1. Central Washington University
   Assessment of Student Learning
   Department and Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: 2012-13  College: College of Business
Department: Economics  Program: All Specializations

1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**
   The CB’s mission is:

   “CWU’s College of Business faculty and staff create value and opportunity for our students by focusing on quality in undergraduate education at the Ellensburg campus and university centers in the Puget Sound and central regions of Washington state. We accomplish this through emphasis on excellence in teaching, which is strengthened by faculty research and supported by professional service.”

   This Mission includes the following explanation of value:

   “We create value by graduating students who possess foundation knowledge in accounting, **economics**, finance, information systems, international issues, legal and social environment, management, marketing, and quantitative business analysis.

   We create value by graduating students who possess appropriate skills in the following areas: **written communication**, **oral communication**, teamwork, **critical thinking** and ethics.

   We create value by graduating students who are satisfied with their educational experience.”

   Based on this mission, we assessed the following learning outcomes:

   a. Students will demonstrate knowledge of Microeconomics, Macroeconomics and Econometrics consistent with the knowledge demonstrated by Economics graduates at peer institutions.
   b. Students will demonstrate competency in Critical Thinking
   c. Students will demonstrate competency in Oral Communication.
   d. Students will demonstrate competency in Written Communication.

   We also assessed student satisfaction via our end of major survey.

2. **How were they assessed?**
a. In an assessment course, Econ 406, students completed graded homework problems, quizzes and exams which were used to assess student comprehension of Microeconomic, Macroeconomic, and statistical concepts.

b. Students prepared written reports for Econ 402 and 406 which were graded by the instructor. These written reports assessed critical thinking and written communication either directly or by use of the College of Business rubrics created for this purpose. These rubrics are included as an attachment.

c. Students prepared an oral presentation for Econ 401 which was graded by the instructor. This presentation assessed oral communication skills using a College of Business rubric created for this purpose. This rubric is included as an attachment.

d. Students took the ETS exam in Economics to demonstrate competence in Macroeconomics and Microeconomics.

e. Student satisfaction was assessed with the following questions from our End of Major Survey:
   i. “How would you compare your education with that of students in other majors at CWU?”
   ii. “Which one or two classes were the most helpful to you in reaching your goals, and why?”
   iii. “Which one or two classes were the least helpful, and why?”
   iv. “What do you think are the strong features of the department?”
   v. “What do you think are the weakest features of the department?”
   vi. “Were you satisfied with the quality of faculty and staff advising? Please comment on advising strengths or weaknesses.”

3. What was learned?

In the assessment course, students completed three midterm exams and the final ETS field exam in Economics. The results on the midterm exams showed proficiency in Microeconomics and Macroeconomics. This proficiency was confirmed by the ETS field exam. A summary of the ETS results for 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 are included in Appendix A. This summary includes the mean of total scores, and the proportion of CWU students that received scores exceeding the ETS national mean. Separate scores are reported for two of several subcategories, Microeconomics and Macroeconomics.

In the five years we have been using the ETS exam, a majority of CWU Economics students exceed the mean nationwide score. This past year 87% of our students exceeded the nationwide mean – the largest proportion to date. Based on these results, we conclude that our students have satisfied the learning outcomes of knowledge of Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, and Econometrics.

Assessments of critical thinking, written communication, and oral communication skills were conducted as described above. (See Appendix B for rubrics used). For this year a single score, instead of the rubric, was assigned for the critical thinking and written communication assessments. For many of the sections we have subcategory scores (see rubric), but here we report the percentage of the students that received a score less than 3 out of 4.

For oral communication, the yearly results are as follows:
The assessment was performed by multiple instructors without substantial coordination. It is not clear that the same student presentation would receive the same rating from two different instructors. This is one reason for the wide dispersion in the average score over time. The wide dispersion in the scores is also a function of the relatively small number of students that were assessed, as well as the relatively small number of students that received a less than “3”.

For written communication, we have fewer data points (all based on the same instructor) and more consistency in outcome.

Very few students were judged as inadequate in written communication, however we are also suspicious of the process of evaluation. In particular, the written work evaluated resulted from a highly structured assignment in which students submitted topic statements, outlines, rough drafts, and final drafts, all of which were returned to the students with feedback. The only student papers that were evaluated as inadequate came from a small number of students that were unwilling or unable to take advantage of the support we provided. We are unsure if the successful papers submitted by the majority of the students are the result of student competency or instead the carefully structured writing process.

