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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 Macroeconomic 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 as an appendix. 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 six years we have been using the ETS exam, a majority of CWU Economics students exceed the mean nationwide score. This past year 60% of our students exceeded the nationwide mean – a significant drop from the prior year. In general we believe our students 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. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Quarter</th>
<th>% less than 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010F</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011S</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012S</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012F</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013S</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013S</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014F</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Quarter</th>
<th>% less than 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010F</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012S</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013S</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014S</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No students were judged as inadequate in written communication, however we remain 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. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Quarter</th>
<th>% less than 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011S</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012W</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012S</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013W</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013S</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014W</td>
<td>23.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014S</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 as an attachment. A qualitative analysis of these results suggests that students are very satisfied with our program. In those areas where student identify less satisfaction we have relied on faculty feedback with the expectation that faculty will address comments in a manner that will support improved connection with students.

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

In the past year, the Department of Economics proceeded through a transition in leadership at a time that conflicted with the evaluation process. As a result, there were few specific actions taken to address deficits in past assessments. The department however, has been actively engaged in student professional development and advising. The department is also working more closely with colleagues in other departments within and outside the College of Business to identify and encourage more dual program majors. We believe this will help to broaden the makeup of students pursuing economics and enhance competencies in the areas of critical thinking.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of Microeconomics Score</td>
<td>Students with scores exceeding National Mean score of 58</td>
<td>Proportion Exceeding National Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of Macroeconomics Score</td>
<td>Students with scores exceeding National Mean score of 56</td>
<td>Proportion Exceeding National Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B – RUBRICS

Attached in electronic form are three Rubrics used in evaluating Oral and Written Communication, and Quantitative Reasoning / Critical Thinking.
### Written Communication Rubric: Demonstrate effective written communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: Sequencing, Use of formatting (headings, bullets, bold, underline, etc.) to promote ease of consumption</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document is too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.</td>
<td>Aspects of document are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (sufficient detail) and relevance of content</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective use of language (sentence construction, grammar, and spelling)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readers are so distracted by language errors that focus is absent.</td>
<td>Readers can follow but some language errors are prevalent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Applicable: References according to some standard publishing format: APA, Chicago, etc.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>Organization</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>Style</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>Use of Communication Aids</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>Depth of content</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>Accuracy of Content</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>Use of Language</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>Personal Appearance (optional)</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 ________________________
**Critical Thinking Rubric:** Apply quantitative and qualitative critical thinking skills to develop, access, and use information to analyze business problems and propose feasible solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Solving Skills</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify and summarize relevant problem and explain relevance.</td>
<td>Has a fair understanding of the problem but misses some important issues and details. Solution &amp; problem match. Fails to fully identify causes of problem.</td>
<td>Has a good understanding of the problem’s causes and ramifications. Analysis fails to address major issues facing the organization. The analysis is missing some details.</td>
<td>Has an excellent understanding of the problem and issues. The analysis is thorough. Isolates the major issues and addresses them in the solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Analysis</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not provide quantitative analysis. Does not demonstrate knowledge of the tools of quantitative analysis.</td>
<td>The quantitative analysis is incomplete with significant errors. Does not effectively utilize the tools of quantitative analysis. Quantitative analysis used but not relevant to points made by the student.</td>
<td>The quantitative analysis is substantial but incomplete. Utilizes the tools of quantitative analysis. Analysis has some errors. Analysis does not strongly support points made by student.</td>
<td>The quantitative analysis is complete and accurate. Applies the appropriate tools of quantitative analysis. Quantitative analysis supports points made by student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-Making Skills</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative solutions don’t match problem, or don’t exist. Unable to process and synthesize information correctly or to recognize problems and issues. Cannot do the necessary analysis. Does not identify alternative solutions.</td>
<td>Processes most of the information, identifies most of the problems and issues, and completes most of the analysis. Fails to express criteria/logic for choosing one solution over others. Fails to examine more than one potential solution. Alternative solutions fail to contain both advantages and disadvantages.</td>
<td>Processes and analyzes information correctly. Recognizes and prioritizes problems/issues while identifying and evaluating alternative solutions with expressed criteria/reasoning. Fails to address larger ramifications of choosing this solution and fails to point out potential trade-offs.</td>
<td>Processes and analyzes information correctly. Recognizes and prioritizes problems and issues, identifies and evaluates the alternative solutions. Telling story/tradeoffs are explained in logic. Addresses relevant opportunity costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Computer Technology</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not utilize applications software and internet resources to research problems and issues.</td>
<td>Uses some applications software and some internet resources to research problems and issues.</td>
<td>Utilizes most applications software and internet sources to research problems and issues.</td>
<td>Utilizes all available applications software and internet sources to do thorough research, identify issues, and solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you compare your education with that of students in other majors at CWU?
- I would rate my education/major as more rigorous and challenging.
- I think my education as an Econ major give me an advantage over other students because so much of what we learn in Econ is real world applicable.
- Very high quality and perhaps more challenging which is a great thing.
- I felt like my knowledge of economics is at a level equal or above any other students knowledge of their field.
- Harder than elementary Ed but easier than Chemistry. I do not know how their professors and advisor help prepare for life after college.
- The whole transferring sucked, put me back a quarter and essentially cost me another 4 grand when I could have graduated early. College of Business “lost” my application for my econ major was told to take classes I didn’t have to take. No one know what they are doing, at least the professors do. The other faculty is just terrible. Oh wait, the econ secretary is really helpful.
- I felt that I have much more practical knowledge than most other students. I naturally do cost-benefit analysis of many decisions and I understand certain relevant technical analysis skills.
- Higher education than most
- I believe that the work/studies/homework in economics courses is very useful to gaining skills and abilities for the workplace. Many courses in other departments give a lot of “busy work” which does not seem helpful or useful beyond the classroom.
- Honestly, the school of business seems to offer an exception educational experience relative to other programs with comprehensible practical applications.
- I haven’t really had a chance to compare my education to other students with other majors. However, compare to BA and MET I think we have the same level of education.
- High
- I feel like I have a more realistic expectation of the job market.
- Much more rigorous than others. Less applied to the real world.
- Much more analytical and difficult than other majors.
- I believe I chose one of the most valuable majors at CWU/.
- My major is more challenging than others, the professors appear to be more passionate, reasonable, flexible and approachable.
- Better than average with a 95% confidence index.
- I don’t know anyone outside the College of Business.
- I would say we receive a higher quality education than students in other majors.
- In depth, challenging, interesting, more intensive
- I feel more confident entering the workforce with an econ degree.
- Much more challenging, but also rewarding.
- Exceeds that of other majors.
- Better
Which one or two classes were the most helpful to you in reaching your goals, and why?

