will clearly indicate its purpose.
  2. **Tone**: The student will adopt a level of formality, including language choice and usage that is appropriate for the intended audience.
  3. **Organization**: The student will write in a logical, coherent fashion so that the reader can always follow the line of reasoning.
  4. **Grammar & Mechanics**: The student will demonstrate correct use of punctuation, spelling, and English grammar.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: The *BBA Written Communications Rubric*, which was developed by COB faculty in consultation with Marshall’s Director of Writing Across the Curriculum.

# 3: **Problem Solving & Critical Thinking**: The student will develop the thought processes necessary to use logic, information, and assumptions to successfully solve problems.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of three Measurable Objectives:

  1. **Logic**: The student will be able to use inductive and deductive reasoning to identify appropriate conclusions based on available evidence.
  2. **Information**: The student will be able to identify relevant evidence and assess its credibility in relation to a given situation.
  3. **Assumptions**: The student will be able to differentiate between facts and conjecture relative to a given situation.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: A nationally known standardized test: the *Cornell Critical Thinking Test*.

# 4: **General/Core Knowledge**: The student will acquire the general or core knowledge required to understand the environment within which business operates.

- To assess this general Outcome we focus on the students’ attainment of ten Measurable Objectives, which we specify in the following way: *By the end of the BBA Core Curriculum, the student will be aware of, and understand the impact on business of, the following features of the world within which business operates:*

  1. The operations of a market *economy*;
  2. The physical and biological *environment*;
  3. The *ethics* of decision-making in the private and public sectors;
  4. The *global economic context*;
  5. The application of *Information Systems* and information management;
  6. The fundamental concepts, principles and rules of *law* that apply to business transactions and the laws, statutes, and *regulations* affecting commercial operations and behavior;
  7. The *multiculturalism* and the multiple dimensions of *diversity* that characterize people around the world today;
  8. The *political* institutions of the country, and the processes by which political and policy decisions are made;
  9. The *social* environment and the importance of cultural norms, group dynamics, behavioral change, and human resource management for business activity;
  10. The nature, pace, and pattern of *technological* progress and technological innovation.

- **The Assessment Instrument**: The *BBA Core Knowledge Exam*, which is written by the COB faculty—
including all Economics faculty—who teach in the BBA Core Curriculum.

2. During the Program Review period, the faculty of the COB completed two assessment cycles for Oral Communications, Written Communications, and Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking. One assessment cycle was completed for the General/Core Knowledge Learning Outcome.

#1: Oral Communications Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Calendar Year 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 108 upper-division students, including Economics majors.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Students had the most trouble with Objectives 3 and 4 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact; Communication Aids). Performance was also relatively weak on Objective 1 (Topic & Organization). Performance was best on Personal Appearance, but the faculty was disappointed with student attire.
4. The key actions taken to improve student performance, by the Economics faculty, are reported in Appendix V.

B. Cycle 2, Calendar Year 2011

1. The Assessment Sample: 73 upper-division students, including the Economics Capstone class.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: Student performance on all Measurable Objectives improved significantly. The Benchmark was met for Objectives 1, 2, 4, and 5. Performance was best on Objective 4 (Communication Aids). Performance was weakest on Objective 3 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact). The rubric score for Vocal Quality was unchanged from Cycle 1; Body Language and Eye Contact improved sharply but remained below the Proficient level.
4. Performance of the Economics Capstone students versus the BBA student sample as a whole:
   a) The students in the BBA sample, and in the Economics Capstone sample, scored (on average) at the Proficient level across the entire Rubric.
   b) The key relative strength of the Economics majors was in Clarity of Topic Coverage.
   c) Economics majors performed better than the BBA student sample on Objectives 1, 2, and 4. Performance on Objectives 3 and 5 (Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact; Personal Appearance) was a relative weakness in Economics students just as in the overall BBA sample.
5. The key actions taken to improve student performance, by the Economics faculty, are reported in Appendix V.

# 2: Written Communications Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Fall 2006 – Spring 2009

1. The Assessment Sample was collected during academic year 2006-07. It consisted of 78 upper-division students, including students in Economics 342 and Economics 460.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Writing Workshop in April 2009. The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Student performance on Objectives 1 and 2 (Purpose and Tone) was relatively strong, but fell just short of the Benchmark. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization; Grammar & Mechanics) was relatively weak: roughly 50% of the sample scored at the Proficient level and above on these Objectives. Overall, across all four Objectives in the aggregate, student performance fell short of Proficient.
4. One outcome of the Assessment Day Writing Workshop was a refinement of the assessment instrument to capture more precisely student attainment of the Measurable Objectives.
5. The key curricular action taken to improve student performance, by the COB and the Economics faculty, is reported in Appendix V.

B. Cycle 2, Fall 2009 – Spring 2011

1. The Assessment Sample was collected during academic year 2009-10. It consisted of 173 upper-division students, including students in Economics 460.
2. The Student Achievement Benchmark: 75% of the sample will score Proficient or Excellent on each Measurable Objective.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Writing Workshop in April 2011. Student performance was broadly similar to that recorded in Cycle 1. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (Organization and Grammar & Mechanics) improved, but our students continued to struggle with these aspects of writing: 54% of the students scored at the Proficient level or above on Organization; 58% of the students scored at the Proficient level or above on Grammar & Mechanics. Students performed best on Tone, with 70.5% of the students scoring at the Proficient level or above. Overall, across all four Objectives in the aggregate, student performance was nearly identical to that in Cycle 1.
4. The key curricular actions taken to improve student performance, by the COB and the Economics faculty, are reported in Appendix V.

#3: Problem Solving & Critical Thinking Assessment at the BBA level:

A. Cycle 1, Spring 2009 – Spring 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 317 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Economics majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone course (required of all undergraduates) from Spring 2009 through Spring 2010.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Cornell Critical Thinking Test Level Z.
3. Results: The COB faculty reviewed the data at the Assessment Day Critical Thinking Assessment Workshop in April 2010. Our students performed well below national User Norms for Seniors, slightly below a national sample of Juniors & Seniors, and roughly on a par with entry-level undergraduates. The instructors of the BBA Program Capstone Course observed that students generally stopped putting forth effort partway through the test. They concluded that the difficulty of the test led students to disengage from it. The faculty of the COB concluded, therefore, that the Level Z test did not provide us with useful, actionable data on our students’ Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking abilities.
4. The key action taken to improve our ability to identify and track student Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking skills is reported in Appendix V.

B. Cycle 2, Summer 2010 – Fall 2011

1. The Assessment Sample: 225 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Economics majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone Course (required of all undergraduates) during Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Cornell Critical Thinking Test Level X.
3. The Student Achievement Benchmark: The relevant National User Norms (for samples of students at undergraduate levels similar to those in our sample) for the Level X test.
4. Results: Overall, our students performed at a level in between the lower-division undergraduate User Norm and the graduate-student User Norm. This makes sense, given that we administer the Level X test in the BBA Program Capstone. Our students performed relatively well on Objective 1 (Logic), but were relatively weak on Objectives 2 and 3 (Information; Assumptions). In sum, our students showed weakness with respect to “information literacy”: the ability to employ observation and assumptions to evaluate the credibility and usefulness of information.
5. The key actions taken to improve student performance, by the COB faculty, are reported in Appendix V.
#4: **General/Core Knowledge** Assessment at the BBA level: December 2006 – Spring 2010

1. The Assessment Sample: 463 seniors (from all COB degree programs, including Economics majors) who took the BBA Program Capstone Course (required of all undergraduates) from Fall 2006 through Summer 2009.
2. The Assessment Instrument: the Core Knowledge Exam.
3. The Student Achievement Benchmark: The median score on the Exam will be at least 70%.
4. Results: The Benchmark was not met: the median score on the Exam was only 62%.
5. The key curricular actions taken by the Economics faculty, to improve student performance on the Economics component of the Core Knowledge Exam, are reported in Appendix V.

### 3. Additional Economics-Specific Assessment Activities Undertaken During Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

#### #1: Oral Communications Assessment

A. The Economics faculty made student attainment of the college-wide **Oral Communications** Learning Outcome an explicit Course Learning Outcome in our own Capstone. Students in the Spring 2011 & Spring 2012 Capstone courses were required to deliver multiple oral presentations, which were recorded. The final presentations were scored by Economics faculty using the **BBA Oral Communications Rubric**. The preliminary presentations were scored by the students themselves, also using the BBA Rubric. Doing this enabled the students to see themselves in action, to internalize more fully what separates Excellent, Proficient, and Needs-Improvement presentations, and to discover for themselves their relative strengths and weaknesses. Classroom discussion, during a review of the preliminary presentations, was used to highlight the assessment results obtained from the BBA sample as a whole (during Cycles 1 and 2, as reported earlier) and to discuss ways to develop and improve presentation skills.

B. Our majors’ strongest performance was in **Clarity of Topic Coverage**, with the class on average scoring at the Excellent level. Performance on **Communication Aids** was also strong. Our majors were relatively weakest on **Voice Quality** (scoring below Proficient), and on **Personal Appearance**.

