

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY
AND ADMINISTRATION

Self-Study

Summer 2005

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENTAL SELF STUDY
Prepared: Summer 2005

Acknowledgments

The PPA faculty members wish to thank Suzi Bryd, PPA departmental administrative assistant, for invaluable contributions to students and the department, and for specific assistance with this self study. We also wish to thank current students and alumni for their input. We view the department's efforts as a true collaboration among faculty members, staff, students, alumni, and others interested in our programs.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Mission and Goals

The study of public policy and administration is inherently multi-faceted and interdisciplinary. As a department and an academic field of study, we draw upon the traditional fields of political science, economics, and public administration as well as the more recent fields of public policy studies and collaborative decision-making. We also place great emphasis on the role and world of the public policy/administration practitioner, notably the work of that practitioner in the Capital region served by Sacramento State University, throughout California State and local governments, and in the growing non-profit sector.

Consistent with President Gonzalez' "Destination 2010" vision, our goal is nothing less than to make Sacramento State a major destination for the study of public policy and administration, and one of the best places in the country to focus on state and local arenas. We hope to challenge students to think in new ways. We aim to offer our graduates a wide range of skills that are highly valued by a diverse set of employers. We want our faculty to be committed and innovative teachers, active scholars contributing to both academic and practical knowledge, and engaged professionals active in the life of the University and in wider communities. We intend that department staff members are true partners in meeting the needs of the various groups with whom we interact. And we want to build a reputation for excellence for our students, alumni, faculty, and staff.

This self study will be different than most in that our main focus will be on our graduate program. Departments typically concentrate on their larger undergraduate programs, but the vast majority of our coursework is in the graduate area and most of our students are seeking master's degrees. In part based on the suggestion of our last program review in 2000, we established an undergraduate minor program in 2002, while simultaneously offering our first three undergraduate classes. However, the minor program remains very small and we are recommending a major change to our undergraduate presence on campus; we will discuss these plans in more depth in subsection "C."

B. Brief Department History/Response to Last Program Review (2000)

The current graduate program supersedes earlier versions at Sacramento State. The first public administration program grew out of the criminal justice/police science concentration in the Government Department. In the early 1970's the program was transferred to the School of Business and Public Administration where it remained into the mid-1980's. For a few years in the late 1980's there was no public policy or public administration graduate program in operation despite Sacramento's importance as a seat of government.

The Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration at CSUS was authorized by the Chancellor's office to begin offering coursework in the fall of 1989. The graduate program has operated continuously since that time. A total of 187 students have received the Master's Degree in Public Policy and Administration since the program's inception. Following the separation of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies (SSIS) the graduate program was administratively housed in the latter college, which was appropriate given its inherently interdisciplinary nature.

With the establishment of the undergraduate minor in 2002, the program faculty determined that it would be appropriate to seek the designation of "department." Chair Ted Lascher made a formal request for such a designation in the fall of 2001 and that request was officially approved in January, 2002.

The program/department has twice been reviewed, in 1993 and 2000. On both occasions the program review team recommended approval for the full term. Each program review team offered helpful recommendations, many of which have been incorporated. Since the 1993 recommendations were discussed at length in our prior self study, the focus in the present document will be on the advice offered in the 2000 report (see Appendix A for a complete list of the 2000 findings and recommendations). We also wish to note the summary statement about the department faculty by the external consultant, Professor Theodore Anagnoson of the Department of Political Science at California State University, Los Angeles (and the newly elected vice chair of the California State University system's Statewide Academic Senate): "The quality of the faculty is exemplary and, by CSU standards, superb. This is clear from the quality of the graduate degrees, the books and materials being used in classes, the demands placed on the students, and the quality and quantity of research and public service being generated by the four faculty in the unit."

Following are our responses to the seven department specific recommendations in the 2000 report.

1. *"The review team recommends that the PPA faculty members continue efforts to revitalize the community advisory group."* This recommendation was implemented in 2003. The Department obtained approval to establish an official department advisory

committee, which was one of the few for a single department on campus. The official charge to the PPA Advisory Committee is included as Appendix B. Advisory Committee members have included a number of prominent local figures with a strong commitment to public service: Christopher Cabaldon, Mayor of West Sacramento and a PPA alumnus; Cheryl Davis, former Director of the Sacramento Department of Human Assistance; Marlene Garcia, Consultant for the California State Senate Education Committee; Grantland Johnson, former Secretary of the State Health and Human Services Agency; Muriel Johnson, former Sacramento County Supervisor; Elisabeth Kersten, former director of the State Senate Office of Research; Lisa Martin, policy analyst for the California Taxpayers Association and a PPA alumna; and Terry Schutten, Sacramento County Executive. The Advisory Committee has met several times and has offered helpful advice with respect to such matters as strengthening connections between students and the professional community. Among the most productive of such events was a series of informal dinners bringing together committee members, faculty, and students for informal discussion.

2. *“The review team recommends that PPA faculty members continue to explore strategies to facilitate recruitment and retention of a diverse group of students.”* Since the last review the Department has taken a number of steps to strengthen and diversify the student population including: holding many recruitment sections for Capital Fellows, an especially talented and ethnically diverse group of recent graduates; holding brief information sessions in a variety of undergraduate classes including courses on the Asian American experience and in Ethnic Studies; and participating in campus-wide graduate school information sessions that cater to a diverse audience.
3. *“The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to examine and improve advising efforts.”* The Department’s graduate student advising efforts can be organized into three phases. First, *prior to their attending their first class*, we engage in a concerted effort to help students to understand the curriculum, course choices, and program requirements. All incoming graduate students are encouraged to attend one of a number of small group advising sessions with at least one faculty member (sometimes in conjunction with the department secretary who has particular expertise on program requirements). Second, students receive faculty advising during the course of completing required courses. Consistent with the recommendation of the 2000 program review team, we have continued to explore ways to improve this process. One of the key changes we made was to link crucial first year student advising with the instructor who teaches PPA 200, the introductory graduate seminar. Third, we advise graduate students with respect to proposals for theses/projects. In that respect, we have made a concerted effort in recent years to advise graduate students of the desirability of talking to the department chair or other faculty members about possible thesis topics well before they reach the stage of enrolling in the culminating experience class.

4. *“The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to explore strategies for increasing students’ participation in professional activities.”* While citing evidence that professional opportunities were available to individual students, the 2000 report noted that there was no functioning alumni organization (a fact that we ourselves acknowledged in our 2000 self study). That problem has since been rectified, and we have maintained an active alumni organization in recent years. That organization has sponsored many activities including among others a presentation by a member of the Governor’s staff on obtaining executive branch employment, a session on breaking into the civil service, a lunch forum on civil service reform, an informal get together to watch and discuss election returns, and social events such as group attendance at a Sacramento River Cats Game. We are proud of the fact that during Alumni Week activities last academic year Dean Joseph Sheley pointed to our department as having a particularly active alumni network.
5. *“The review team encourages the PPA department to reflect on strategies that can provide a balance between opportunities for faculty involvement in activities resulting in local, state, national and international contributions to the field and other programmatic needs.”* The 2000 program review team report commended the department for “exemplary” scholarly and service contributions but noted that the faculty were “spread very thin over many worthwhile activities[.]” No specific guidance was given as how to address this challenge, but the faculty were advised to reflect on different strategies. Professor Anagnoson raised a similar issue. In part we believe any problem has been addressed by additional faculty resources and the contributions of two former top administrators who are emeriti faculty in our department and contribute much to governance: former President Donald Gerth and former Vice President Elizabeth Moulds. But we acknowledge that achieving balance remains in part a challenge because of our desire to achieve excellence in a number of areas.
6. *“The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue discussions regarding the proposed undergraduate major/minor including the suggestions from the team and the external consultant.”* We took these suggestions to heart and, during the 2001-02 academic year, submitted a proposal to establish an undergraduate minor. That proposal received support at all levels of university governance and became effective in the subsequent academic year. Yet not all our hopes for the program have been realized. Again, we plan to discuss the minor further in subsection “C.”
7. *“The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue efforts both in development of assessment measures and in utilizing results of student learning outcomes for program improvement.”* We have done both; details are discussed in section II of the self study.