For critical thinking skills, one instructor provided the evaluation in all years, providing a degree of consistency in evaluation. Students performed relatively poorly in this category, reflecting the more general difficulty students have with applying the tools of economics to examples not explained in the textbook or classroom.
In general, we are not satisfied with the current system of evaluating student abilities in the areas of oral communication, written communication, or critical thinking. If we continue to use the current rubrics we will first have to establish consistency between instructors. In contrast to this, the ETS exam provides a most consistent and comparable method for measuring student mastery of Micro and Macro Economic theory.

The end of major survey questions related to student satisfaction, and their responses, are included in Appendix C. A qualitative analysis of these results suggests that students are very satisfied with our program. Several specific courses were identified as needing improvement, and solutions to these complaints are identified in the next section.

4. **What will the department or program do as a result of that information?**

The Department of Economics uses the performance on the ETS field exam as a signal of how successful we are at providing content knowledge to students. The student performance is judged as adequate, and we do not plan substantial revision to the Microeconomics, Macroeconomics or Econometrics content.

Based on the evaluation of student writing skills, we judged student writing as adequate. Given the importance of these skills, we decided to increase the frequency of student writing, and the amount of feedback students receive from their written reports. See below for our plan to use undergraduate technical writing majors to increase the amount of writing in our major. We also believe that additional writing projects will help students in developing their critical thinking skills, since critical thinking is an important component of successful written communication.

For those courses that a substantial number of students rated unfavorably on the end of major survey, the department will make revisions. The Economic and Business Forecasting course (Econ 325) will be taught by a different instructor. Managerial Economics contains a long running problem related to its class size, which far exceeds the CB Policy on upper division course enrollments. Given sufficient resources (which we currently do not have), we intend to divide that course into two sections, potentially tailoring each to a somewhat different audience.

5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?**

As we planned in last year’s report, we hired technical writing majors as student TAs to assist our majors with report writing. These TAs were used in two courses last year, and will be used in at least four courses this year. Economics students will develop a portfolio of their written projects for use in assessing writing in our 406 Assessment course.

In response to concerns expressed by a very small number of students regarding advising, the department developed a standardized advising packet of material, including a checklist, that faculty
review with students as they enter the major. This packet should decrease the variability in the content of student advising between faculty members.

The advising packet currently consists of the following material:
1) A checklist. The checklist requires faculty to discuss
   a) A student specific graduation plan
   b) Student internships
   c) Double majors/minors/certificates
   d) The Econ club and Econ honor society
   e) The Econ web page, Linkedin, Facebook
   f) Application for graduation deadlines
2) Suggested courses for different professions
3) An annual schedule
4) Information on double majoring with Finance
5) Information on GIS courses
6) Applications for the three specializations, with information on each.

We also assembled past years data assessing student proficiency in critical thinking, written communication, and oral communication.

6. **Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:**
## APPENDIX A – ETS RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean of Total Score</th>
<th>Students with scores exceeding National Mean Score of 157</th>
<th>Proportion Exceeding National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean of Microeconomics Score</th>
<th>Students with scores exceeding National Mean Score of 58</th>
<th>Proportion Exceeding National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean of Macroeconomics Score</th>
<th>Students with scores exceeding National Mean Score of 56</th>
<th>Proportion Exceeding National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B – RUBRICS