C. The actions taken by the Economics faculty to address our students’ areas of weakness are reported in Appendix V.

#### #2: Discipline-Specific Knowledge & Problem-Solving Assessment

A. In the fall of 2010, the Economics faculty adapted the college-wide **General/Core Knowledge** Learning Outcome for use within the Economics discipline. To do this we first re-defined the Learning Outcome to make it Economics-specific, to read:

   **“Discipline-Specific Knowledge & Problem-Solving”: The student will be able to use economic models, definitions, and quantitative techniques to solve economic problems.**

We then made this Outcome an explicit Course Learning Outcome in our Spring 2011 and Spring 2012 Capstone Courses. It has since become a Program Learning Outcome.

B. To assess student attainment of this Outcome, we created the **Economics Core Knowledge Exam**. This exam, written by the Economics faculty who teach the key courses required for the major, consisted of three components:
1. A set of multiple choice questions covering the basic concepts taught at the introductory level, in our Principles of Microeconomics and Macroeconomics courses.
2. Four problems to solve, drawn from core material in Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis.
3. Four problems to solve, drawn from core material in Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis.

C. Student performance on the Economics Core Knowledge Exam during Spring 2011 surprised us. The students did very well across the board on the mastery-of-basic-concepts questions in Component 1. The students also performed well (and better than expected) on the Intermediate Macroeconomics problems. The Intermediate Microeconomics results, however, were lower than expected. The actions taken by the Economics faculty to address these test results are reported in Appendix V.

D. In the Spring 2012 class, performance on the Economics Core Knowledge Exam was roughly similar to that in Spring 2011: the students performed well on Components 1 and 2, but again showed distinct weaknesses on Component 3 (Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis). The actions agreed upon by the Economics faculty to address these test results are reported in Appendix V.

#3: Teamwork Assessment

A. During Fall 2010 the Economics faculty identified one additional Learning Outcome that we agreed should be assessed in our Capstone: Teamwork. (Employers of our students have told us repeatedly, over the years, that they want to hire team players: graduates who can work productively as members of a team.) We then agreed to specify the Teamwork Outcome as:

*The student will function effectively as a member of a team, and contribute productively to completing group projects and solving economic problems.*

B. In the Spring 2011 Capstone, we established Teamwork as an explicit Course Learning Outcome for the first time. To assess student attainment of this Outcome we created a Peer-Critique Rubric, based on one that has been used in recent years at the graduate level. To use the Rubric, each student scores each of his/her teammates on four specific criteria:

- **Group Goal Setting**: Helps develop the group’s goals; Focuses on the purpose of the project; Includes all team members in goal setting & decision making; Helps keep team members on task/on target.
- **Friendliness, Optimism, and Trust**: Is friendly and approachable; Looks out for the welfare of the group; Does little things to make it pleasant to be part of the group; Is optimistic about the team’s future; Builds trust and cooperation.
- **Communication**: Listens attentively to other team members; Offers suggestions & listens to those of others; Considers others’ suggestions thoughtfully.
- **Accomplishing Tasks**: Contributes to work being done; Completes assigned tasks; Helps to decide what should be done; Meets group deadlines.

C. After completing the major Group Project at the end of the semester, each student scored his/her teammates with the Peer-Critique Rubric. Interestingly, the students scored each other as Excellent across the board, on all criteria. They did this despite the fact that many students complained all semester long about their free-riding teammates. We concluded that, even though the instructor emphasized that the Peer-Critique scores would not affect anyone’s grade, the students thought it did. We realized, at the end of the semester, that the students had not been properly prepared for this exercise. The actions agreed upon by the Economics faculty to address these results are reported in Appendix V.

D. In the Spring 2012 Capstone we again administered the Peer-Critique Rubric. But we had learned from Spring 2011 that we needed to help the students understand the point of the exercise, and to learn how to use the Rubric properly. So, we asked the students to tackle it in three stages, during the second
half of the semester. The students, however, still did not make use of the exercise as they should have: their complaints and concerns about their teammates’ abilities and weaknesses were not reflected in the Peer-Critique Rubric scores. We have decided to revamp the Peer-Critique exercise for Spring 2013, as reported in Appendix V and the Plans for Program Improvement section below.

#3: Written Communications Assessment

In Spring 2012, as we began to think about elevating Written Communications to the status of a Program Learning Outcome, we decided to assess our students’ writing skills in Economics 423 (Introduction to Econometrics). The 29 students in the class, all economics majors and mostly seniors, completed a short paper at the end of the semester, which we scored using the BBA Written Communications Rubric. The students scored better than expected: the COB-wide Student Achievement Benchmark (see page 10 above) was met for each of the four Measurable Objectives. Performance on Purpose was by far the best, with 28 of the 29 students scoring Proficient or Excellent. Grammar & Mechanics, not surprisingly, was our students’ main area of relative weakness; only 76% of the sample scored Proficient or above on this Objective (and only five of the 29 students scored Excellent). We will use these results as a baseline against which to evaluate our students’ performance in 2012-13 and beyond.

b. Other Learning and Service Activities: N/A

c. Plans for Program Improvement: (Based on assessment data, provide a detailed plan for program improvement. The plan must include a timeline.)

A. The Economics Assessment Program has two major weaknesses: Reliance on a single point of assessment for each Program Learning Outcome, and reliance on the Capstone Course. Our goals, over the coming five years, are therefore to embed Assessment activities throughout the required, upper-level curriculum and to incorporate at least two points of assessment, for each Program Learning Outcome, in these required courses. We will pursue these goals in the context of the university-wide HLC Open Pathways Demonstration Project.

B. The HLC Open Pathways Demonstration Project, we have discovered, provides us with the tools we need to improve our understanding of what we want our students to learn and why, and to create a more coherent, complete, within-Economics assessment program. To date we have met the university-wide deadlines for Project Activities 1 and 2, and are preparing to implement the program-wide assessment plan we developed for Activity 2. Developing this plan has forced us to think through the connections between our required upper-level courses, how each course fits into the overall plan for the major in terms of Course Learning Outcomes, and how we can most fruitfully expose our majors to Program Learning Outcomes before they take the Capstone. In the process we have come to a better understanding of how and where we want to focus student learning in the Economics major. The Open Pathways Project has, therefore, served as the catalyst for a re-examination of our program. The result will be a tighter, more coherent, more focused program—which will benefit our students.

C. The Structure of the Economics Program Assessment Plan for 2012-13:

1. The Program Learning Outcomes are:
   • Oral Communications: The student will be able to communicate orally in an effective and professional manner.
• Written Communications: The student will be able to communicate effectively in writing within a business environment.

• Discipline-Specific Knowledge & Problem-Solving: The student will be able to use economic models, definitions, and quantitative techniques to solve economic problems.

• Teamwork: The student will function effectively as a member of a team, and contribute productively to completing group projects and solving economic problems.

2. In Spring 2011 and Spring 2012, as reported above and in Appendix V, we chose to assess three of these four Outcomes in the Capstone (all except Written Communications). At the time, moreover, we had not yet elevated each of them, explicitly, to the level of a Program Learning Outcome. Starting in 2012-13 each outcome will become a Program-level Outcome, and in Spring 2013 we will assess all four outcomes in the Capstone. Starting in 2013-14, we will implement a rotation plan for the Capstone, so that we assess two of the four every other year. Beginning in 2013-14, therefore, we will assess all four Program Learning Outcomes once, in the Capstone, every two years.

3. The other required courses in our upper-level curriculum are Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis, Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis, and Introduction to Econometrics. We will use each course, during 2012-13, as a second assessment point for at least one of our Program Learning Outcomes; across all three courses we will assess student attainment of all four Program Learning Outcomes. Doing this will give us more assessment data to work with, along with a better feel for our students’ abilities and how they are being developed in the major. This process will, moreover, create explicit connections between our required upper-level courses that students will be able to observe and make use of as they develop their economics skills. Below we identify where and when, in our required upper-level curriculum, we will assess each Program Learning Outcome:

   a. Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis (ECN 328), Fall 2012:

   • Discipline-Specific Knowledge: Problem-Solving Exercises
   • Teamwork: Group Problem-Solving Exercises
   • Written Communications: Short application-of-microeconomic concept papers, graded using the BBA Written Communications Rubric.

   Students have always engaged in group problem-solving exercises in ECN 328, but now they will learn what we expect of them in terms of teamwork skills. They will encounter the Peer-Critique Rubric for the first time and begin learning how to apply it to identify what makes for a good teammate and to help their peers learn about their individual strengths and weaknesses as teammates.

   Bringing Written Communications into ECN 328 is something we have wanted to do for years. The Open Pathways Project has given us the incentive to include student writing in ECN 328 in a way that will help students practice their skills and help us learn where our students are weak prior to the big project work required in the Capstone.

   b. Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis (ECN 326), Spring 2013:

   • Discipline-Specific Knowledge: Problem-Solving Exercises
   • Teamwork: Group Problem-Solving Exercises
Students will gain more practice at working as teammates, and more exposure to the Peer-Critique Rubric and how to use it to help their peers improve their teamwork skills.

c. Introduction to Econometrics (ECN 423), Spring 2013:

- **Discipline-Specific Knowledge**: Problem-Solving Exercises
- **Oral Communications**: Short, organized student presentations on assigned topics, graded using the BBA Oral Communications Rubric.