C. Program Trends and Department Plans

Before addressing the details of trends and plans, it is worth noting that all major changes have been discussed at length at a series of annual departmental retreats. For the last several years all full-time faculty and staff have attended a one to two day retreat in the early summer, with part-time faculty joining us for some of the discussion. Assessment data, curriculum concerns, ideas for new initiatives and other topics have been considered at each of the retreats. The initiatives we have proposed tend to reflect the consensus reached at the retreats.

Graduate Program

As Professor Anagnoson emphasized in his 2000 consultant's report, overall our graduate program differs from many traditional CSU public administration programs (including the one offered at the Los Angeles campus) in that we put greater emphasis on methods and applied economics. In that sense our program offerings are consistent with a broad national trend over many years to add more "analytics" to the traditional MPA offerings—a trend less pronounced within the CSU system. Indeed, sometimes programs across the nation have been criticized for overemphasizing quantitative skills at the expense of understanding public management and politics. We have strived for balance in that regard, mindful not to ignore such traditional concerns as attention to organizational culture and implementation challenges.

Consistent with that goal and with the recommendation of both the 2000 program review team and the external consultant, we concluded it was necessary to beef up the "A" (administrative) side of our program with an additional faculty person. The department sought and was granted approval to search for a full-time faculty member. We were successful in hiring Dr. Mary Kirin who had taught in a similar program at Indiana University and had extensive experience as a public sector administrator. Hiring Professor Kirin also allowed us to make a major programmatic change: adding a second required public management course (240B) to the core curriculum. This additional class has allowed us to address many important management topics in more depth, and better prepares our students for organizational environments.

We have made three major changes to the PPA graduate curriculum since the last program review. First, we have added coursework in the emerging field of "collaborative policy making," working closely with the CSUS Center for Collaborative Policy Making. These courses are based on the recognition that public policy problems increasingly involve complicated interactions among a variety of agencies at different levels of government, as well as interactions between government and various interest/community groups. Skill at managing such interactions has become highly valued. The Center is at the cutting edge of this work, and our department's graduate courses incorporate the theoretical and practical insights of Center staff and others active in this field. David Booher, a senior advisor for the Center, took the lead in developing the course content and taught the initial versions of the courses as a part-time instructor for the Department. Our courses in this area (PPA 270 and PPA 271) have proved very popular with students; faculty have been very positive about them as well.

Accordingly, after extensive consideration we are now planning to take an important further

step. Reflecting on the evaluations of the courses, the quality of our interaction with the Center for Collaborative Policy Making, the continued national attention to collaborative methods, and positive input from students, the faculty is proposing establishment of a graduate certificate in collaborative policy and decision-making. The certificate would incorporate the two existing collaborative policy making courses as well as a new, intensive advanced practice class. We believe this program will fill an important niche and further establish our program as innovative.

We wish to stress two sources of information that underscore student support for our plan to move our specialization in collaborative policy making to the next level. We surveyed students in the fall of 2004 about several program issues, in preparation for this self study (we also surveyed alumni and faculty). A total of 81 students responded to the survey, the results of which are referenced at several places in this report (see Appendix C for a complete summary of the results). The student survey indicated that while most were generally satisfied with the courses and instruction, they desired further elective options. We then decided to use a portion of an evening class to probe further about what students wanted. We found a surprisingly strong consensus about the desirability of a collaborative policy making certificate, even if this required students to take one additional, new elective class.

A second major PPA program initiative has been development of a specialization in higher education. This initiative was linked to a highly advantageous decision by the University administration: establishment of the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy (IHELP). Dr. Nancy Shulock, who had previously served as the campus Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs as well as a PPA faculty member, has served as the director of IHELP since its inception while continuing to maintain a position in the Department. We were also able to search for another full-time faculty member to assist in the work of IHELP and develop course work in the area. Happily, we were able to hire Professor Miguel Ceja who has a doctorate in higher education and particular expertise with respect to such important topics as the transition from high school to college for ethnic minority students. Dr. Ceja has developed and offered two new graduate elective courses: "Higher Education Policy" (PPA 280) and "Higher Education Leadership" (PPA 281).

Additionally, during the 2000-01 academic year, the then Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer of the CSU urged faculty members and the administration to address the development of a doctoral level program in higher, focusing on community college leadership, and principally based upon the field of public policy and administration. The reasoning was that at least one program in higher education in the state should have a public policy base. Discussion of this became mixed with the discussion of the CSU independent doctorate, and these discussions were antecedent to a more recent effort to development of a joint doctorate in education.

Professors Ceja and Shulock from our department have been active in this most recent doctoral program effort, in collaboration with other CSUS faculty/administrators and faculty/administrators at the University of California, Davis, and Sonoma State University. This

program will offer the EDD degree and is especially targeted at educational leaders in the community colleges. Current plans are to begin program instruction in fall, 2005. We expect that Professors Ceja, Shulock, and Wassmer will serve as instructors in the program, and perhaps other PPA faculty members as well,

A third major change has been implementation of a new interdisciplinary Master's of Science Program in Urban Land Development. The purpose of this program is to bring together the private (decision making) and public (policy) aspects of real estate development and to help students develop skills related to land development in metropolitan areas. Making uses of existing courses within the College of Business Administration (CBA) and PPA, the program covers all major aspects of the development process including design, feasibility analysis, land use regulation, market and location analysis, and negotiation. While the idea for such a program originated in the CBA, Ted Lascher, Rob Wassmer, and other PPA faculty have been full collaborators involved in specifying course requirements, development of the program change proposal, taking the proposal through the campus governance process, reviewing applications, and advising students. Professors Jaime Alvaay of CBA and Ted Lascher of PPA are Co-Directors. In the fall of 2004, Wassmer took the lead in organizing an afternoon social, cosponsored by SSIS and CBA, that introduced the new program to the community and University. We have admitted the first cohort of nine students for fall, 2005.

Undergraduate Program

The Department has offered a 24 unit minor for the past three academic years. The minor consists of two required lower division prerequisite courses and six upper division courses. Three of the upper division courses are offered by PPA faculty and within the Department: "Introduction to Public Policy and Administration" (PPA 100), "Effective Public Organization" (PPA 140), and "Culminating Project in Public Policy and Administration" (PPA 191). Three other required courses are offered by the Department of Economics, the Department of Government, and the College of Business Administration, respectively.

Unfortunately, the minor has not drawn many students. As of May 2005, only five students had graduated with the minor and seven current students had declared the minor, although significantly more had taken one or more PPA undergraduate courses. PPA faculty have engaged in an ongoing effort to promote the minor including: development of a brochure, making presentations to a variety of Sacramento State classes, sending multiple letters to departments across the University providing information about the minor, meeting with department chairs in different colleges to inform them of the minor, and even meeting with advising officials at local community colleges.

We believe there are a number of reasons why the undergraduate minor has not drawn more students despite our promotional efforts, including the following:

- As former President Gerth has indicated, Sacramento State does not have a tradition of students enrolling in minors. Most students graduate without a minor, and few majors require that students also have a minor (Environmental Studies is an exception). Minors are not even listed on students' diplomas.
- Most Sacramento State undergraduates are transfers from community colleges. Many transfer students arrive at the University with relatively little room in their schedules beyond major and general education requirements.
- The PPA department offers only a minority of the courses within the PPA minor. Accordingly, we have little control over scheduling many courses in a way that is most convenient to students wishing to complete the minor. There have been instances in which other departments' courses required for the PPA minor have been canceled or rescheduled without our knowledge.
- Our own undergraduate PPA courses are not yet included in the general education program.

At the same time, the actual student evaluations of our courses have been very positive. We also have developed a very productive partnership with the Gerontology Program whereby Gerontology students enroll in PPA 100 and obtain valuable general training in public policy and administration. We also believe there is potential to develop an interesting undergraduate collaborative decision making course, and the Center for Collaborative Policy has an expressed interest in working with us on such a course.