- Econ 201 actually helped a lot in discovering econ as a major.
- Bus 221 and Econ 401 because both were heavily based in Excel which is very important and attractive to employers.
- Econ 406 because it is a summary of all economics courses and prepared me for grad school.
- Econometrics- I feel like I learned more in that class than any other class at CWU. Economic research- helped with finding research and writing reports.
- Econ research with Wassell, understanding the time, effort and writing techniques needed for needed for thorough research helped see what careers I’m looking for the calculus series to get a grasp of how the numbers and inputs relate.
- Econometrics. I learned what I wanted to learn. Real useful stuff.
- Econ 201 (Hedrick) was very helpful because it taught me a new way of thinking (marginal analysis) Econ 356 (Business/Govt Tenerelli) helped give me the tools to analyze our current government problems.
- Statistics and econometrics because the numbers dealing with actual life situations will be valuable in future and help earn more money.
- 401 and econometrics Dr. Dittmer had us do projects using the tools we learned in these classes. These projects are highly useful in demonstrating what I can do at job interviews.
- Intro to macro with Sipic because it opened my eyes to economic issues and possibilities. Also, statistics with Sipic, it built a foundation for the rest of the program.
- I enjoyed Econometrics, it was interesting to run regressions.
- Econ 324 and 401, they laid the framework and understanding for micro business analysis
- Economic research because it incorporated everything I learned throughout my major.
- Bus 221 and Micro Econ because they helped me gain some knowledge of decision making in a business environment.
- I liked econometrics because it taught me how to make sense of data which is what I want to do as a career.
- 462; Environmental because it introduced me to my professor for independent study, along with informing me of a fascinating field of study.
- Intermediate micro and macro. Also the math courses I took at the recommendation of several econ profs.
- Research class (Econ 426) because it was the most real world applicable.
- Econometrics, Business Forecasting. Because I learned skill sets I use and will continue to use throughout my career.
- Bus Law helped me realize I wanted to go to grad/law school
- Research taught me how to write projects, which other econ classes don’t.
- The Econometrics and Forecasting classes were very interesting and helpful but also the Govt and Bus taught me a lot I did not know. 426 was also amazing.
- Econometrics because it focuses on quantitative analysis that can be used in a variety of settings.
- Econ 406- help me not only with academic knowledge but also real life experience.
- I enjoyed Econ 355 and 202
- Money and Banking, economic research, most relevant.
Which one or two classes were the least helpful, and why?