This marks an opportunity for us to move oral presentations back into our upper-level pre-Capstone curriculum. In recent years, staffing constraints have forced us to offer our upper-level required courses only once per year, which has meant enrollments per section upwards of 30. Our ability to give students practice, pre-Capstone, at developing their oral presentation skills, has thus been compromised. This is unfortunate, because all the businesspeople we interact with tell us that aside from teamwork skills, they want new graduates to have solid oral presentation skills. They tell us, to be specific, that if our new graduates cannot function as team members, and cannot speak comfortably and effectively in public, our new graduates will not get jobs.

4. Assessment of Student Learning in the Spring 2013 Economics Capstone

- **Oral Communications**: Students will once again give multiple individual presentations in class, starting very early in the semester. All presentations will be recorded; students will watch and score themselves, using the BBA Oral Communications Rubric. Based on the assessment results of the past two years, we will have to work very hard to develop our students’ sense of Professional Attire. The Capstone instructor, accordingly, will include explicit, specific dress-code instructions in presentation assignment sheets, and will make student attire during the presentations a grading criterion.

- **Teamwork**: The results of our Spring 2011 and Spring 2012 teamwork assessment exercises in the Capstone tell us that we are going to have to manage this exercise differently in Spring 2013. First, we are going to incorporate each student’s Peer Critique Rubric Scores into his/her course grade, so that s/he realizes that these skills matter. We resisted doing that the past two years, and the result was that the students did not take the Peer-Critique Exercise seriously. Students in Spring 2013 will discover that their course grades will be influenced by the assessments of their teamwork skills made by their teammates.

To help students learn how to assess their peers’ teamwork skills effectively, we will set aside class time for each group to do “Performance Reviews” of their own members—much like the performance reviews done of employees in today’s professional workforce. Three class periods during the semester, the groups will meet (under the direction of the instructor) to evaluate each member one at a time, using the Peer-Critique Rubric. We hope that by working together on these reviews, the students will learn from each other how to become better teammates and how to help their peers become better teammates.

- **Discipline-Specific Knowledge & Problem-Solving**: We will continue to administer the Economics Core Knowledge Exam in Spring 2013, while incorporating the following changes:
  1. We will expand the Exam to include problems from Econometrics, which were
not included on the 2011 and 2012 versions of the Exam. We will rewrite and modify the Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis questions as well, since we have had a difficult time the past two years gauging our students’ abilities in this important branch of Economics.

2. Most importantly, we will break up the administration of the Exam across the semester, by having the students complete each component separately. Based on last year’s results, we have concluded that giving the Exam all at once at the end of the semester (right when the students are polishing up their final Group Presentations) is not appropriate. To be specific, in Spring 2013 we will administer Component 1 of the Exam the first week of class. This will serve to remind the students of the basic concepts they need to carry with them into their Capstone work. Then, during the semester we’ll spread out the administration of the other components of the Exam, so that students do not get overwhelmed with too much at any one time. Doing this, we hope, will give us a more accurate reading on our students’ discipline-specific problem-solving skills. We can then use this information in 2013-14 to modify and refine our problem-solving exercises in ECN 328 and 326 to target areas of student weakness.

- **Written Communications**: Students have always produced written work in the Capstone. But, to date, we have relied on our college-wide Written Communications Assessment Program to identify our students’ strengths and weaknesses. In Spring 2013 we will require each student on each team to write a short paper on some aspect of the Group Project. This will benefit the students because they will get more out of the Group Project; by articulating what they have learned during the Project they will internalize and solidify the key lessons of the Project. This will be, in other words, a “writing to learn” exercise. And we will use the student papers to assess their writing skills, using the BBA Written Communications Rubric. The students will gain from the assignment, and we will gain knowledge of their writing skills that will help us design more beneficial assignments in the future.

D. We will also begin follow-up studies on our graduates to learn what they think, as alumni of our program, about our curriculum and the value of the educational experience they received as Economics Majors. We will use this information, along with the course-embedded assessment efforts laid out above, to improve our program and offerings as necessary.

More specifically, we will survey our graduates once per year, starting in the Summer of 2012. This will be done via the online survey software package *Surveymonkey*. Below, in the Graduate Satisfaction subsection, we report the results of our 2012 Survey—which highlight input provided by alumni who graduated between Summer 2007 and Spring 2012.

**d. Graduate Satisfaction**: (Provide evidence and results of follow-up studies to indicate graduate satisfaction with the effectiveness of the educational experience they received in your program. Indicate the number of individuals surveyed or contacted and the number of respondents.)

A. In May of 2010 we invited the 29 members of the Economics Capstone class to fill out an open-ended Graduating Senior Exit Evaluation form. Seven members of the class agreed to do so. Below are the key results:
1. The first set of questions asked the respondents if they would still choose Economics as a major again if they had the opportunity to start over, if they would recommend this major to a friend currently at Marshall, and what specific advantages are provided by the Economics Major. All seven respondents said *Yes, knowing what they know now [on the eve of graduation] they would definitely choose Economics as their major if they had the opportunity to make the choice again.* All of them said they would recommend Economics as a major to a friend currently at Marshall. As a group, these respondents identified three specific advantages provided by the Economics Major:

- “Critical Thinking Skills”
- “Critical Thinking preparation for Graduate School”
- “Learned relevant information for everyday life.”

2. The next set of questions asked the students to rate a set of factors in terms of how much value each contributed to their undergraduate experience. Specifically, the students were asked to do the following: *Rate the value of the following factors to your undergraduate experience, comparing your division to other divisions, using the following ranking options:*

   - Excellent (distinguishes my major from other majors at Marshall University)
   - Better
   - Equal
   - Weaker
   - Worse
   - No basis for judgment

*The seven students responded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Weaker</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>No Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Fairness of grading in my courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Quality of instruction in my courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Opportunities for interaction with faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The availability of courses required for the major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Intellectual climate of the division</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Academic caliber of your peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. In June of 2012 we created a short, 10-question survey of our alumni, and invited our BBA graduates to complete it through the online software package *Surveymonkey.* We first attempted to contact the 31 students who had taken the Economics Capstone class in Spring 2011 and Spring 2012 and who had graduated by May 2012. We then got in touch with 24 additional graduates for whom we had contact information, including 15 who graduated within the Program Review period and nine who graduated prior to the summer of 2002. Of these 55 students, 33 completed the survey.

In Appendix VIII we report the Job and Graduate School Placement data for our current Program Review graduates. Below we highlight key findings of the survey and provide more specific information on the students’ careers and graduate-level education.

1. The first set of questions asked the respondents if they would still choose Economics as a major again if they had the opportunity to start over, if they would recommend this major to a friend currently at Marshall, and what specific advantages are provided by the Economics Major. 32 of the 33 respondents said *Yes, knowing what they know now, they would definitely choose Economics as their major if they had the opportunity to make the choice again.* These 32,
moreover, said they would recommend Economics as a major to a friend currently at Marshall. The advantages provided by the Economics program, as identified by the respondents, are:

- “Critical Thinking Skills” (17 students)
- “Critical Thinking preparation for Graduate School” (6 students)
- “Learning of relevant information for everyday life” (9 students)
- “All of the above” (21 students, nearly 64% of the sample)

To quote six respondents who provided more detailed comments:

“Econ majors are able to think on their feet, prepare rational and well-prepared factual documents for various occasions, and have great critical thinking skills. Because of all this, they are more employable. In this kind of an economy, choosing a major that will land you a job is very important! I would not nor would I ever change my major at Marshall—very happy to have been a Marshall Economics major.”

“Throughout my post college life I’ve learned that core economic principles can be used to explain virtually all aspects of life. One can see the obvious link between economic acumen and business acumen, but the foundation that a degree in economics lays for critical thinking skills has been by far the most beneficial aspect of my education. I’ve been able to apply these skills and economic principles to various problems outside my primary line of business ranging from increasing the size of fish in our lake to advising farmers on how to market their crop to maximize profit. Perhaps the real reason economics is known as “The Dark Science” is that its principles are at work in every shadowy corner of our lives.”

“I am currently a rising 3rd year law student at WVU College of Law. My double major in Finance and Economics has helped me beyond words in my studies at law school. The first year it was difficult to grasp how certain topics of law worked, but my economics degree taught me how to think critically. I have been able to improve my GPA every semester. […] My degree from Marshall University gave me the solid foundation to be where I am today at WVU College of Law. I am extremely excited about the future possibilities I have….”

“I have found that since graduation I am much more competent in understanding the current economic and political climate mostly because of my education in macroeconomics.”

“Good job opportunities right out of the bachelor’s program and also in the future with a graduate degree.”

“The Economics faculty at the time (and I do believe this culture has been maintained), greatly enriched my undergrad experiences.”

One other respondent wrote back to us, after doing the survey, to say:

“I just completed it. Thank you for asking our opinion, it is one of the reasons I would recommend the program. The faculty not only teach us valuable lessons for work and life but they genuinely care about their students and their future.”