Accordingly, the Department is planning to abandon the minor but keep two PPA undergraduate courses: PPA 100 and a new collaborative decision making course. This approach has several potential advantages. We are more likely to find students willing to take a course or two in our department than willing to complete an entire minor, especially given the lack of emphasis on minors at Sacramento State. We will not need to coordinate with other departments to meet the needs of a handful of students. And our faculty can concentrate on more specific tasks such as bringing the PPA courses into the general education program.

Summary of Ongoing and Planned Department Initiatives

- Develop a graduate certificate in collaborative policy and decision-making.
- Collaborate in implementation of a joint doctorate (EDD) program.
- Collaborate in the continued implementation of the new Master's of Science in Urban Land Development.

- Abandon the PPA minor, but maintain PPA 100 and add a new undergraduate course in collaborative decision making, in conjunction with the Center for Collaborative Policy Making.
- Seek general education status for the two PPA undergraduate courses.

II. Academic Programs

A. Learning Expectations

Department faculty members have developed a set of explicit expectations for our graduate students. We expect that students will demonstrate proficiency in the areas of critical thinking, effective communication, integrative thinking, and practical applications. We also have identified more specific expectations under each of these categories, applicable to particular core courses. Expectations are communicated to students in course syllabi and in-class course overviews.

B. Structure of the Graduate Program

The graduate curriculum is structured to ensure that all learning goals are addressed in the required core courses, and that different courses specialize more in specific goals. Appendix D is a matrix showing where particular learning goals are covered in the graduate core. The matrix also indicates whether learning outcomes are primary or secondary goals of particular courses.

C. Effective Teaching Strategies

In general, Department faculty find active learning teaching strategies most effective. Our graduate students tend to have skills and backgrounds that make them well suited to active involvement in the pedagogic process. Additionally, the applied nature of the PPA program leads to expectations about making knowledge usable. Faculty members commonly use the following approaches:

- Dividing the classroom into small groups to address a problem, debate ideas, or apply class concepts to a specific situation;
- Engaging in simulations of real-life policy situations (e.g., conflict over local land use decisions);
- Requiring group projects that incorporate course learning and typically end in oral presentations to the class;

- Posing stimulating policy questions to the class that encourage discussion and debate (e.g., “Should drugs be legalized? What do the lessons of microeconomics suggest?”).
- Using case study materials (e.g., case studies about public management and political decision making developed by the Senate Fellows and published by the Institute of Governmental Studies at UC Berkeley; public policy/administration case studies developed by the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University).
- Assigning particular students to take the lead in summarizing key lessons from particular readings.
- Requiring that students consider specific questions for class discussion in completing background readings.
- Incorporating into quantitative courses applied statistical analyses of California public policy issues.
- Seeking outside clients (e.g., California State Department of General Services, California Integrated Waste Management Board, Sacramento Water Forum, Sacramento County TANF Office) desiring real world policy/administrative analyses, and encouraging students to generate such analyses for classroom projects.
- Use of technology such as WebCT and chat rooms/discussion boards to provide additional ways of communicating with students.

Copies of syllabi for all graduate courses taught in 2004-05 are included in Appendix E.

D. The Department’s Involvement in Distance and Distributed Education

During the last few couple conducted an experiment in offering a core graduate course in a partial distance education format. Professor Rob Wassmer modified the first class in his two-course “Applied Economics” sequence (PPA 220A) to allow students to observe a maximum of 40 percent of his class meeting via an Internet or television connection. WebCT was widely used in the give and take between professor and students in PPA 220A and this appears to have enhanced communication regarding course materials and concepts.

The department has not yet moved beyond the Wassmer experiment. We are concerned that distance and distributed education may be, in most instances, more appropriate for undergraduate lecture courses than for a program which is primarily a graduate program utilizing an enormous amount of faculty-student interaction. However, we are cognizant of the need to utilize technology and offer courses in a variety of formats. To that end, more faculty are using WebCT and we offer courses in Saturday formats.

E. Assessment Plan

Our departmental assessment plan focuses on two main tools: 1) *Surveys*. The department conducts end of semester surveys of students in each graduate core course regarding how well specific course learning goals were met. We have conducted surveys of sections of required graduate level core courses taught during the past three academic years. Additionally, two years ago we began surveying students regarding how well learning outcomes were met in the upper division, undergraduate introductory and public management courses (PPA 100 and PPA 140), which are presently required for the PPA minor. 2) *Review of Sample Theses*. The department reviewed a sample of theses completed during the 2003-04 academic year to determine how well these theses reflected the skills we wanted students to have obtained by the end of their graduate studies. The thesis review was not repeated until summer 2005 because the preliminary review and discussion thereof convinced us we needed to modify our approach to the culminating experience without waiting for further data. In a nutshell, we determined there was a need to encourage students to develop theses that were shorter, more focused, and more oriented toward real world problems. A department policy statement summarizing the new approach is included as Appendix F.

Additionally, as noted in the prior self study section we undertook extensive surveys of current students, alumni, and current faculty and have incorporated the findings into the present document; results are summarized in Appendix C.

F. Lessons from Assessment Data

Note: This section covers only the effectiveness of our graduate program in meeting departmental expectations. Other goals mentioned in the University's self study guidelines (e.g., meeting the campus' learning goals for undergraduates) are not relevant to the graduate program.

We are pleased that students have generally rated the department highly with respect to meeting our specified learning goals. On a five point scale, overall ratings for all core classes (required graduate courses and undergraduate PPA courses included in the PPA minor) have been as follows: fall, 2003- 4.27; spring, 2004- 4.28; fall, 2004- 4.62; spring, 2005- 4.35. At the same time, ratings have not been uniform across all items, and we have made some changes in response to findings about areas in which we were not rated as well. For example, we learned that ethics was not being covered as thoroughly and as early in some courses as was desirable. We therefore beefed up our ethics discussion in these courses and discussed the topic earlier in the classes.

G. Maintaining Consistency across Multiple Sections

Maintaining consistency across sections tends not to be a major concern for our department. Generally graduate and undergraduate classes alike are offered once a year in a single section. In a few cases heavily enrolled graduate courses are offered in two sections, usually in a single

semester but sometimes over consecutive semesters. Sometimes the same professor teaches both sections, which eliminates any concern about consistency.

In a few cases a graduate seminar is offered in two sections taught by different instructors. In such cases the faculty members meet prior to the semester and develop consensus about core topics and readings. We do not require that faculty use exactly the same readings and cover exactly the same topics but we do have an expectation that students in different sections will have similar experiences. Consistency across sections is enhanced by regular and open sharing of course content by department faculty.

Aside from the narrower issue of consistency across sections, we wish to emphasize that PPA faculty regularly discuss the content of courses, how content is spread across the curriculum, and how learning goals are met. Such issues regularly appear on the annual retreat agendas and are discussed periodically throughout the academic year.

H. Changes Needed to Improve Academic Program Outcomes

We discussed necessary changes at length in the introductory section of this document.

I. Experience Offering General Education Courses

The Department has not yet offered general education courses. The department has only recently become involved in undergraduate education. As discussed at more length in Section I, we do have plans this upcoming year to seek general education designation for two undergraduate courses (PPA 100 and a new undergraduate collaborative policy making course).

J. Addressing Cultural Diversity and Student Preparedness

The Department incorporates consideration of diversity issues in many core courses. For example:

- Our collaborative policy courses address social diversity as it affects policy development and group communications, including ethnic differences, cultural differences, and cognitive style differences. In those courses we also consider methods to work effectively in groups with significant differences and to utilize those differences for joint learning, mutual gain, and creativity.
- The second semester applied economics seminar (PPA 220B) includes a two-week module on challenges and contributions that Latin American legal and immigration is offering to California.
- The “Political Environment of Policy Making” seminar (PPA 210) has included a unit focusing on the battle over affirmative action in California in the mid-1990s, and the

implications for issue framing, group mobilization, and racial coalitions.