The three Rubrics used in evaluating Oral and Written Communication, and Quantitative Reasoning / Critical Thinking follow.
# Oral Communication Skills Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1: Unacceptable</th>
<th>2: Marginal</th>
<th>3: Proficient</th>
<th>4: Exemplary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Logic of arguments is not made clear</td>
<td>Listener can follow presentation with effort</td>
<td>Presentation is generally clear and well organized</td>
<td>Presentation is clear, logical and organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Presentation is too elementary or too sophisticated for audience</td>
<td>Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience</td>
<td>Level of presentation is generally appropriate.</td>
<td>Level of presentation is appropriate for audience. Speaker comfortable in front of group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Communication Aids</strong></td>
<td>No communication aids were used or their use detracted from presentation</td>
<td>Communication aids were poorly prepared or used inappropriately.</td>
<td>Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation</td>
<td>Communication aids enhance the presentation. Professionally presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of content</strong></td>
<td>No reference is made to literature or theory</td>
<td>Explanation of concept or theories are inaccurate or incomplete</td>
<td>Explanation of concepts and theories are accurate and complete</td>
<td>Speaker provides an accurate, complete explanation of concepts and theories drawing upon relevant literature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy of Content</strong></td>
<td>Information included inaccurate.</td>
<td>Errors are made which distract the knowledgeable listener but some information is accurate.</td>
<td>No significant errors are made.</td>
<td>Information (names, facts, etc.) included in presentation is consistently accurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Language</strong></td>
<td>Listeners are so distracted by difficulty with grammar that focus is absent</td>
<td>Listeners can follow but some grammatical errors are prevalent.</td>
<td>Sentences are complete and grammatical and flow together.</td>
<td>Sentences are complete, grammatical and flow together easily. Words are chosen for their precise meaning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Appearance (optional)</strong></td>
<td>Personal appearance is inappropriate for occasion and audience</td>
<td>Personal appearance is somewhat inappropriate for the occasion and audience.</td>
<td>Personal appearance is appropriate for occasion and the audience.</td>
<td>Personal appearance is completely appropriate for the occasion and the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor ___________________________  Class ___________________________  Student ___________________________
Quantitative Skills Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Skills</th>
<th>1: No competence</th>
<th>2: Developing Competence</th>
<th>3: Competence</th>
<th>4: Clear Competence</th>
<th>5: Exceptional Competence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solve basic mathematical problems</td>
<td>Is not proficient in solving basic math and algebra problems</td>
<td>Can solve simple math and algebra problems with few errors</td>
<td>Able to solve complex math problems with few errors</td>
<td>Can apply formula to a wide variety of problems with a high degree of accuracy</td>
<td>Applies tools of mathematics to personal and professional problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use statistical tools to solve problems</td>
<td>Does not understand basic statistical concepts and formula</td>
<td>Understands probability distributions and basic statistical measures and can calculate basic statistics</td>
<td>Can interpret statistics and apply statistical tools to problem solving</td>
<td>Can use statistical tools for decision making, risk analysis, and in other business applications</td>
<td>Applies tools of statistical analysis to personal and professional decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mathematical models to solve optimization problems</td>
<td>Fails to learn the basic optimization techniques</td>
<td>Understands basic optimization models and can solve elementary problems</td>
<td>Uses optimization techniques to solve a wide variety of problems</td>
<td>Can analyze and solve difficult problems of constrained optimization</td>
<td>Applies advanced mathematical models to personal and professional decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use time value of money tools to solve financial problems</td>
<td>Does not grasp time value of money formula and concepts</td>
<td>Can solve basic present value and future value problems</td>
<td>Understands the theory, formula, and concepts of present and future value</td>
<td>Can apply time value of money to solve a wide variety of complex problems</td>
<td>Applies time value of money concepts and formula to personal and professional decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use technology to solve problems</td>
<td>Unable to use financial calculators, statistical software, and spreadsheets</td>
<td>Can solve basic problems with financial calculators, statistical software, spreadsheets and operations management software</td>
<td>Can solve complex problems with financial calculators, statistical software, spreadsheets and operations management software</td>
<td>Can use the tools of the internet for research. Uses presentation and multi-media technology in written and oral assignments</td>
<td>Uses technology in personal and professional life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking and decision-making skills</td>
<td>Unable to recognize problems and issues and identify cause and effect relationships</td>
<td>Identifies some of the problems, issues, and cause and effect relationships, but has difficulty drawing conclusions</td>
<td>Understands many of the problems, issues, and cause and effect relationships and draws some conclusions</td>
<td>Identifies problems, issues, and cause and effect relationships. Draws good conclusions and makes good decisions</td>
<td>Integrates the tools of critical thinking, quantitative analysis, and technology to solve problems and make decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor_________________________  Class_________________________