2. The second section of the survey focused on employment. Currently, 26 of the 32 who answered this question are employed. The jobs our graduates report holding, along with salary information, include:
Financial Management Specialist for the US Department of Defense: $60,000/yr.
Regional Economist, US Army Corps of Engineers: $90,000/yr.
Mingo County Assistant Prosecuting Attorney & owner of a law practice
Corporate Governance – Proxy Specialist
Donor Relations Manager: $50,000/yr.
Community College Assistant Professor of Economics: $45,000/yr.
Senior Recruiter, Global HR firm: $118,000/yr.
Financial Advisor (2 graduates): One makes $38,000/yr. in base salary; one makes $175,000/yr. inclusive.
Oil and Gas Title Abstractor: $65,000/yr.
Management Assistant for Enterprise Holdings (2 graduates): One makes $32,000/yr.; one makes $34,000/yr.
Operations Specialist: $38,000/yr.
Research Associate: $33,000/yr.
Research Associate, Forensic Economics: $34,000/yr.
Budget Analyst II, University Financial Office: $40,000/yr.
Program Analyst: $40,000/yr.
Manager: $50,000/yr.
Summer Clerk at Huddleston Bolen LLP in Huntington, 2011 and 2012: $4,000 per month; starting salary for first-year associates is roughly $70,000/yr.
Economics Co-Op employee (as a student in graduate school) with the US Army Corps of Engineers: $33,402/yr.

To quote one of our students about his/her job and career: “I am a financial advisor. So, I’m not a practicing economist in the traditional sense, but I’d be lost without my educational background.”

3. We also asked our alumni if they have done any graduate or professional school training since graduation. 19 of the 33 students who completed the survey have done so, as follows:

- Eight are currently enrolled in graduate school or professional school (e.g., law)*
- Four have earned an MS degree
- Two have earned an MA degree
- Four have earned an MBA
- Two have earned a JD

*One of these students is in the results twice: s/he earned a Master’s degree several years ago, and is now currently enrolled in a more advanced graduate-level program.

In sum, these survey results tell us that our alumni remain highly satisfied with their economics education, long after they have graduated. They tend to seek out, and complete, graduate and professional training. And they are employed in a variety of fascinating, well-paying occupations.

Our alumni are very glad they had the opportunity to study with us in Marshall’s BBA program in Economics, have found their training very useful in the “real world” of work, career, and responsibility, are enjoying a variety of interesting careers, and would come back to Marshall and study economics all over again if they had the opportunity to do so.
e. Attach the previous five years of evaluations of your assessment reports provided by the Office of Assessment.

The Letters from the Assessment Office are included in Appendix IX.

9. **Previous Reviews**: State the last program review action by the Marshall University Board of Governors.

At its meeting of April 23, 2008, the Marshall University Board of Governors recommended that the BBA in Economics continue at its current level of activity.

10. **Identify weaknesses and deficiencies** noted in the last program review and provide information regarding the status of improvements implemented or accomplished.

In its previous review, submitted in academic year 2007 – 2008, the BBA in Economics identified its weaknesses as having relatively low salaries among its faculty. It stated that, “On average, the economics faculty earn a mean salary that is about twenty percent below the market rate for a comparable economics faculty member. The salary issue has led to the loss of one faculty member to another university.”

With respect to salaries, we have made significant progress in recent years. We hired one new tenure-track faculty member who started in Fall 2010, and this spring we hired three additional tenure-track faculty members who will start in Fall 2012. In all four cases we were able to hire our first choice, and each of our new hires was very happy with the salary/benefits package we were able to offer.

11. **Current Strengths/Weaknesses**: (Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Describe program plans for removing the weaknesses.)

The two notable strengths of the program are its faculty and the curriculum. As discussed above in Section II (Adequacy of the Program) on pp. 5 and 6, the economics faculty are well-regarded instructors, active scholars in their field, and committed to service at the college and university levels. Those faculty who served fulltime during the program review period have earned, over the course of their careers, a total of 17 college-level and 4 university-level awards for teaching, service, and research.

Our faculty are also recognized by student groups, on a regular basis, for their care and concern for students. Delta Sigma Pi, a professional business fraternity at Marshall, honored two economics faculty members for meritorious service to students and the program at its Spring 2012 Banquet & Awards Ceremony. Phi Eta Sigma, a national freshman academic honor society, has recognized several of our faculty as “Fabulous Faculty Members” over the years, and one current faculty member has been inducted by the Phi Eta Sigma students as an honorary member. The students of Beta Gamma Sigma, the official academic honor society of the AACSB and hence of the College of Business, have honored three members of the economics faculty over the years, by inducting them as members of the society. One of our Beta Gamma Sigma faculty members, moreover, has served as Faculty Advisor to this society since 2003.

To quote again what one of our BBA alumni wrote to us recently:
“I just completed it [the survey]. Thank you for asking our opinion, it is one of the reasons I would recommend the program. The faculty not only teach us valuable lessons for work and life but they genuinely care about their students and their future.”

The curriculum, as managed by the faculty, prepares the students very well for the “real world” of work, career, and responsibility. Starting at the introductory level, we train our students to think logically and clearly about how economic activities affect our society, at the level of the individual business firm and consumer and at the level of the economy as a whole. As our students progress through the program they learn how to apply the tools, concepts, and analytical methods of economics to the study of a country’s current and potential levels of production, rate of inflation, unemployment rate, and the factors driving economic growth or decline. Students also learn how a market economy distributes goods, resources, and income across individuals and businesses in society. The global context within which countries operate is emphasized throughout the curriculum, so students learn to integrate the factors driving international trade and financial flows into their analyses of individual economies and businesses. At every step along the way top priority is placed on helping students develop their problem-solving, analytical, and critical-thinking skills. As a result, graduates can and do apply their economics knowledge to problems of local, regional, and international economic development. The BBA in economics also offers a solid foundation for post-baccalaureate education including law, public administration, hospital and health care management, urban and regional planning, and, of course, economics.

Our BBA alumni, as reported in the Graduate Satisfaction section earlier in this review (pp. 16-19) are very satisfied with their educational experiences as economics majors. The survey results also show that our alumni believe that our program prepared them exceedingly well for a variety of interesting and challenging jobs and careers, as well as for graduate and professional school. Our alumni state, to a person, that they would come back to Marshall and study economics all over again if they had the opportunity to do so.

One major weakness of the program is that we can offer our upper-level required courses, including the Capstone, only once per year. Our majors, especially those who come to economics as juniors or who graduate in December rather than May, struggle with curriculum planning. We work carefully with the professional academic advisors in the College of Business Dean’s Office to help our students navigate our curriculum offerings successfully, especially in light of our students’ propensity to double-major. But students and faculty alike remain frustrated with a situation that often does not permit students to map out courses of study in ways that meet all their needs.

Why are we constrained in our course offerings? Lack of staffing. Right now we have 9 full-time Economics positions in our department, but one of these positions is occupied by an economist whose contract with Marshall defines his teaching responsibilities to be in the graduate-level Human Resources Management program in the College of Business. Only 8 of our faculty, therefore, teach undergraduate economics courses. This may sound like a sufficient number of faculty, but as we point out in detail in Section III (Viability) below, and in Appendix VI (Economics Program Course Enrollment), the vast majority of our instructional time and effort is devoted to so-called “Service Courses”—those required by programs and majors (within the College of Business and across campus) other than economics. Simply put, the 8 faculty members who teach in economics, collectively, are not able to offer the Service courses on the schedule we are required to maintain and to offer our upper-level required economics courses every semester.
We have targeted our recent searches for new tenure-track faculty (four in the past two years) on those who can teach core Service courses and key courses in our upper-level curriculum. Starting this fall, for example, are three new tenure-track hires. Each will contribute to our Service teaching beyond the level of the faculty s/he is replacing, and each is able to teach particular required upper-level courses in the major. As we integrate these new hires into our teaching schedule, therefore, our hope is that within a few years we will be able to offer two of our four upper-level required courses every semester. We also see opportunities, with these new faculty on board, to offer our other upper-level courses more often—say, three times (instead of two) every two years. The more required courses we can offer more often, the better our program will be for our students.

We expect one, if not two, of our faculty to retire within a year or two. We have already begun to identify the multiple ways in which replacements for one or both of these retirees can enhance our ability to meet our Service course requirements, our major requirements, and the needs of the International Business program (which makes heavy use of economics courses). Given the connections between our major, the International Business program, the major in economics available to students in the College of Liberal Arts (which our faculty manages), and the Modern Languages program, these discussions have already involved the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

The final weakness of the program is a weakness of all COB programs, the lack of dedicated space that is uniquely identified as the College. Specifically, other non-COB disciplines are intermittently placed throughout Corbly Hall. As a result, the College and all of its disciplines lack an identity associated with a unique COB location.

III. Viability of the Program: (Provide a narrative summary in each of the following sections in addition to the appendices.)

1. Articulation Agreements: (Describe program specific articulation agreements with other institutions for delivery of this program.)

No such agreements exist.

2. Off-Campus Classes: (Describe/Summarize off-campus (other than the Huntington, or South Charleston campuses) courses offered. Include this information in Appendix VI.)

Our two introductory courses, Principles of Microeconomics (ECN 250) and Principles of Macroeconomics (ECN 253) have been offered yearly at Marshall’s Teays Valley Regional Center (TVRC) and/or the Mid-Ohio Valley Center (MOVC). Total enrollments have been very modest: 148 students took ECN 250, and 76 took ECN 253, at TVRC and MOVC during the program review period. Given that a total of 4,371 students completed ECN 250 and 253 during the review period, the vast majority of them took these classes on the Huntington campus. More details on these offerings can be found in Appendix VI.
3. **Online Courses:** (Describe/Summarize online courses offered. Include this information in Appendix VI.)