Sensitivity to diversity issues is likely also enhanced by the fact that our students tend to be early and mid-career professionals, many of whom have dealt extensively with such issues themselves. The political sophistication resulting from knowledge of public policy may also contribute to awareness of and positive responses to cultural diversity.

It is worth noting that we do not tend to face the same challenges about preparedness that are encountered by departments catering primarily to undergraduates. We are able to ensure a minimal level of preparedness in our competitive admission process.

K. Evaluation of Minor and Plans for a Certificate Program

Please see Section I of this self study.

III. Students

A. Student Profile

1. Enrollment Patterns

Enrollment in the MPPA program has steadily grown from 20 or so during the first several years of the program to high of 45. It seems to be leveling out at about 30-34 students admitted each fall. This is a number with which we are quite comfortable as it allows us to keep classes at a “seminar size” without requiring significant use of adjunct faculty.

2. Gender and ethnic composition

We are pleased with our efforts to increase the percentages of non-whites in our program and are within 6% of the University totals for most years. The relatively small number of total students means fluctuations of 2-3 students in an ethnic group can cause large changes in our percentiles. We also have fewer students who check “other”. On balance we are pleased but recognize there continues to be room for growth in this area.

We are currently wrestling with why our program seems to be increasingly dominated by females growing from 55% female in 2001 to 71% female in 2004. It should be noted that of late female enrollment has exceeded male enrollment in universities across the nation, and that this trend has been especially pronounced in some programs aiming to train people for public service. For example, in most recent years women have been predominant in the four Capital Fellows programs operated by the Center for California Studies at Sacramento State. We will continue to monitor developments with respect to gender balance.

3. Retention and graduation rates

Institutional data show fairly uneven patterns in the seven year graduation rate as applied by the University for graduate students. The low of 36% was followed the next year by a high of 85%. The dramatic fluctuations seem to be driven in part by the relatively small size of the class cohorts seven years ago.

Because in our program the graduation and retention issues are fairly tightly coupled, we did additional research into the issue. Our own records show that students are completing the program much more quickly that they did initially, now averaging just three years. This is a positive trend as the students who drag out the program longer seem to be at greater risk for not completing the program before “timing out.” We have also spent considerable time over the past eighteen months modifying and adapting our thesis requirements and adapting the classroom activities to better prepare students for the thesis stage. We believe these changes are beginning to pay off as we have fewer students simply “disappearing” at the thesis stage. See Section II, Part D for more background with respect to changes in the thesis requirement.

Part and full-time enrollments

Our full-time student population has grown from about 20% of the total in 1999 to about 30% of the total in 2004. This reflects another subtle change in the students, namely an increase in younger students with less work experience coming directly into graduate school. These students bring many positive elements with them but their lack of work experience sometimes makes for an imbalance in their ability to quickly apply conceptual materials. As this cohort has grown, we have worked to modify our pedagogical approaches.

4. *Native and transfer students*

This issue is not relevant to our graduate program; we have almost no students transferring into the program.

A final note about our students is that almost 70% of them work full time in addition to school. This reflects our professional nature but also means many of our students are juggling work, graduate school and family obligations.

B. Student Academic Performance

1. *Grading Distribution*

Institutional data on graduate grade distribution from 2000 to 2004 reveal a fairly consistent pattern with regards to departmental grading policies. Except for the Fall 2000 semester, the department has awarded the A grade at a higher proportion than the B grade. This is consistent with the overall trends of both the college and the university as a whole with respect to graduate students. The use of the C grade does not occur with great frequency at the department, college, and institutional level. It must be emphasized that a C level grade means something very different for graduate and undergraduate

students. Undergraduates can obtain a BA with a C grade point average. PPA graduate students must repeat any core course in which they earn a grade of less than B -, and must maintain an overall GPA of 3.0 or higher.

In fall of 2004 the grade distribution among our graduate students was 60% A, 26% B, and 1% C. While the distribution in 2004 was higher than the grade distribution for the college and the university, a five-year average suggests that the department has awarded the A grade at a slightly lower percentage than either of the two comparison groups.

The department does not have cause for concern with the grade distribution over the five-year time period. In general, the difference between the department grades and those of the college and the university do not vary substantially.

2. *Grade Point Average*

In the fall of 2004 the average grade point average for our graduate students was 3.28. This is very close to the average graduate grade point average of the college (3.27) and the university (3.23). Since Fall 2000, our department's average grade point average for our graduate students has been increasing gradually. A similar trend is apparent for the school and the university during the same time period.

3. *Students on Probation*

With respects to students on probation, the department has not had any major problems. In the fall of 2003, 99 percent of our graduate students were in good standing compared to 98 percent for both the college and the university.

4. *WPE pass rates*

100% of our graduate students pass the WPE. A large number of our incoming graduate students enter the program having met the WPE requirement. Students who enter our program not having met the WPE are encouraged to do so during their first year. The WPE is waived for some students who meet specified criteria (e.g., having earned honors as undergraduates, receiving a high score on the writing portion of the Graduate Record Exam). Passing the WPE/receiving a WPE waiver is a prerequisite to advancing to candidacy.

5. *Preparation for upper division/graduate coursework*

Not applicable.

C. Student Academic Support

1. Every summer, prior to the beginning of the academic year, the department requires all new incoming master's students to attend an advising session facilitated by a department faculty member. While in the past this responsibility fell on the hands of only a few faculty, primarily the department chair, summer advising is now scheduled in a way that

includes a larger number of PPA faculty as facilitators. This allows the advising responsibility to be spread more equally among faculty and gives incoming students an opportunity to meet some of the different faculty in the department.

While students are not assigned an official advisor, the instructor of PPA 200, the first required core course taken by new students, serves as an informal advisor to the new cohort. Students also have ample opportunities to discuss curricular matters informally with all faculty during office hours. Our faculty, typically have an open-door policy, where students can stop by if they have any curricular questions.

As students move through the program, we make an effort to establish healthy advising relationships with them. The relatively small size of our master's program gives us the opportunity to get to know everyone of our students on an individual and personal level, making the establishment of advising relationship more feasible. We are confident that the department faculty is meeting students' advising needs.

Based on the latest institutional data from the Student Needs and Priorities Survey from fall 2003, 65% of CSUS students felt that the quality of advising from faculty in their major department was either "good" or "excellent". Twenty-two percent reported the quality of advising as "fair", and 8% reported the quality of advising as being "poor" or "very poor". Data from our fall 2004 survey of our PPA students indicate that 80% of our students were "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with faculty availability, faculty relations with students.

2. Students in need of extra assistance can visit individual faculty members. Our department does not have department tutors, and thus faculty members provide the bulk of the assistance for those students who may require help with challenging course material. Students also have access to university-wide resources, such as computer labs, writing tutors, and library assistance. Faculty and students are satisfied with department and university-level support for students requiring extra assistance.

D. Opportunities to socialize students into the profession

Due to the professional nature of our degree and the engagement of our faculty, students in the department have several opportunities to encounter the profession and develop more nuanced understandings of them as expectations of professionals.

First, many of our students are themselves professionals seeking additional education. This means that for many students, the classroom provides a rich array of experiences and contacts, beginning with fellow classmates. This is extended by the faculty as most of us are actively involved in either the state, local or university communities in roles beyond our faculty roles. Finally, practitioners are often brought in from government and nonprofit agencies to serve as guest lectures.

We also have an active Alumni chapter and have sponsored events and workshops aimed at professional development. For example, David DeLuz, then Deputy Appointments Secretary for Governor Schwarzenegger, earlier this year talked to a group of students/alums about obtaining jobs in the administration. Job referrals also occur through an email distribution list and the many informal contacts that faculty members retain.

The list serve also provides opportunities to inform students about professional conferences and training opportunities.

Finally, we provide a series of less formal gatherings for faculty and students and during fall 2004 the Advisory Committee sponsored a series of dinners bringing together current students, faculty, and local professionals who are members of our Advisory Committee.