- Intermediate Micro, no real world application
- MIS 386—although it is not an Econ course, it was by far the least helpful. I receive an A without any effort.
- None, every class added value. If any 201 and 202 were a bit slow.
- Research taught me how to write projects which other econ classes don’t
- Bus stat, least used everything was covered again in Econometrics and Forecasting.
- None
- MIS because I already had a background in computer (although the class was good).
- Business forecasting with Tenerelli. We simply did not cover enough material
- Gov’t and business; My professor (Tenerelli) was scatterbrained and graded subjectively.
- Management because it is all common sense stuff. MIS and SCM were also less useful for the same reason and SCM and MIS were extremely similar.
- Not sure, probably some basic and breath classes.
- Intermediate Macro economics
- Economics 406, it reiterates many thing I have already had to undergo and apply to obtain a grad school acceptance.
- Money and Banking— it seemed like what was taught isn’t how the work works now.
- Least helpful was probably intermediate micro with Hedrick. He does not teach the information rather he scrambles it out on the board and expects student s to already understand. I did well, but I wasted my money.
- I found that most of the Econ 352 was largely review of 401 material.
- Business Forecasting, just didn’t learn anything new.
- Econ 402 (Wassell) Although he is very knowledgeable I did not learn much practically applicable info.
- Accounting classes, they had nothing to do with Econ.
- At this point the accounting classes seemed to be the least beneficial you learn the key pieces of ACCT in Fin 370, except in 370 it’s more specific towards an actual occupation.
- Money and Banking. It is a very dry class and I don’t feel I learned anything from it.
- Accounting and Accounting because unless you are going to be a CPA there is no need to require students to learn that much accounting.
- Not sure, I’ve enjoyed them all.

What do you think are the strong features of the department?

- All of the staff are very helpful and nice.
- The teachers are by far the strongest feature of the dept. because they help you so much in getting to where you want to be.
- The faculty and depth of information that students learn.
- All of the 400 level classes are well structured and done really well. As well as the professor being extremely knowledgeable and focused on the classes.
- The research and social web the professors possess. That makes it more helpful when looking for internships or questions about a field of interest.
- Econ dept. was great, really helpful and at least could guide you to whatever you needed, but where you were guided, the y people there, usually DID NOT know what ws going on.
- Excellent staff that are dedicated to student development. Rigorous courses that facilitate higher level thinking.
Tenured staff and other Econ staff are extremely knowledgeable and helpful along the path.
We have very knowledgeable and well connected staff which helps us attain skills and knowledge which are useful in the “real world”.
Strong features include a well rounded, educated staff for the most part.
Easy to follow curriculum, great instructors/professors
I enjoy/like many of the faculty members.
Access to faculty.
Strong professors, great research background.
Faculty are always available to help.
Availability and helpfulness of a great teaching staff.
The professors, hands down.
Helpful, knowledgeable faculty who are for the success of the students.
Excellent teachers and advisors.
The instructors
The professors, a select few really stick out in my mind.
Professors!
Professors, they are very attentive and helpful
The case/real world studies that take place. Finding actual data and using it. Even coming up with our own research projects was really rewarding.
The professors
The staff