The Department began offering ECN 250 online every semester, starting in Spring 2011. To date, 165 students have taken the course. ECN 253 has been offered online throughout the review period; to date 399 students have completed this course. As noted in section 2 above, over 4,300 students completed these courses during the review period. The vast majority of our ECN 250 and 253 students, clearly, took these classes via the traditional F2F delivery method.

Just this past semester (Spring 2012) we offered ECN 200 (Survey of Economics, a course designed explicitly for non-College of Business students), online for the first time. 49 students signed up, which surprised us. We will explore the potential for offering ECN 200 online again, in the future.

More details on our online offerings can be found in Appendix VI.

4. **Service Courses:** (Describe/Summarize departmental courses that are required for students in other majors and support programs outside the major. Include enrollment data for these courses in Appendix VI.)

Service work dominates our faculty’s instructional time and effort. Fully 85% of the students we taught during the review period (i.e., 6,227 students out of 7,331 in total), were enrolled in our service courses. The specific service courses we teach are as follows:

1. Principles of Microeconomics (ECN 250) and Principles of Macroeconomics (ECN 253) are required of all students in the College of Business regardless of major. Students in programs outside the College of Business are also required to take one or both of these courses. For example, International Affairs, Political Science and Secondary Education (i.e., 5-Adult Social Science) require students to take coursework in economics, typically ECN 250 and 253. Total enrollment in these two courses, during the review period, equaled 4,371 students, most of who were majoring in something other than economics.

2. ECN 340 (Global Macroeconomic Issues), ECN 408 (Comparative Economic Systems), ECN 420 (International Trade), and ECN 460 (Economics of Developing Countries), are elective offerings in economics, and also designated as “International Studies” courses in the university curriculum. As such, they satisfy the university’s International Studies requirement as well as the International Studies requirements placed on students in the College of Business. A total of 1,238 students took these courses during the review period, the vast majority of whom were not majors in economics.

3. ECN 460 is also designated as Writing Intensive, so students in the College of Business and across campus can use this course to satisfy the university’s Writing Intensive course requirement. The majority of the students taking this course during the review period (out of a total of 92) took it not as an Economics Elective but rather to satisfy the university’s Writing Intensive course requirement.

4. ECN 408 is taught, currently, as part of the university’s multi-year BB&T grant to support the advancement of American Capitalism across campus. Prior to the grant, this course was taught once per year. One requirement of the grant, however, is that ECN 408 be taught every semester. ECN 408 is now almost a pure service course, taught to satisfy the requirements
of the BB&T grant and so that students can meet college and university International Studies curriculum requirements.

5. ECN 200, Survey of Economics, is a pure service course. Enrollment is restricted to non-College of Business students. We teach this course regularly, therefore, to meet the needs of non-College of Business programs that require three hours of economics and would like their students to take a general survey course. A request from the School of Journalism and Mass Communications, in particular, led to the development of this course.

5. Program Course Enrollment: (Describe/Summarize program area courses taken by students who are majors and include enrollment by semester for the past 5 years. Indicate required or elective courses. The purpose of this section is to indicate the availability and relative strength of the program area courses. Include all students enrolled in the courses, whether majors or not. Include enrollment data for these courses in Appendix VI.)

As shown in Appendix VI, total Program Course Enrollment during the review period was 7,331 students. On average, nearly 1,470 students took our economics courses each year, during the program review period. These students come from all over campus, not just from the College of Business. And the vast majority of these students are not economics majors.

Most of our courses are offered on the Huntington campus: 6,487 students (88.5% of the total), took our courses the traditional F2F way, in Corbly Hall.

6. Program Enrollment: (Summarize data indicating the number of new students admitted, number of principal majors enrolled from your college, number of second majors, the number of students enrolled as majors from other colleges (i.e., College of Education specialization majors), the number of minors, and the number of graduates for the program for each of the past five years.)

Appendix VII, supplied by the Office of Institutional Research, provides a summary of this information. As shown, 104 students graduated with a BBA in economics during the review period—roughly 21 per year, on average. The total number of majors enrolled in the program during the review period, per year, averaged 53. And yearly enrollment has been on the rise: 41 majors were enrolled during Year 1; by Year 4, 65 students were majoring in economics; by Year 5 the number of majors enrolled had reached 67.

Notice also the number of double-majors: 100 of the enrolled majors during this period were “second majors”—which means that a major other than economics was each student’s “principal [first] major.” In addition, it is quite likely that some of the 163 students who are shown in Appendix VII as “principal majors” in economics had a second major. For example, the double-major in Economics and Finance has become quite popular; in Fall 2007 14 enrolled students had declared a double-major in Economics and Finance; by Spring 2012 this number had more than doubled, to 31.

At the top of the next page, in Figure 1 (courtesy of the university Office of Assessment), we present the trend lines for total enrollment in the major and program graduates:
What Appendix VII does not reveal, fully, is the number of economics minors enrolled in our program during the review period. Students in the College of Business (and in some other colleges on campus) generally do not declare their minors until they apply for graduation, and so can be pursuing a minor for years without appearing in the Institutional Research census reports.

Through MUBERT, we have been able to identify the minors earned by all graduates of the College of Business, and indeed by all graduates of the university (regardless of college and major) during the review period. As the table below shows, 203 university graduates earned an economics minor during the review period. 173 of these graduates earned a BBA; the rest earned bachelor’s degrees in the College of Liberal Arts (21), the College of Science (3), the School of Journalism and Mass Communications (1), and the Regents BA program (5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of MU Graduates in:</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Economics Minor is defined as “A minimum of 15 hours in Economics, with no more than six of those hours earned at the 200 level.”
IV. **Necessity of the Program**: Provide a narrative summary for each of the following items in addition to requested appendices.

1. **Advisory Committee**: (Identify whether the program has an Advisory Committee, and, if so, briefly indicate the role and impact of the Committee.)

   The Economics Program does not have its own Advisory Committee at present. There is a college-wide Advisory Board, which works with our Dean and with individual programs within the college, as requested, to enhance the educational experience offered to College of Business students. For example, in recent years members of the Advisory Board, members of the business community, and alumni have spoken to our Economics Capstone class on how to make the most of their education, and on how to make the transition from school to the world of work and career successfully. These Guest Speakers have enjoyed interacting with our students, and are happy to serve as contact people for follow-up discussion on career and job opportunities.

2. **Graduates**: (Provide information on graduates in terms of places of employment, starting salary ranges (where appropriate and known), number employed in field of specialization, and/or acceptance into baccalaureate or graduate programs. (NOTE: Do not identify students by name.) Include this information in **Appendix VIII**.)

   Appendix VIII provides the Job and Graduate School Placement statistics on our 2007-12 graduates that we have been able to compile to date.

   As first reported in the Graduate Satisfaction section earlier in this review (pp. 16 – 19), we attempted to contact the 31 students who had taken the Economics Capstone class in Spring 2011 and Spring 2012 and who had graduated by May 2012. We then got in touch with 24 additional graduates for whom we had contact information, including 15 who graduated within the Program Review period and nine who graduated prior to the summer of 2002. Of these 55 students, 33 completed our survey.

   Thanks to this survey we obtained specific information concerning our graduates’ jobs, current salaries, and acceptance into (and completion of) graduate and professional school. Currently, 26 of the 33 respondents are employed and 8 are enrolled in graduate school (one is employed and going to graduate school, as noted below). The jobs our graduates report holding, along with salary information, include:

   - Financial Management Specialist for the US Department of Defense: **$60,000/yr.**
   - Regional Economist, US Army Corps of Engineers: **$90,000/yr.**
   - Mingo County Assistant Prosecuting Attorney & owner of a law practice
   - Corporate Governance – Proxy Specialist
   - Donor Relations Manager: **$50,000/yr.**
   - Community College Assistant Professor of Economics: **$45,000/yr.**
   - Senior Recruiter, Global HR firm: **$118,000/yr.**
   - Financial Advisor (2 graduates): One makes **$38,000/yr.** in base salary; one makes **$175,000/yr. inclusive.**
   - Oil and Gas Title Abstractor: **$65,000/yr.**
   - Management Assistant for Enterprise Holdings (2 graduates): One makes **$32,000/yr.;** one makes **$34,000/yr.**
• Operations Specialist: $38,000/yr.
• Research Associate: $33,000/yr.
• Research Associate, Forensic Economics: $34,000/yr.
• Budget Analyst II, University Financial Office: $40,000/yr.
• Program Analyst: $40,000/yr.
• Manager: $50,000/yr.
• Summer Clerk at Huddleston Bolen LLP in Huntington, 2011 and 2012: $4,000 per month; starting salary for first-year associates is roughly $70,000/yr.
• Economics Co-Op employee (as a student in graduate school) with the US Army Corps of Engineers: $33,402/yr.

To quote one of our students about his/her job and career: “I am a financial advisor. So, I’m not a practicing economist in the traditional sense, but I’d be lost without my educational background.”