Student___________________________

Draft – Ma 6, 2008
## Written Communication

Name of Evaluator: _________________________     Student #___________________

### Written Communication Rubric: Demonstrate effective written communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication Rubric</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization:</strong> <strong>Sequencing, Use of formatting (headings, bullets, bold, underline, etc.) to promote ease of consumption</strong></td>
<td>Document is unorganized and very difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Document is somewhat organized but difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Document is generally clear and well organized.</td>
<td>Document is clear, logical and organized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Document is too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.</td>
<td>Aspects of document are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.</td>
<td>Level of document is generally appropriate for audience.</td>
<td>Level of document is appropriate for audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth (sufficient detail) and relevance of content</strong></td>
<td>No reference is made to literature or theory. Includes inaccurate information.</td>
<td>Explanation of concept or theories is inaccurate or incomplete. Errors are made which distract the knowledgeable reader but some information is accurate.</td>
<td>Explanation of concepts and theories is accurate and complete. No significant errors are made.</td>
<td>Document provides an accurate and complete explanation of concepts and theories drawing upon relevant literature. Information (names, facts, etc.) included in document is consistently accurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective use of language (sentence construction, grammar, and spelling)</strong></td>
<td>Readers are so distracted by language errors that focus is absent.</td>
<td>Readers can follow but some language errors are prevalent.</td>
<td>There are no spelling errors. Sentences are complete, grammatically correct, and flow together.</td>
<td>There are no spelling errors. Sentences are complete, grammatically correct, and flow together easily. Words are chosen for their precise meaning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Applicable: References according to some standard publishing format: APA, Chicago, etc.</td>
<td>Claims are not referenced. Publishing format is not used.</td>
<td>Some claims are referenced. Over reliance on unsubstantiated claims. Publishing format inconsistently applied.</td>
<td>Properly referenced evidence to support claims is present. Publishing format generally followed.</td>
<td>Properly referenced compelling evidence supports claims. Publishing format accurately and consistently applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you compare your education with that of students in other majors at CWU?
Superior and much more concrete
A little better
Probably very similar. I’m sure every major has good and bad teachers, useless classes and students of all levels of education. Compared to other schools we are bottom tier
It seems more in depth
More time consuming, more difficult to mix with work schedule due to M-F on most classes.
Very high
Not sure
I think that the Economics major goes further in rounding out students’ education. You learn critical thinking, writing skills, communication complex ideas and many other things. Many other majors focus on less.
I tried very hard in every course. I got as much as possible out of my courses. I am amazed how little some students do.
Of course my major is the best
The econ department seemed much more rigorous in curriculum than majors of other students I have encountered. The exception being math and science majors. I think this is very much a positive thing.
Ability for writing economic research paper. Knowledge of economics.
Superior
Relative The business and forecasting program is too similar to the General Econ degree. I don’t feel like I’m actually in a specialization. The program needs more classes like econometrics, possibility an advanced econometrics class.
Exceptional
Better than most
Stronger
A lot further ahead, better suited for life outside of college.

Which one or two classes were the most helpful to you in reaching your goals, and why?
Economic Research good example/application of Economic tools in a job like setting.
Macro and Econometrics
Labor Econ because I learned to use Excel
Advanced Stats Methods- Math 410A/B because I learned how to analyze data with SPSS and did research on real Kittitas County health data. Then presented technical information to non technical people in SOURCE.
Econometrics with Dittmer caused me to appreciate coming to class and talking with the professor outside of class for help. Tough but doable.
Money and Banking gave me a practical view and understanding of money in our economy. Economic research- this course taught me how to use economic knowledge in our business life.
Bus 221, Econ 324, Econ 401, Econ 310. 221 and 324 for becoming an analyst, 401 and 310 for currency trading. The subject matter related to my career goals.
Econometrics, Econ 406, Public Finance
462- Enviro and Resource- finding solidifying interests
Econometrics and 401 because I learned so much from those courses
Business Stats and Econ 201/202
Finance 370 because it ties everything together; 401 because it addresses ery real issues that pertain to all of the classes.
Econ 401, 324, 325 Increase Quantitative Analysis skillset.
What goals? Was my advisor supposed to help me set goals? I guess my main goal is graduating so Econ 406.
426 and 324
Econometrics and Forecasting