IV. Faculty

A. Faculty Profile

Our faculty profile analysis is conducted based on our official instructional faculty count of 8 individuals: 6 full-time faculty and 2 part-time faculty. In addition, our actual faculty complement includes four individuals who are current or former full-time administrators but who are not considered instructional faculty. Some of these administrators teach and all of them are active participants in the governance of the department.

The following table displays University, college, and department percentages for faculty status, gender, ethnicity, age, and rank. The last two rows address student faculty ratio and average class size.

Table 1: PPA Faculty Profile

	University	College: SSIS	Department
Faculty status:			
Tenured	32%	31%	50%
Probationary	21%	36%	25%
Part-time	47%	33%	25%
Ethnicity: % white	75%	73%	88%
Gender: % male	53%	58%	75%
Age: % > 45	62%	53%	62%
SFR	21	25.2	8.1
Average class size	28.2	35.4	17.2

B. Analysis of Faculty Profile

The data in the table above show that compared to the University and our college, the PPA department has more full-time faculty, more tenured faculty, and less ethnic and gender diversity. We also have smaller class sizes.

Two contextual issues are important to understanding the data: our department is very small and it is almost exclusively a graduate-level program. Because of our small size, there are limited opportunities to hire new faculty. We have hired just two new faculty in the last eight years; one white woman and one Latino male. That has improved the diversity of our faculty but additional new hires will depend on program growth and/or faculty retirements.

The smaller average class size is appropriate for a graduate program. Most of our core courses are taught in the range of 15-30 students. We believe this allows for the level of student participation and engagement that is essential to graduate seminars. Some of our elective courses are smaller than we would like. The range of elective offerings and the scheduling of those courses is an issue that the faculty is addressing. Nearly all of our courses are offered in the evening – we have offered occasional courses on weekends. There is a strong demand among our students for alternative scheduling and, in particular, for summer courses. The many administrative changes regarding the operation of state-supported summer program in the CSU system has prevented us from responding to this demand as quickly as we would like. We do plan to add summer offerings as soon as is practicable given state and system policies regarding summer term.

Our faculty have consistently raised concerns about the workload expectations placed on graduate faculty in the CSU system. With state funding formulas providing no recognition of the greater workload involved in teaching graduate students and supervising theses, our faculty feel somewhat constrained in our ability to offer the ideal curriculum. Specifically, we would like to expand the administrative offerings of the core and we have considered some innovative ways to do this in short courses (i.e., 1- or 2-unit courses) but as long as we have to meet the current workload expectations of the campus and the college, we are unable to adapt the curriculum to meet those goals.

C. Faculty as Teachers

As also fully described in our ARTP document (contained in Appendix G), the Department of Public Policy and Administration uses specific criteria to gauge the teaching effectiveness of its faculty. Since teaching is given the highest priority among the three broad activities (teaching, scholarship, and service) that PPA faculty undertake, we take the evaluation of what determines an effective teacher very seriously and use various methods to determine teaching performance. We begin with a broad definition of teaching that encompasses any activity that involves faculty interaction with students for the purpose of education. Classroom activity is of primary importance, but in our graduate program, we also consider thesis supervision and advice,

mentoring, teaching and research assistantship supervision, curriculum advising, and co-authorship with students to be important.

As with most programs at CSUS, we use student evaluations as a primary gauge of faculty performance in the classroom. Unlike many programs at Sacramento State, we require that all PPA faculty members conduct a student evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in every course that they teach in our program. Quantitative results are tabulated for every set of teaching evaluations. When the appropriate PPA committee assesses teaching effectiveness, committee members are required to look at three different components of these evaluations: (1) the – overall - rating, (2) the average of responses to all questions, and (3) the variation in responses to all questions. In practice, variation has come to be measured by the faculty member reporting their minimum and maximum scores received, and in what categories they were received.

The PPA Department also agrees that a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is gauged by more than just the accumulation of student teaching evaluations given in every course that they teach. Thus, evaluation committees in our department are required to look at other indicators of teaching effectiveness. These include the content and clarity of syllabi and the appropriateness of pedagogical methods (e.g., providing means for student to engage in active learning). Since we are a relatively small faculty with a relatively large number of graduate students, advising load, thesis load, and the quality of theses supervised also weighs heavily in our determination of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

Finally, since effective teaching is valued highly in our program, we recognize the importance that periodic long-term reviews carry for the well-being of our department and the entire university. We have adopted the policy that every instructor due for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review be required to participate in an in-class evaluation of teaching skills conducted by one or two department faculty members. We feel strongly that peer review is an essential element in the determination of a PPA faculty member’s teaching effectiveness and needs to be conducted as part of every long-term review process.

It should be noted that one of our faculty members, Ted Lascher, received the College’s 2002 award for excellence in teaching.

D. Faculty as Scholars

1. Department specific expectations of scholarly activities.

The Sacramento State University PPA program places a high value on scholarship. We expect that all probationary and tenured faculty members will continually engage in scholarship of one sort or another.

We also believe that active engagement in scholarship contributes greatly to currency in the field; we believe this is especially important in a graduate program. Maintaining currency in

turns helps people to be better teachers. Carried to an extreme, engagement in scholarship certainly can undermine attention to teaching. However, some amount of scholarly activity is likely to have a positive carry-over in the classroom. For example, faculty members engaged in scholarship of necessity must address the most recent, cutting edge research in their area of study. Doing so breeds familiarity with readings and ideas that can then be incorporated in class syllabi.

The Department of Public Policy and Administration uses specific criteria to gauge the effectiveness of scholarly output produced by its faculty. We begin with a broad definition of scholarship which includes the production and dissemination of knowledge related to the fields of public policy and administration. In our department, dissemination is an essential element of effective scholarship and we look for written material in the form of books, articles, papers, reviews, op-ed pieces, reports, or written texts of speeches and presentations. The distinction that we draw between scholarship and service is that scholarship normally requires the production of a written piece of work.

The evaluation of scholarly effectiveness is especially important when making retention, tenure, promotion, or merit-pay decisions. First and foremost, we rely upon an evaluation made by Public Policy and Administration faculty serving on the appropriate committee. For purposes of periodic long-term reviews - such as promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review - we also seek input from suitable reviewers outside the department in the forms of letters. A minimum of three and a maximum of six, letters of review are required to be gathered for every tenure, promotion, or post-tenure evaluation of a PPA faculty. The reasonable process that we use to gather these letters is described in our ARTP document. The process of soliciting outside letters for long-term reviews allows us to better gauge the scholarly effectiveness of our faculty in terms of the academic and practitioner audience for which it is produced.

Finally, since interdisciplinary faculty produce different types of written scholarship, we explicitly allow the appropriate committee to determine the relative weights that each type carries in an evaluation of a faculty member's overall scholarly effectiveness.

2. Scholarly and creative activities of faculty in the last six years.

To demonstrate that PPA faculty members have a strong scholarly record, we have summarized faculty activities in Table 2. This table details selected activities of each PPA faculty member since the last departmental program review (or for those hired after that review, since beginning work at CSUS).Table IV D. In particular we wish to note that Rob Wassmer received the 2001 President's Award for Research and Creative Activity.