We also asked our alumni if they have done any graduate or professional school training since graduation. 19 of the 33 students who completed the survey have done so, as follows:

• Eight are currently enrolled in graduate school or professional school (e.g., law)*
• Four have earned an MS degree
• Two have earned an MA degree
• Four have earned an MBA
• Two have earned a JD

*One of these students is in the results twice: s/he earned a Master’s degree several years ago, and is now currently enrolled in a more advanced graduate-level program.

These survey results show that job placement for BBA graduates in economics is excellent. Our alumni are employed in a variety of interesting, well-paying occupations. And most have sought out (and completed) graduate or professional training. As we first pointed out in the Graduate Satisfaction section earlier in this review, our graduates have found their economics training to be very useful in the “real world” of work, career, and responsibility, are in jobs and careers they enjoy, and would come back to Marshall and study economics all over again if they had the opportunity to do so.

3. **Job Placement:** (If the job placement rate reported above is low, can a course of action be identified that would improve this situation? Provide a summary of procedures utilized by the institution to help place program graduates in jobs or additional educational programs. Include activities supported by both the student’s academic department as well as the institution’s placement office. This summary should include the institution’s procedures and program organization for continuing contact and follow-up with graduates.)

The alumni survey results reported in this review indicate that there are no significant problems with job placement. Faculty have always made it a priority to work with and advise our students, one-on-one, as they develop their internship, career, and graduate school plans. This activity has proven successful, as our graduates’ success indicates. And it is very rewarding. The faculty in economics are known as caring, concerned mentors of students; for several faculty this is the best part of their job.
We are very happy with the services provided to our students by the university’s office of Career Services, and will continue to urge our students to make working with this office a priority as they begin to make the transition from school to the world of work, career, and responsibility.

The alumni of our program, the representatives of the business community, and the College of Business Advisory Board members who have spoken to our Economics Capstone class the past two years have made a tremendous impact on our students. We will continue to invite Guest Speakers into the Capstone, for they can teach our students valuable lessons about the “real world” that our students are about to enter. And our students have paid attention. We are already finalizing our Guest Speaker list for Spring 2013.

Finally, as noted in the Graduate Satisfaction section earlier in this report, this summer’s survey of our alumni is just the beginning: we plan to develop this survey instrument over time to create a more complete database on our graduates, and we will administer this survey regularly over the coming five year period.

V. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: N/A
### Appendix I

#### Required/Elective Course Work in the Program

**Degree Program:** BBA, Economics  
**Person responsible for the report:** Harlan Smith, Ph.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Required in Major</th>
<th>Total Req. Hrs.</th>
<th>Elective Credit Required by the Major: Any 300 or 400 level ECN or FIN course. One elective must be at the 400 level. “I” = International “WI” = Writing Intensive</th>
<th>Elective Hours</th>
<th>Related Fields Courses Required</th>
<th>Total Related Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECN 250 Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 310 Money &amp; Banking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BBA Core Curriculum (not inc. 250 &amp; 253)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 253 Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 340(I) Global Macroeconomic Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other College Requirements</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 326 Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 342 Economic Development of the U.S.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 204 Writing for the Workplace</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 328 Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 408(I) Comparative Economic Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CMM Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 423 Introduction to Econometrics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 420(I) International Trade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Business Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 466 Economics Workshop (C)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ECN 430 Forensic Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other College Requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECN 440 History of Economic Thought</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECN 450 Public Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 327 Life &amp; Health Insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 329 Property &amp; Liability Insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 356 Financial Management of Health Care Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 405 Social Insurance &amp; Employee Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 410 Corporate Risk Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 425 Portfolio Analysis &amp; Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIN 431 Futures &amp; Options</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional society that may have influenced the program offering and/or requirements: The American Economic Association (AEA). The AEA does not dictate program offerings and/or requirements, but as the major professional body for Economics, the AEA does have an indirect influence on program development over time.
## Appendix IIa
### Teaching Assistant Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GTA Name</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. 101)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Fa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete graduate teaching assistant’s name; course number and course name taught; indicate enrollment in the semesters taught.

*Expand table as needed.*

**NOTE:** No Graduate-student Teaching Assistants were used during the program review period. In general, none are ever used.
### Appendix III
Students’ Entrance Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: BBA in Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean High School GPA</th>
<th>Mean ACT</th>
<th>Mean SAT Verbal</th>
<th>Mean SAT Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>23.29 (n =14)</td>
<td>525.56 (n = 9)</td>
<td>573.33 (n = 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>23.61 (n = 19)</td>
<td>560.01 (n = 8)</td>
<td>578.75 (n = 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>24.64 (n = 14)</td>
<td>592.86 (n = 7)</td>
<td>591.43 (n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>22.7 (n = 14)</td>
<td>471.82 (n = 11)</td>
<td>562.71 (n = 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>24.47 (n = 9)</td>
<td>553.98 (n = 5)</td>
<td>536.02 (n = 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data obtained from Institutional Research.*
Appendix IV
Exit Abilities for Past Five Years of Graduates: BBA in Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>Licensure Exam Results</th>
<th>Certification Test Results</th>
<th>Other Standardized Exam Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data obtained from Institutional Research.
### Component Area/Program/Discipline: BBA in Economics

#### Program Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program’s Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures (Tools)</th>
<th>Standards/Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Analysis</th>
<th>Action Taken to improve the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communications</td>
<td>The BBA Oral Communications Rubric</td>
<td>75% of the students will score Proficient or Excellent on each of the five Measurable Objectives highlighted in the Rubric</td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Assessment Cycle 1 (Calendar 2010): Benchmark not met for any Objective. Performance best on Objective 5 (<em>Personal Appearance</em>); Performance weakest on Objectives 3 and 4 (<em>Vocal Quality, Body Language, Eye Contact</em> and <em>Communication Aids</em>). Performance also relatively weak on Objective 1 (<em>Topic &amp; Organization</em>). See the Narrative section of this Review.</td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> In the Spring 2011 Economics Capstone class: (1) we required each student to make three presentations; (2) we recorded all the presentations and graded the final one with the BBA Rubric; (3) The students were given the BBA Rubric in the Syllabus, watched their own recorded presentations and scored themselves with the Rubric; (4) The instructor and students discussed the weaknesses of the first two presentations and how to overcome them. <strong>B. In Economics 460</strong> the final oral presentation was elevated in importance: (1) It became the final component of the course; (2) Its value in the course grade, and the length of the presentation, were increased significantly; (3) The points awarded for the Introduction, the Conclusion, and Delivery/Communication Aids were increased significantly; (4) The Cycle 1 BBA-level results were reviewed with the class prior to the presentations. <strong>C. In the Spring 2012 Economics Capstone class:</strong> (1) The instructor will lay out very specific, explicit instructions and rules for student attire during presentations; (2) each student will give six presentations, starting the first week of the semester; (3) one of the presentations will be devoted to a Topic Statement competition, during which each student in each group will deliver his/her own statement of the Topic to be covered by his/her group in the final presentation. (4) While in class, the students will score themselves on the first five presentations, while watching recordings of their own presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communications</td>
<td>The BBA Written Communications Rubric</td>
<td>75% of the students will score Proficient or Excellent on each of the four Measurable Objectives highlighted in the Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving &amp; Critical Thinking</td>
<td>The Cornell Critical Thinking Test</td>
<td>The relevant national User Norms on this test, for samples of students at undergraduate levels similar to those in our sample.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Assessment Cycle 1: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Overall, across all Objectives, the BBA Sample scored below Proficient. Performance on Objectives 1 and 2 (*Purpose* and *Tone*) was relatively strong; Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (*Organization; Grammar & Mechanics*) was relatively weak. See Narrative.

B. Assessment Cycle 2: The Benchmark was not met for any Objective. Overall, across all Objectives, the BBA Sample scored below Proficient. Performance on Objective 2 (*Tone*) was strongest, but just short of the Benchmark. Performance on Objectives 3 and 4 (*Organization; Grammar & Mechanics*) improved, but remained below the Benchmark. See Narrative.

A. The COB faculty worked with the English Department to design a new writing course for COB students: ENG 204 (Writing for the Workplace), which would carry Writing Intensive course credit. This will address our students’ specific weaknesses and introduce our students to the kinds of writing done at the upper level in the COB and in the business world. Economics faculty served as Consultants during the initial development phase. One Economics faculty member remained a principal Consultant throughout the process. ENG 204 was first offered in Fall 2010.

B. (1) The COB AOL Committee (Assurance of Learning, or Assessment) worked with the instructor of ENG 204 to redesign the syllabus for Fall 2011. The instructor also chose a different book, focused in a more direct and user-friendly way on the business writing our students must learn to do.

(2) Starting Fall 2011, the English Department agreed to staff four sections of ENG 204 per semester. Starting in Spring 2012 the Registrar restricted enrollment in ENG 204 to COB students only.

(3) The Economics member of the COB AOL Committee worked with the English Department on the redesign of ENG 102 (the second semester of MU’s 6-hour English Composition requirement). ENG 102 is becoming ENG 201 starting Fall 2012, and our goal was to help the English Department create sections of this new course specifically for COB students, targeting the kinds of writing our students need to do in the COB curriculum. The new ENG 201 course will not substitute for Writing for the Workplace, but rather serve as a required lead-in to ENG 204.