Which one or two classes were the least helpful, and why?
Managerial Economics-just don’ remember the course much at all. Govt and Business- didn’t talk much Gov’t and Business
Public Finance
Biology 101 Theater 101 not relevant
Macroeconomics with Dr Saunders because his teaching was difficult to understand and inefficient
Forecasting, Econ 325. Memorizing formulas yet not doing anything with them is NOT helpful. Concepts are only useful if you can USE them, not reiterate them on paper.
Econ 402 w/ Wassell. Clouded with formula and theory, very little application
ADMG
Econ 402 I did not get much out of this course it seemed to be a glossing over of the material in the book, mostly skipping over the more difficult concepts. This might be because there is no calculus requirement.
They all seemed to offer something worthwhile
MIS 386- not applicable math!
I think that macro classes are helpful, however Money and Banking and Macro 202 seem less helpful than they should have. I would have liked to move out of the books and actually make it about the world.
AMDG 385: It was all common sense
None/N/A
402 I was lost most of the time. The lectures were full of incomplete sentences and “wrong” examples. Brilliant professor but the communication in the classroom was tough. One on one was great.
Management 382- Total focus on group work without any disincentives to being a non contributing member fostered a frustrating environment
Public finance spent way too much time reviewing Econ 201, Govt and Business I don’t know what I learned in that class. We spent 3 weeks on C/B analysis and another 2 on reviewing 201.
Mkt 362 because there was no critical thinking just memorizing arbitrary concepts.
International Econ and Managerial

What do you think are the strong features of the department?
Support, clarity, quality of profs, caring nature
More math and writing
Dr. Ditmer, Dr. Wassell are excellent teachers. Dr. Sipic seems like he will be an excellent teacher as well.
Knowledgeable and helpful professors
Excellent leadership—both past and present.
High Professionalism—willingness and openness to help
Access to professors
I think the professors are very influential and understand the subject well.
Small class size, opportunity for independent study.
First rate faculty, strong focus on job placement
Accessible professors, professors with published research, relatively small class size in upper division courses.
High quality lectures
Professors with great knowledge and caring/helpful to help students succeed
Only class I really enjoyed was econometrics which is the basic information/skills that I want to do in my life.
The professors are very personable and easy to approach. Also the Econ 406 capstone course is very beneficial for finding work after college.
The advisors
Willingness to help and knowledge
Profs always very helpful in every aspect. Class/outside of class/beyond college-job expectations.

What do you think are the weakest features of the department?
Being friendly
One professor
None, I enjoy the Economics department
The business and forecasting degree NEEDS another USEFUL forecasting class like Dittmer’s econometrics class. I also think it is ridiculous I have to pay for the Wall Street Journal. You people get enough money from me.
There are less classes are required for graduation.
Classes over 1 hour in length. After one hour I become quite disengaged and get very little out of remaining class time.
Not a strong sense of community among the students.
Too few advanced courses. Do intro to Mathematical Econ!!
I think that some of the classes should be more discussion oriented instead of just flipping through pages of the book.
Some of the econ electives don’t add much beyond econ 401 and 402.
Don’t have any comments
Professors contradict each other at times. Requires a student to switch gears each quarter.
It’s the same as pleasing an English professor. Each one is unique.
Minimal help for post graduation job placement.
Not requiring more math as a pre req. Dr. Tenerelli. Too much theory, lack of quantitative work
Not enough reading or history
Honestly, I can’t say I see much weakness
Were you satisfied with the quality of faculty and staff advising? Please comment on advising strengths or weaknesses.

Yes, caring and thorough did not feel like they were trying to fill their roster but directed me toward my goals.
Some faculty are unorganized and in the business school some faculty are very boring and make no effort to keep students interested.
I met with my advisor, Dr. Wassell once. I didn’t get much out of it. But I’m graduating mostly on time. Not satisfied
Yes Professors were always available for advise.
Yes, my advisor was very careful to tailor my classes to my chosen careerpath.
Yes, strengths-compassion, understanding, honesty Weaknesses- don’t have any
Mostly, econ 355 wasn’t too useful, I am glad I took econometrics though
Mostly, yes. The staff is very bright, some could be more personable though. And a few classes seemed unproductive.
Very satisfied. My advisor challenged me constantly. Every Econ professor was available and willing to talk/ help with class.
Very satisfied, they were always available to answer questions and give guidance Advising was top notch. Dr. Sipic kept a spreadsheet tracking my progress through graduation. Also he was interested in my opinion on classes and made an effort to help whenever asked.
I’m satisfied with the quality of faculty and staff advising. Strengths: always helpful Weakness: Nothing
Mostly satisfied. Faculty-completely. Advising-Shirley is extremely helpful and full of knowledge.
Not only does Debbie Bodie give the wrong information, she sporadic. I want a starting advisor that actually cares about my interests, not just give me general information.
I am very satisfied with the faculty and staff advising. Coming from the Actuarial Science program the professors were unhelpful and I received little help when asking to plan my major.
Very satisfied, helped a lot
It was helpful
Didn’t use advising apart from finding classes one quarter and they were helpful in finding a good class to take.