Table 2. Selected Scholarship Activities for Probationary and Tenured Faculty Members, Spring 2000 to August 2005

<p>Miguel Ceja (first CSUS semester, Fall 2002)</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in areas of diversity in higher education, access and equity, affirmative action, campus racial climate, and the retention and persistence of students of color in higher education.</p> <p>Published refereed journal articles in <i>Journal of College Student Development</i> (forthcoming 2005); <i>Journal of Hispanic Higher Education</i> (2004); <i>The Review of Higher Education</i> (2004); <i>Journal of Educational Computing Research</i> (2001); <i>Journal of Negro Education</i> (2001)</p> <p>B. Published book chapter, <i>Transcending deficit thinking about Latinos' parenting styles: Towards an ecocultural view of family life</i> (2000).</p> <p>C. Research presentations at the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education (2005 and 2004); Association for the Study of Higher Education (2004, 2003, and 2000); American Educational Research Association (2004, 2003, 2001, and 2000); Patterson Research Conference (2004); National Association for Chicano(a) Studies (2002); American Sociological Association (2000); Society for the meeting of Social Problems (2000).</p> <p>D. Work in progress, <i>Understanding the Importance of Faculty of Color as Role Models for Chicanas Aspiring Towards the Ph.D.</i>, (under review in the Review of Higher Education).</p> <p>E. Research Grant from the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies (2005) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (2005) to study the transition to college for Latino college students.</p>
<p>Timothy A. Hodson</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in the areas of legislative behavior, politics and policy making; direct democracy; elections and California government, politics and policies</p>

	<p>B. Refereed journal articles in <i>California Policy Issues Annual</i> (2003), <i>California Politics & Policy</i> (2000), articles published in the <i>California Journal</i> (2004), <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> (2005) <i>San Jose Mercury News</i> (2004, 2000), and <i>Riverside Press-Enterprise</i> (2002, 2000)</p> <p>C. Presented research papers at professional conferences including the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association (1997, 1995) and the annual California Public Issues Conference (2003, 1999, 1998)</p> <p>D. Participated as panel chair and/or discussant at panels at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association (2005, 2000, 1998, 1996, 1994); annual California Public Issues Conference (2005, 999); annual LINKS conference (1999, 1998, 1995); annual meetings of the National Conference of State Legislatures (1997-2005)</p>
<p>Cristy Jensen</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in the areas of local government capacity building and development of federal relationships in the Russia and higher education policy in California.</p> <p>B. During Fall 2000 sabbatical, participated in Council of Europe conference discussions in Moscow, and consulted with Tbilisi City Council (former Republic of Georgia).</p> <p>C. Continued work with Far Eastern State University, Vladivostok, Russia on expanding their curricular approaches to incorporate internet technology.</p> <p>D. Chaired CSU Academic Senate Task Force and authored report, Graduate Education in the CSU, (2004).</p> <p>E. Continue to serve on multiple committees and task forces at statewide level which produce written reports on the following issues: improving transfer in the CSU, use of technology to increase access to</p>

	<p>education, inter-segmental efforts in doctoral education, etc.</p> <p>F. Provided academic supervision to group of 8 graduate students who reviewed assessment models for “green practices” in the California Department of General Services; edited final report to department.</p>
<p>Mary Kirlin, (first CSUS semester: fall, 2003)</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in the area of civic engagement with a special focus on definition and development of civic skills.</p> <p>B. Published refereed journal articles in <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> (2002) and <i>Public Administration Review</i> (2002), <i>Journal of Public Affairs Education</i> accepted for October 2005).</p> <p>C. Monographs for Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (2000 and 2001).</p> <p>D. Consulting reports/papers for Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Education (2002 and 2003), Constitutional Rights Foundation (2005).</p> <p>E. Research presentations at American Political Science Association (2000, 2001, 2002 and 2004), American Society for Public Administration (2004), National Association of Schools of Public Affairs (2004), International Conference on Civic Education (2003 and 2004).</p> <p>F. Research grants received from the Center for Research and Information on Civic Engagement and Learning (CIRCLE) totaling \$54,000 (2002, 2003 and 2004).</p>
<p>Edward (Ted) L. Lascher, Jr.</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in areas of the politics of ideas, direct democracy, comparative political institutions, insurance and regulatory policy, elections, and political parties</p> <p>B. Published co-edited book: <i>The Economics and Politics of Choice No-Fault Insurance</i> (Kluwer Academic Press, 2001)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">C. Published refereed journal articles in <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i> (2004), <i>Journal of Politics</i> (2001), <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> (2005), <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> (2000)D. Refereed journal articles accepted and forthcoming in <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> and <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>E. Published conference proceeding papers in volumes on budgeting in the western states for Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Utah (2002, 2001, 2000)F. Book review forthcoming in <i>Perspectives on Politics</i>G. Three opinion pieces published in newspapersH. Research presentations at American Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2005, 2003)I. Work in progress: four journal articles (one submitted to an academic journal)
--	--

<p>Nancy Shulock</p>	<p>A. REPORTS:</p> <p><u>Shared Solutions: A Framework for Discussing California Higher Education Finance</u></p> <p><u>Variations on a Theme: Higher Education Performance in California by Region and Race</u></p> <p><u>A Framework for Incorporating Public Trust Issues in States' Higher Education Accountability Plans</u></p> <p><u>Facing Reality: California Needs a Statewide Agenda to Improve Higher Education Outcomes</u></p> <p><u>Ensuring Access with Quality to California Community Colleges</u> - Institute was a contributing author to this report published by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.</p> <p><u>Diminishing Access to the Baccalaureate through Transfer: The Impact of State Policies and Implications for California</u></p> <p><u>Funding Adult Education: Does California Put the Money Where the Needs Are?</u></p> <p><u>Capacity Constraints in California's Public Universities: A Factor Impeding Transfer?</u></p> <p><u>Improving Outcomes for California's Minority Students: Can an Increased Role for Community Colleges in Teacher Preparation be Part of the Answer?</u></p> <p><u>Envisioning a State of Learning: Conference Summary and Observations on the California Master Plan for Higher Education</u></p> <p><u>California Community College Transfer Rates: Policy Implications and a Future Research Agenda</u></p>
-----------------------------	---

[An Accountability Framework for California Higher Education: Informing Public Policy and Improving Outcomes](#)

[The Cal Grant Entitlement: Increasing Access to Financial Aid](#)

[California Community Colleges' Leadership Challenge: A View From the Field](#)

B. ARTICLES:

Shulock, N. & Moore, C. (in press). A strengthened community college role in teacher preparation: Improving outcomes for California's minority students. In Gandara, P., Horn, C., & Orfield, G. (Eds.), *Leveraging Promise: Equalizing Opportunity in Higher Education*. New York: SUNY Press.

Shulock, N. & Moore, C. (2005). Diminished access to the baccalaureate for low-income and minority students in California: The impact of budget and capacity constraints on the transfer function. *Educational Policy*, 19(2), 418-442.

Wassmer, R., Moore, C., & Shulock, N. (2004). The effect of racial/ethnic composition on transfer rates in community colleges: Implications for policy and practice. *Research in Higher Education*. 45(6): 651-672.

C PRESENTATIONS:

Testimony to Assembly Higher Education Committee, June 22, 2005, "[Highlights of Institute's Reports, \(1\) Variations on a Theme and \(2\) Shared Solutions](#)"

Testimony to Assembly Higher Education Committee, March 1, 2005, "[Suggestions for Addressing California's Higher Education Challenges](#)"

Testimony to Assembly Higher Education

	<p>Committee, February 22, 2005, "Problems and Challenges Facing California Higher Education"</p> <p>Presentation to Community College League of California: Accountability in Higher Education: Where California Is (or Isn't), January 30, 2005</p> <p>Presentation to California Association for Institutional Research (CAIR), November, 2004, "Accountability for State Policy Purposes: A Different Focus."</p> <p>Testimony submitted to the California Performance Review Commission, September 2004.</p> <p>Testimony submitted to the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, May 2004.</p> <p>On the Durability of The Master Plan in the 21st Century, or "If it's breaking, why isn't anyone fixing it?", February 2004.</p> <p>A Fundamentally New Approach to Accountability: Putting State Policy Issues First, October 2003.</p>
<p>Robert W. Wassmer, (first CSUS semester: fall, 1995)</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in area of public economics, with a concentration in state/local public finance and urban economics. Particulars in these areas include municipal production of services, local government structure, public school finance reform, local economic development incentives, fiscal stress, and property taxation.</p> <p>B. Published books: <i>Readings in Urban Economics: Issues and Public Policy</i> (Blackwell, 2000); and <i>Bidding for Business: The Efficacy of Local Economic Development Incentives in a Metropolitan Area</i> (W.E. Upjohn Institute Press, 2000)</p>