A. The COB faculty decided to switch to the Cornell Level X test, in hopes of obtaining a more accurate reading of our students’ strengths and weaknesses in Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking. We implemented the Level X test during Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011. See the Narrative section for more details.

B. (1) The COB faculty agreed to create a *User’s Guide to Teaching and Assessing Critical Thinking Skills* during the Summer of 2011. The purposes of this Guide are to help faculty learn: a) what dimensions of Critical Thinking are being assessed via the Cornell Test; b) how the university is addressing Critical Thinking in the new Core Curriculum; c) from each other how to teach Critical Thinking skills, via a set of “best practices” assignment examples collected from COB faculty. The first version of this Guide was disseminated during Fall 2011. One of the two Co-Authors of this Guide is a member of the Economics Faculty.

(2) Individual faculty across the COB, including four members of the Economics faculty, agreed to implement new, specific Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking-based assignments in their Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General/Core Knowledge (BBA): up through Spring 2010</th>
<th>The BBA Core Knowledge Exam (see Narrative section)</th>
<th>The median score on the Exam will be at least 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Benchmark was not met:</strong> the median score on the Exam was only 62%. The COB faculty agreed to revisit the Exam, and their respective Core Courses, to address areas of weakness. The Economics faculty met in two groups, those teaching ECN 250 and those teaching ECN 253, to review the question-by-question results for these courses.</td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> During Spring 2010 the Economics faculty agreed to modify the Course Alignment Matrix (a.k.a. Course Learning Outcome Matrix) for both ECN 250 and 253. These new matrix agreements took effect in Fall 2010. In modifying these matrices, the faculty (1) deleted some topics in ECN 250 in order to focus student learning on a smaller, core set of Outcomes deemed most important; (2) added an Outcome in ECN 253 focused on the current reality of our Federal Budget and the National Debt, along with the workings of contemporary Monetary &amp; Fiscal Policy; (3) added an Outcome in ECN 253 on linkages between economic growth and international trading activity, to help students learn more about the workings of the global economy.</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> The Economics faculty also reviewed the ECN 250 and 253 question banks used to help generate different versions of the Core Knowledge Exam. Out-of-date questions were deleted, other questions were modified in response to student performance, new questions were added to bring the new ECN 250 and 253 question banks into line with the new Course Alignment Matrices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline-Specific Knowledge &amp; Problem-Solving in Economics: 2010-11 &amp; 2011-12. See Narrative.</strong></td>
<td>This exam was first administered in Spring 2011. We are using the results of the 2011 &amp; 2012 test administrations to establish a Baseline for our students’ achievement, against which we will measure future student cohorts.</td>
<td><strong>C.</strong> The Economics faculty teaching ECN 250 and 253 agreed to adhere to the new Course Learning Outcome Matrices until such time as the faculty agree to revisit them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student performance on Components 1 and 2 of the Exam (Mastery of Basic Concepts; Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis &amp; Problem-Solving) was very strong. Better than expected. Student performance on Component 3 (Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis &amp; Problem-Solving) was relatively weak. We decided that the questions and problems in Components 1 and 2 captured our students’ abilities well. We agreed that some Component 3 questions tested mastery of particular techniques more so than mastery of conceptual analysis and thinking/reasoning skills. Other Component 3 questions prevented the students from demonstrating their thinking skills because the techniques needed to solve the problems proved to be more of an obstacle than we expected. Since our #1 goal in the Economics curriculum is to help our students learn how to think, we realized we need to re-do these questions to test for this ability.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> For the Spring 2012 administration of this Exam, we modified the Intermediate Microeconomics problems to give students more of a chance to demonstrate their thinking and reasoning skills.</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> For Spring 2013: (1) We will include a fourth component on the Exam, consisting of problems from Econometrics (ECN 423). (2) We will break up the administration of the Exam across the semester, by having the students complete each component separately. Giving the exam all at once at the end of the semester, we have decided, is not appropriate. We will therefore administer Component 1 of the Exam the first week of class, to remind the students of the basic concepts they need to carry with them into their Capstone work. During the semester, at designated points, we will administer each of the other components of the exam. Doing this, we hope, will give us a more accurate reading on our students’ discipline-specific problem-solving skills. We can then use this information in 2013-14 to modify and refine our problem-solving exercises in ECN 326 and 328 to target areas of student weakness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Peer-Critique Rubric, created by the Economics faculty in Fall 2010.

All graduating seniors will be scored Proficient, by their peers, on all four rubric criteria. See Narrative.

Our students scored "too high" on the Peer-Critique Rubric, across the board, in both Spring 2011 and Spring 2012. Nearly all of them rate nearly all of their peers as Excellent on all four rubric criteria. But, given the litany of complaints we hear in the Capstone, from students concerned about their free-riding teammates, we do not believe that these high scores reflect our students' true Teamwork skills.

We have concluded that the students are not sure of the purpose of this exercise, and do not know how to make use of it to help their peers gain a deeper understanding of their strengths and weaknesses when it comes to Teamwork. To date this exercise has not proven to be the learning tool we thought it would be in Fall 2010.

A. In Spring 2012 we attempted to help the students learn the point of the rubric exercise, and to learn how to use the rubric properly, by implementing the exercise in stages, across the entire semester. (In Spring 2011 we administered the rubric just once, at the end of the course.) In the first stage we asked the students to simply rank their teammates on the four rubric criteria to highlight where each teammate is relatively strongest and weakest. In stage two we had the students repeat what they did in stage one, and then complete the entire rubric for each teammate. Finally, in stage three at the end of the term, we had the students complete the entire rubric for each teammate again. Our hope was that by the end of the term the students would be more comfortable with the rubric and how to use it—and that we would get a better reading on our students' teamwork skills.

B. The results of the Spring 2012 staged implementation of the exercise were little changed from the result obtained in Spring 2011. For Spring 2013 we are going to incorporate each student’s Peer Critique Rubric Scores into his/her course grade, so that s/he realizes that these skills matter. We are also going to set aside class time for each group to meet and do a set of “Performance Reviews” on their own members—much like the performance reviews done on employees in today's professional workforce. We hope that by working together on these reviews, the students will learn better how to become a better teammate and how to help their peers become better teammates.
# Appendix VI
## Program Course Enrollment: BBA in Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Required/Elective/Service</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECN 200-Td</td>
<td>Survey of Economics</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 200-O</td>
<td>Survey of Economics</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 250-Td</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 250-O</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 250-OC</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>TVRC, MOVC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 253-Td</td>
<td>Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 253-O</td>
<td>Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 253-OC</td>
<td>Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>R + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>TVRC, MOVC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 310</td>
<td>Money &amp; Banking</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 326</td>
<td>Intermediate Macroeconomic Analysis</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 328</td>
<td>Intermediate Microeconomic Analysis</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 340 (I)</td>
<td>Global Macroeconomic Issues</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 342</td>
<td>Economic Development of the US</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 408 (I)</td>
<td>Comparative Economic Systems</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 420 (I)</td>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 423</td>
<td>Introduction to Econometrics</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 430</td>
<td>Forensic Economics</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 440</td>
<td>History of Economic Thought</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Td</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td>Campus Location</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 450</td>
<td>Public Finance</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 460 (I, WI)</td>
<td>Economics of Developing Countries</td>
<td>E + S</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 466</td>
<td>Economics Workshop</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 480</td>
<td>Economics Workshop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 481</td>
<td>Economics Workshop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 482</td>
<td>Economics Workshop</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 483</td>
<td>SpTp: Adv Monetary Analysis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 485</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HTN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 490</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL STUDENTS ENROLLED 2007-2012: 7331**

Required = R; Elective = E; Service = S. Please indicate all that apply (e.g., E+S if the course is both an elective and a service course).

Delivery Method: Traditional = Td; Online = O; Hybrid = H

Location: HTN, SC, MOVC, TVRC, WEB

*SpTpTitles varied by semester.
Appendix VII
Program Enrollment: BBA in Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1 2007-2008</th>
<th>Year 2 2008-2009</th>
<th>Year 3 2009-2010</th>
<th>Year 4 2010-2011</th>
<th>Year 5 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Majors Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Area of Emphasis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBA in Economics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Majors Enrolled*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Majors Enrolled:**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total of Students Enrolled in the Program</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of the program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If known. This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students often do not declare a second major until the junior evaluation or the student has her/his primary major in another college.

**On occasion you may have a student enrolled in your program who is declaring your program as a 3rd major.

***This information is not completely accurate at this time, as students in the College of Business generally do not declare minors until the senior application for graduation.
## Appendix VIII
### Job and Graduate School Placement Rates: BBA in Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Graduates employed in major field</th>
<th># of Graduates employed in related fields</th>
<th># of Graduates employed outside field</th>
<th># of Graduates accepted to Graduate Programs</th>
<th># of Graduates not accounted for*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: During the Program Review period some of our graduates were accepted to Graduate Programs, completed those Graduate Programs, and are now Employed. These graduates are recorded twice in this table: once as being “accepted to Graduate Programs” and once as “employed.”*
Appendix IX
Assessment Letters

Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 20, 2012

Dr. Harlan Smith, Chair
Finance and Economics
College of Business

Dear Harlan:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BA-BBA in Economics' assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. I have included the scoring rubric we used to evaluate your assessment report in a separate document.