What do you think are the weakest features of the department?
Building structure, it is almost insulting.
Having to deal with Debbie Boddy
Lack of writing component
The short time period in which to absorb the information
The econ major is not mathematically intensive.
Lack of mathematical econ. Going into a Ph.D program requires we know at least univariate calc. However this dept only teaches “graphical” econ which is more intuitive but less exact.
A dwindling number of profs recently, which forces one to take multiple classes from the same prof., which can be tiresome, especially if in the same quarter! Also, before 8 AM classes. Its like you want us to suffer more than we already are.
Inconsistency in grading. Grades depend large on who you take for a class.
Lack of technology application, lack of real world/job application.
Limited class choices per quarter.
I think 201 and 202 can be too abstract at times and tend to turn students off to Econ more real world application may encourage students to stay engaged.
Availability of courses
I would say scheduling is the weakest feature.
It’s a small department, needs to be made bigger to offer more class choice and easy access instead of
the 4th floor.
I would have liked to have more involvement with current economic issues.
It is on the 4th floor of Shaw. It’s an attic....beef it up please.
Some of the actual professors are not good teachers. Tenerelli tops the list.
- I feel some of the lower level classes can be more focused. I hear a lot of non econ student talk about how bad 201 and 202 are. Maybe more focus on those classes can increase econ majors.
- Low options of class times in week and offered in the year.
- I think there should be more companies brought in to give seminars and hold interviews for Econ students. I know the construction management dept brings in a ton of companies who give presentations, provide dinner and hold interview for internships as well as full time jobs. This would be a huge step forward.
- Maybe the lack of math in curriculum, otherwise nothing.

Were you satisfied with the quality of faculty and staff advising? Please comment on advising strengths or weaknesses.
- Yes very. My prof was so helpful in so many ways. I cannot stress how much better this department is compared to the Aviation Dept.
  - Yes, Toni Sipic my advisor could not have been more helpful to me.
- Very much. Professor Tenerelli is a very helpful person who guided myself down a good core of classes. No weaknesses.
  - I thought most of the faculty was helpful and knowledgeable.
- I was very satisfied with Hedrick as my advisor. He was always willing and able to help, if there were any shortfalls it was from my lack of engagement.
- Dr. Bob is my advisor. He has been excellent and he is always willing to meet and discuss anything. Shirley Hood has also been very kind and helpful. Favorites: Dr. Bob, Dr. Tenerelli and Dr. Hedrick.
- Yes, faculty has always been helpful in the Econ dept and Wassell as an advisors has helped me come up with a solution for every problem I have brought him even if it met consulting with department chairman.
- Econ staff and advising were awesome. Just general advisors and Debby Boddy really could just be replaced. You can teach a monkey and pay it in bananas to do a better job than her. She has no idea what is going on w/ transfer students. Ex telling me I have to take classes I don’t need. Didn’t even take a serious look at my situation.
- My advisor is very informative and has great understanding of requirements as well as university events.
- Yes, Sipic, Wassell and Carbaugh are excellent professors with a passion for economics and the success of their students.
- I really like my advisor, Mr. Toni Sipic. He’s helpful and always available for my needs. That applies to most of the faculty. However, I experienced on thing I don’t like, staff doesn’t give me an update on the process of re-apply for the course.
- Yes, the staff is good. It would be nice if some faculty where on the same page with some terminology. Seems multiple ways to say the same thing can be confusing at times.
- I was 100% satisfied with my advising.
- I am satisfied with my advising within my major, but my general ed advising was terrible and frankly, set me up for failure.
- Overall yes, very satisfied.
- Overall yes. Dr. Sipic and Dr. Wassell were the most helpful even though neither are my advisor. My actual advisor put some pressure on me to take some classes, but I believe he did through to benefit the department rather than me.
- I was satisfied. I didn’t need much “advising” but what I did get was sufficient.
• Yes  They were knowledgeable when it come for grad school applications, however, not so helpful in determining when classes would be most beneficial for me while also moving me toward graduation.
• Yes, several faculty members gave me excellent help when I was applying for grad school.
• Yes I have been satisfied with the quality of faculty and staff advising.
• Very satisfied, excellent profs
• Very satisfied, my advisors were very helpful in planning my graduation.
• Once in the major, staff advising and faculty teaching was excellent.
• Advising was very good. I personally had more than one throughout my economics education and did not have any problems.
• I was, however I initially voided many teachers and thus did not experience them. Work on a finance minor that is actually possible.
• Yes