<p>Robert W. Wassmer</p>	<p>C. Published referred journal articles in <i>California Politics and Policy</i> (2004), <i>Economic Development Quarterly</i> (2001), <i>Economics of Education Review</i> (2002), <i>Research in Higher Education</i> (2004), <i>Urban Studies</i> (2002)</p> <p>D. Published chapters in four books</p> <p>E. Other published articles/book reviews in <i>Californiana</i> (2001), <i>Cities Journal</i> (2004), <i>Economic Development Quarterly</i> (2001), <i>Economics of Education Review</i> (2000, 2003), <i>Resource Recycling</i> (2002), <i>State Tax Notes</i> (2000), <i>Urban Land Institute Working Paper on Land Use Policy</i> (2002)</p> <p>F. Consulting reports/papers for California Senate Committee on Local Government (1999), California Building Industry Association (1998), California Assembly Committee on Housing and Community Development (1997), CSUS Office of Community Affairs (1996)</p> <p>G. Research presentations at American Economic Association (ASSA) Annual Meetings (2000, 2001), Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Annual Meeting (2004), National Tax Association's Annual Meetings (2001, 2004), Western Economic Association (2000), Lincoln Institute of Land Policy (2001), Urban Affairs Association (2001), Devoe L. Moore Center, Florida State University (2005)</p> <p>H. Published opinion articles in various places such as the <i>Sacramento Bee</i></p> <p>I. Work in progress: journal articles on urban sprawl under consideration</p> <p>J. Research grants received from the Hewlett Capacity Building Grant (\$5,000, 2005), Local Initiatives Support Corporation (\$3,500, 2004), National Education Association (\$25,000, 2003), Field Institute (\$1,000, 2002), California Integrated Waste Management Board (\$48,000, 2001/02), California</p>
---------------------------------	--

	Senate Office of Research (\$10,000, 2002-02), Urban Land Institute (\$6,000, 2000-01), Faculty Research Fellows (\$22,000, 2000-01), Lincoln Land Institute (\$21,000, 2000-01)
<p>Robert J. Waste (first CSUS semester: fall 1997)</p>	<p>A. Scholarship in areas of urban public policy, public administration, program evaluation and policy analysis.</p> <p>B. Refereed articles for the following journals: <i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i>, and <i>California Policy & Politics</i> (2004-05).</p> <p>C. Published entries on "Community Power" and "Robert A. Dahl" in Roger W. Caves (ed.), <i>The International Encyclopedia of the City</i> (2005).</p> <p>D. Published book chapter, "Regional Governance in the Sacramento Valley" challenges and Potential Solutions," in Robert Fountain (ed.), <i>Regional Futures Compendium</i> (2001).</p> <p>E. Research presentation at the Urban Affairs Association Annual Meeting (2003).</p> <p>F. Work in progress: a book manuscript on: <i>Something Has to Give: A 12 Step Program for Repairing California's Dysfunctional Political Circus</i></p>

3. Extent to which the faculty meets the Department's expectations for scholarly/creative activities. Identify issues in need of improvement and describe action plans.

With a wide range of current scholarly activity encompassing a broad swath - from scholarly book and journal activity, to applied research and consultancies, to think tank service in our CSUS Institute for Higher Education Leadership, to organizational, we believe that our faculty research profile is deep, diverse, and uniquely suited to a program that aims chiefly to serve the needs of public sector policy and administration, and higher education professionals in the state and Capital Region.

As befits a department with an applied graduate degree program, we are a "praxis-oriented" research faculty. We both research higher education policy and problems, and help to craft policy and organization solutions to those problems. Thus, PPA Departmental research includes

creating a higher education think tank and crafting a joint CSU/UC higher education doctoral program; and includes service in key statewide Academic Senate leadership positions and higher education committees.

The same is true in the area of land use and planning. As a Department, we have published research on urban sprawl and development; played a key role in creating a new graduate degree in land use and planning; and served on local planning commissions and as consultants to the regional Council of Government's regional "Blueprint" planning process. Our Departmental research profile is strong, substantive, and of immediate benefit to our students, our teaching mission, to our region, and to the stated goals of the Sacramento State University Strategic Plan.

E. Faculty Service to the University and Community

According to our department's ARTP policies, there are significant expectations for these two components of service (19 percent weight is accorded in the policy). Our faculty must be among the most service-oriented in the University – easily exceeding the level of expectations.

University Service

It is hard to imagine a department on any CSU campus that has such a high proportion of its faculty resources devoted to university and campus service. We have a faculty member (Cristy Jensen) who has served for several years on the statewide academic senate, including on its executive committee, and on numerous systemwide committees and commissions, and on the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates. She is currently the Chair of the campus faculty senate. Professor Jensen was the first ever recipient of the College's service award in 2002. Several other faculty members have served as college representatives to the faculty senate, as chair and members of the college and the campus curriculum committees, and in numerous other capacities. Another faculty (Lascher) has served on the systemwide Social Science Research and Instructional Council. Our faculty (Wassmer, Lascher, Waste) have served on committees for other departments (e.g., Ethnic Studies, Economics, College of Business) as well as on PPA and college-wide committees. Another faculty member coordinates the University's American Democracy Project efforts.

Three of our faculty (Jensen, Ceja, Shulock) have been involved in planning our campus' new joint education doctorate – which is a key priority of the CSU. Two of our faculty (Kirlin and Shulock) are currently serving on committees related to the University's 10-year WASC accreditation review. This level of university service is disproportionately high for a department with just six full-time faculty. When one considers the full complement of faculty (i.e., those who are formally in administrative positions) the level of university service is even higher. Our faculty include a former 19-year University president (Gerth), a former dean of faculty and staff affairs and former vice president and chief of staff (Moulds), the current director of the systemwide Center for California Studies (Hodson), and a former 15-year associate vice president for academic affairs who now runs a state policy research institute on higher education

and conducts projects on behalf of the CSU Chancellor (Shulock). All four of the administrative members of the faculty are full participants in the life of the department and college, serving on committees as allowed by University policy and maintaining a level of university service that is high for administrators with academic appointments. Included among the university service activities of these faculty are membership on the boards of the CSUS Foundation (now called University Enterprises), the Center for California Studies, and Capital Public Radio.

Community Service

Community service is an integral part of our faculty's role as public policy professionals. Nearly all of our faculty are heavily involved in local, regional, and state policy work that blurs the line between professional service and scholarship. One reason for this blend of professional and community service is that our regional "community" encompasses the state capital community, making a natural connection between our professional expertise and service to the community. Rather than list individual service by faculty, this section describes the central themes into which our faculty service generally fits. Consistent with the scope of our academic program, these themes are civic education, regional planning and development, higher education, and state governmental relations and policy. This section does not address service that is strictly *professional* service with no community or social service component, such as editing and contributing to professional journals, serving on editorial boards, presenting at academic conferences, or engaging in funded consultant work. These activities are included under part D (faculty as scholars).

Civic education. One new faculty member (Kirlin) is not only involved in, but has spearheaded the University's participation in the American Democracy Project. She has spoken to the system wide service learning directors and represented the CSU system on a recent national panel. She is also active in the national efforts to implement the Civic Mission of Schools report, serving as California's Research Chair. She is a member of the governing board of the California YMCA Youth and Government Model Legislature and Court program and helped the CSUS College of Continuing Education develop curriculum for a new Teen Leadership Academy and has given numerous presentations on civic education at regional and national conferences. Several faculty, usually led by Tim Hodson in his role as Executive Director of the Center for California Studies, have been involved in campus forums to help educate citizens about political races facing the state and the nation. Hodson and other PPA faculty contribute directly to a major state civic education initiative through the Center for California Studies' Legi-School program. Ted Lascher served on the City of Davis' Governance Task Force that recommended changes to the city's electoral system.