Most of your program's learning outcomes imply higher levels of cognitive ability, although I would argue that writing them in a more precise way might improve your assessment of them. You analyzed results with enough detail to allow you to identify relative strengths and weaknesses and have used those results to inform program improvement. However, you did not use complementary measures that were integrated throughout the curriculum.

During the coming academic year, it will be important that you follow the plan you developed as part of the first two activities of the Open Pathways Demonstration Project. The project's steering committee will provide more feedback regarding next steps in that project at summer's end. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. David Pittenger, Dean, COLA
Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, COB
Office of Assessment & Program Review

June 7, 2011

Dr. Harlan Smith, Division Head
Finance and Economics
LCOB

Dear Harlan:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Economics’ assessment of student learning. This letter will provide general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports was sent to you in April, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that the rubric is still relatively new and is continuing to be revised. At this time, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

Your program’s stated learning outcomes are measurable and assess higher orders of thinking. However, although you alluded to having some discipline specific outcomes, I did not see any articulated in the report. The report did a nice job of reporting the results of the assessment of the oral communication outcome and using those results to inform improvement. Plans for the integrative themes test also were appropriate. However, nothing was said about problem-solving or written communication. Have these been assessed and, if not, what are the plans to assess them? One of the University Assessment Committee reviewers commented that he/she liked the fact that the program used Communication Studies’ faculty to evaluate oral communication. This reviewer also noted that the report contained a thorough outline of meetings and faculty participation.

I know you are preparing for an AACSB accreditation visit in the fall and compliment you on the excellent work you have done (and are doing) to prepare for this. If I can help in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, LCOB
   Dr. Harlan Smith, ACL Director, LCOB
Dr. Roger Adkins, Chair
Finance and Economics
LCOB

Dear Roger:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Economics’ assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

Your report shows evidence of considerable thought and work in evaluating student learning and in using those results to improve your program. Regarding learning objectives, I have a problem with “will acquire knowledge” (which is not really measurable or, at the very least, suggests measuring on a very low level), but I realize that this is a broad area. However, given that you appear to assess this objective only at the capstone level, I question whether you should just be measuring what knowledge students have retained. At the capstone level, don’t you want to see how students can use this knowledge to solve “real-world” problems, to create solutions, to develop economic plans? I would suggest integrating tests that only assess whether or not students have remembered information throughout the curriculum, but would challenge you to develop a measure that assesses higher level thinking at the capstone level. To some degree you’ve done this with the Critical Thinking Test you’ve adopted, but I assume this is more general. I believe you could easily adapt the same principles to solving problems within your discipline.

Your assessment of written communication appears to be well developed and you have used assessment data to make changes in the curriculum. You are making progress on assessing oral communication and critical thinking as well.

Regarding discipline specific objectives, I believe you’re headed in the right direction with these, i.e. analysis and decision making. I wonder if there’s a way to write the objectives to state more clearly what students will do to show mastery. As you develop your assessment measure, I’d encourage you not to rely too heavily on the “test banks” you’re developing. My guess is that these questions will assess “knowledge” rather than higher level skills. Again, it’s important that students be able to use the knowledge to do what economists do.

Please see the attached rubric. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.
Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Dean, LCOB
   Dr. Harlan Smith, AOL Director, LCOB
Dr. Roger Adkins, Division Chair
Finance and Economics
LCDB

Dear Roger:

The University Assessment Committee and I have completed our evaluation of the BBA in Economics' assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric for the first time this year and, as you will see, it has changed considerably from the ones used in previous years. It raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment considerably and, since it was not shared with programs before this assessment cycle, I'm not comfortable using it to give programs a formal rating this year. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this new rubric.

You have made a nice start with your assessment plan and I'm sure this initial planning will bear fruit in the near future. I would encourage you to develop a curriculum map to determine where (and how often) each outcome is being assessed throughout the economics curriculum. For example, you plan to assess core knowledge in the capstone final exam, but I'm sure this knowledge also is assessed in various courses throughout the curriculum. Capturing these complimentary assessments, at different points throughout the curriculum, would help you to gauge student learning over time. Also, you will be assessing written and oral communication using various types of class projects and presentations. I assume that students will write and speak about one of the topics listed in the core knowledge domain. Perhaps your assessment rubrics could include a category for assessment of each student's depth and breadth of understanding of that specific topic area. The same is true of critical thinking; students will be thinking critically and solving problems using some content.

Having said all of this, I want to emphasize that it is important to identify more than one assessment measure for each outcome. These could be multiple papers (in various classes), a combination of specific test questions and projects/presentations, etc. You could also supplement your direct measures of student learning with indirect measures in the form of information from student satisfaction surveys or focus groups, which would give you information on students' perceptions of their knowledge, writing ability, etc.

One additional observation — your assessment reports for the BBA in Economics and the BBA in Finance are exactly the same. I do see that the final outcome refers to discipline specific knowledge. However, you need to define this “discipline-specific knowledge” for the two majors, so that distinctions become obvious. I also recommend that you write these outcomes in measurable terms.
Please see the attached rubric and letter to Deans, Chairs, and Faculty detailing general suggestions for an effective assessment program. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Chong Kim, Interim Dean, LCOB
January 24, 2012

Chong W. Kim  
Dean  
Marshall University  
Lewis College of Business  
One John Marshall Drive, 107 Corbly Hall  
Huntington, WV 25755-2300  
UNITED STATES

Via email: kim@marshall.edu

Dear Dean Kim,

It is my pleasure to inform you that the peer review team recommendation to extend maintenance of accreditation for the undergraduate and master’s degree programs in business offered by Marshall University is concurred with by the Maintenance of Accreditation Committee and ratified by the Board of Directors. Congratulations to you, the faculty, the students, the staff, and all supporters of the school.

One purpose of peer review is to stimulate further continuous improvement of quality programs. As noted in the team report, the school is to be commended on the following strengths and effective practices:

1. The College’s Business Advisory Board plays a critically significant role in advancing the quality of the College and its outreach into the business community as well as Marshall University as a whole.

2. The College is commended for its effective recruitment and retention of students. University administration has made this a top strategic initiative and the College has added a new position of Director of Recruitment and Retention.

3. The College provides vital business, community and economic development outreach to the service region through a wide variety of course/degree based opportunities. Examples include: the College’s effective economic development outreach such as the Toyota/International Business program Problem-Solving partnership; live cases in marketing and entrepreneurship program with the medical center; and, the MS in Health Care Administration Internships with Cabell-Huntington Hospital.
4. The College’s Hall of Fame Dinner Fundraiser each spring is a significant source of external funds and increases community prestige for the College as well as the University as a whole.

5. In discussions with business faculty and the College Business Advisory Board the PRT learned that the College Dean has been effective in increasing the linkage between the College and the business community.

6. The College’s students laud the small class size, close association with faculty in learning and service as well as the faculty’s dedication to student success.

Additionally, in the interest of continuous improvement, Marshall University should closely monitor the following item and incorporate it into ongoing strategic planning initiatives:

1. The PRT was concerned that the Fifth Year Report did not adequately tell the story of the overall quality. The entire report was not well organized and lacked management and key faculty supervision and leadership. Even though an Executive Summary is no longer required by AACSB, the addition of a clear summary would have added an effective beginning to the entire maintenance report. All five parts of the Situational Analysis were entirely too brief and required PRT members to spend much time obtaining additional information. The report did not contain a table showing financial support for the College strategic action items for the next three years (report did contain discussion points).

2. The College should continue to use and mature its AoL program and more effectively demonstrate widespread faculty involvement and ownership in all aspects of the program and its implementation and assessment. It should ensure that results from the analysis of goals/objectives for each assessment cycle are more exact and have clear links to continuous improvements. Additionally, the College should be more consistent in developing AoL methodologies and processes used for all degree programs. (Standards 16-19: Assurance of Learning)

3. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College should review and strengthen its process used to classify faculty intellectual contributions as basic, applied and pedagogical research. The Digital Measures system should be carefully implemented to ensure faculty intellectual data are correctly entered in Table 2-1. (Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions)

4. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the College should review and strengthen its maintenance of qualification definitions for AQ faculty, particularly related to the overall quality of peer-reviewed journals. The College should have sufficient AQ faculty resources prior to starting any new degree programs. (Standard 10: Faculty Qualifications)
Marshall University has achieved accreditation for five additional years. The next on-site maintenance review occurs in the fifth year, 2016-2017. A timeline specific to your visit year is attached. Please note that your Maintenance Review Application will be due on July 1st, 2014. You will be expected to provide an update on progress in addressing the concerns stated above in addition to other relevant information for initiation of the next maintenance review.

Please refer to the Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook for more information regarding the processes for maintenance of accreditation. The handbook is updated periodically to provide the most current process improvements. Please monitor the website to make certain that you have the most current version.

Again, congratulations from the Accreditation Council and AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. Thank you for participating in the maintenance of accreditation process and for providing valuable feedback that is essential to a meaningful and beneficial review.

Sincerely,

Jan Williams, Chair
Board of Directors

cc: Peer Review Team
Berkwood M. Farmer,
Business Team Chair
George W. Krull Jr., Accounting Team
Chair Henry Lowenstein,
Business Team Member
Gary D. Burkette, Accounting Team
Member