Regional planning and development. One faculty member who specializes in urban politics and policy (Waste) is chair of the Sacramento Planning Commission, having previously served as vice chair. He also serves on the Sacramento Heritage Board and served previously on the City of Sacramento Campaign Reform Commission. He has delivered testimony in recent years to the California Assembly, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, the Assembly

Speaker's Commission on Regionalism, and the California Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century. A second faculty member who also specializes in urban and regional growth and economic issues (Wassmer) has written several recent articles for the Sacramento Bee on regional growth issues, has done work on regional economic issues for entities such as the Community Services Planning Council, the Capital Region Institute, Valley Vision, the California Institute of County Government, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and the California Assembly Speaker's Commission on Regionalism. Ted Lascher and Tim Hodson serve on the board for the California Institute for County Government. This area of community service is a major strength of the department.

Higher education policy. Two faculty (Shulock and Ceja) are heavily involved in higher education policy, working through the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy that is affiliated with our department. Much of their work falls in the category of "scholarship" but there is much that can be considered professional and community service. For example, Miguel Ceja specializes in issues of college choice and transition among under-represented minorities and has made several presentations to youth and minority organizations on related topics. Nancy Shulock has testified several times before the Assembly Higher Education Committee, as well as before the joint Committee on the Master Plan, and the Governor's California Performance Review Commission. She serves with two legislative staff on the California team in a national project to improve higher education finance policy. In addition, she is serving on the steering committee for the California Community Colleges Strategic Planning effort and is scheduled to be co-chair of the first WASC accreditation review of the new UC Merced campus.

State governmental relations and policy. Drawing on the affiliation of PPA faculty with the Center for California Studies, which includes the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy, several PPA faculty have strong relationships with the state government community which affords us considerable opportunity to advise policymakers and participate in events, both formally and informally. Tim Hodson works closely and regularly with legislative and executive officials in all aspects of his work as Director of the Center for California Studies and particularly with respect to the four fellowship programs run by the Center and the annual "Envisioning California" conference. Other recent examples include Ted Lascher's testimony before the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee on the insurance commissioner position and a panel presentation by Nancy Shulock for the Attorney General regarding career and technical education. Cristy Jensen, through her strong CSU systemwide connections and inter-segmental Senate work, is highly active in a variety of state government arenas. Elizabeth Moulds and Donald Gerth, as a result of decades of leadership of CSUS, have many opportunities to interact with and provide service in the state government arena.

Miscellaneous. Other recent service activities of note among the PPA faculty include board membership on the Sacramento Regional Sports Education Foundation, Sacramento Business Volunteers for the Arts, the Sacramento Capitol Club, the Sacramento History Museum, and the Sacramento Pioneers.

V. GOVERNANCE PROCESS AT THE PROGRAM, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS

A. Faculty Involvement in Planning, Developing, and Implementing Department Policies

The culture in the department is one which values faculty involvement in all areas of administration and governance. This is, in part, due to size. It is also a function of the very nature of our field of study. And finally, the expectation of active participation in governance draws from the exceptional talent, interest, and energy of the varied faculty.

The role of the chair/coordinator in department governance

The department chair plays a key leadership role in day to day decision making re: application of departmental, college and university policies.

- The Chair brings issues for discussion and problem solving to the bi-weekly departmental meetings when experience suggests a need for revision or rethinking of departmental policies and procedures.
- All full-time faculty and staff attend these regular meetings, and part-time faculty are invited to meetings addressing issues relevant to their assignments.
- The Chair places items on the agenda which reflect new opportunities identified by other faculty, colleagues in other departments, the Dean, or the University community at large
- The Chair assigns to other faculty responsibilities for various tasks, including the completion of this self study
- The Chair organizes the agenda for, and leads, the annual Departmental Retreat

Departmental governance rules and procedures

The department is sufficiently small that formalized rules for regular meetings have not been necessary. We do have formalized appointment, review, tenure, and promotion (ARTP) procedures. Revisions to our ARTP document were approved in July 2005. The department's ARTP document is distributed to all faculty members and is available on the PPA web site.

B. Student Involvement in the Departmental Governance Process

Student involvement in the departmental governance process is generally limited to informal interaction with the chair or faculty. These discussions are valuable in providing feedback on departmental policy and procedures which frequently finds its way to departmental meetings. As part of the preparation of this self study, the faculty set aside an evening graduate class period for an extensive discussion with the students about the curriculum.

C. Departmental Relationships with the College and the University

The Chair participates actively in biweekly College meetings designed to share information and respond to College level administrative/scheduling/budget issues.

The Chair also contributes to the campus wide Committee of Graduate Program Directors which initiates and considers changes in graduate program policies and procedures for recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Members of our faculty are regular contributors to college and university level governance through service on the SSIS Faculty Council, the SSIS Secondary RTP Committees (PPA faculty have regularly chaired those subcommittees in the last several years), the SSIS Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the University Curriculum Committee.

V. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT/RESOURCES

A. Library

1. Curriculum support offered by the collection

Our faculty and students have a good relationship with our liaisons in the library and have found them to be extraordinarily helpful in guiding our new graduate students in their orientation to research and data sources. The collection is generally supportive of our curriculum; we would always like to see more access to electronic journals. With that statement of strong support for the efforts of library staff in a world of limited constraints as a background, we want to express our strong concern for the cumulative effect of inadequate funding of our libraries during the last decade. We hope the Board of Trustees will continue to request funding from the state at levels which will permit the expansion of the educational materials available to our faculty and students. We also hope that the Sacramento State administration will be willing to supplement the allocation of funds provided by the CSU system.

2. Services provided by library for faculty and students

Hong Wang has provided excellent orientation and support for our new graduate students as indicated above.

B. Computer/Technology

We are pleased at the recent announcement of extended hours for the computer labs which will increase the access to the labs for our graduate students

The Department is pleased that Sacramento State was one of the first wave of CSU campuses to implement direct access to data from the Inter-University Consortium on Political and Social Research (ICPSR). We are also pleased that the University has supported access to other important data bases (e.g., Field Polls on public opinion in California) through arrangements developed by the Social Science Research and Instructional Council. If Sacramento State truly wants to be a “destination campus” it is absolutely essential that such support continue, as access to common electronic databases is an expectation of faculty and students throughout the country.

C. Student Support Services (e.g. Admissions and Records, Advising Center, Learning Skills Center, Union, Multicultural Center, Education Opportunities Program, Writing Center)

Our primary interactions on the student support services level are with the Graduate Center – at the beginning of the process, i.e. admissions, and then at degree completion, i.e. receipt of the culminating product, i.e. project or thesis. Along the way, our students interact with the Center re: exceptions to the WPE, Advancement to Candidacy, and the seven year deadline.

We have good relations with the Graduate Center and appreciate the significant workload and responsibilities of that staff. We have in recent years experienced significant delays in the receipt of GVARs which has in some cases compromised our ability to make timely admissions decisions. Our departmental staff and chair have continued to work with the Center to address this problem, uncertain whether it is a resource issue or a workload process issue.

We have discussed as a faculty the need for a clearer support system to assist graduate students with their writing. We attempt to gauge writing ability during the admissions process and we provide ongoing feedback, assistance and guidance during the coursework phase of the program. However occasionally we have students who need more intensive assistance with their writing. The support programs for undergraduate students are not really appropriate. The Graduate Associate Dean might consider a means of providing the writing support services. These services would undoubtedly have an impact on thesis/project completion.

D. Faculty Support Services (e.g. Center for Teaching and Learning, Computing, Communications, and Media)

Our faculty have benefited from the CTL’s Teaching Using Technology Summer Program, the support and guidance of the Director for Distributed Education (Dr. Vines) and ongoing courses from CCMS. Their evaluations suggest that these services have been extremely valuable and have enhanced our ability to meet student course needs.

E. Physical Facilities and Equipment

The Dean provided adequate space when our new faculty members (Professors Ceja and Kirlin) joined the department. The main departmental office and auxiliary office (which serves as the

space for the student assistant, storage for office supplies and infrequently used files, and a place where part-time faculty can meet with students before evening classes) are functional and comfortable, if small.

F. Financial Resources (faculty, staff, operating expenses)

We have found that basic financial resources are adequate. Suzi Byrd monitors and reports on office expenditures in all categories regularly using Excel spreadsheets. The department chair reviews the expenditures and any major expenditure issues are discussed in regular department meetings.