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Summary of Commendations to the Department

1. The Department is commended for development of a Self-Study document that included a comprehensive examination of current functioning and future issues for the department.

2. The review team is very appreciative to Bob Waste (PPA Department Chair), and Suzy Byrd (departmental Administrative Assistant) for providing additional information requested by the team; and also to the faculty members for their open conversations with the team regarding the program.

3. The Department provided a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the prior program review recommendations and has documented efforts to respond to these recommendations.

4. The review team commends PPA faculty members for their scholarly contributions and university and community service.

5. The review team applauds the interdisciplinary activities of the PPA program.

6. The review team commends the PPA faculty for a strong teaching record as well as taking an active role in evaluating effectiveness of the teaching-learning process.

7. The review team notes the commitment of faculty members to provide student support to facilitate successful completion of the degree.

8. The review team commends the PPA program for ongoing efforts to evaluate and improve student outcomes.

Summary of Recommendations to the Department

1. The review team recommends that PPA faculty members continue efforts to revitalize the community advisory group. (p. 3)

2. The review team recommends that PPA program faculty members continue to explore strategies to facilitate recruitment and retention of a diverse group of students. (p. 6)
3. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to examine and improve advising efforts. (p. 8)

4. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to explore strategies for increasing students’ participation in professional activities. (p. 9)

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. (p. 12)

6. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue discussions regarding the proposed undergraduate major/minor including consideration of suggestions from the team and the external consultant. (p. 15)

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. (p. 16)

**Recommendations to the College**

1. The review team specifically recommends that the College support at least one additional faculty position to enable the PPA department to strengthen the administration focus in the program. (p. 14)

2. The review team recommends that the College provide physical and fiscal resources necessary for program expansion including recruitment of additional students and the addition of faculty members. (p. 17)

**Recommendation to the Faculty Senate**

1. Based on the review process the team recommends to the Faculty Senate that the PPA program be approved for six years or until the next program review. (p. 18)
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Introduction/Historical Information

The Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration at CSUS is a relatively new program, which began admitting students and offering courses in Fall, 1989. The program is administratively housed as an academic department in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies.

The PPA Self–Study describes the study of public policy and administration as "...inherently multi-faceted and interdisciplinary. As a program and an academic field of study, we draw upon the traditional fields of political science and economics and the more recent fields of public administration and public policy studies" (PPA Self-Study p. 4). Additionally, faculty define the PPA program as an "interdisciplinary program designed to equip its graduates with conceptual, analytic, and problem solving skills and experiences enabling them to deal with public sector policy and administrative issues, problems, and opportunities." (PPA Self-Study, p. 5).

In conducting the program review, the review team read the Self-Study prepared by the department, the previous program review conducted in 1993, appropriate material from the CSUS 1998-2000 catalog, PPA listings in the Fall, 1999, Spring 2000 Schedule of Classes, and program data supplied by the University and the PPA department. Members of the team met with the following individuals:

A. Dr. Ric Brown, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies,
B. Dr. Bob Waste, Chair of the PPA Department
C. Each member of the PPA faculty:
   – Dr. Timothy Hodson,
   – Dr. Christy Jensen,
   – Dr. Ted Lascher,
   – Dr. Nancy Shulock,
   – Dr. Bob Wassmer
D. Dr. Theodore Anagnoson, external consultant from California State University Los Angeles, Department of Political Science.

In addition, the team interviewed eight current and former students regarding their program experiences. The following report is based on the information gathered during this process as well as the report from the external consultant. The report is organized to address the questions raised in the Guidelines for Program Review Report document prepared by the office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

A. Is the mission of the department/program clearly defined? To what extent are the programs offered, and contributions to other programs
appropriate? Are the degree program requirements outlined clearly in the University catalog?

Mission. According to the Self-Study the primary mission of the PPA Department is "... to engage in the teaching and learning of public policy and administration, and in so doing to aid CSUS in meeting a key element of the campus strategic plan: serving the state and capital region" (p. 6). This statement clearly identifies the purpose of the program.

Program contributions and appropriateness. As stated in the CSUS 1998-2000 catalog, "The CSUS program differs from other similar programs in that it focuses on California state and local levels of government. This attractive feature is facilitated by the proximity of the CSUS campus to the main operations of the California state government. That proximity offers significant advantages to students in the program, providing them with a ready "laboratory" for observing the policy and administrative issues they will confront professionally and for gaining experience alongside existing practitioners in public policy and administration" (p. 517). In addition to offering a unique program, which provides sound academic opportunities to its students, the Graduate PPA faculty members also participate in other CSUS programs. Faculty and students are integrally involved in activities of the CSUS Center for California Studies. "...PPA faculty member Rob Wassmer directs the Center’s CSU Faculty Research Fellows program. Professor Ted Lasher serves as the Center’s Executive Fellow Academic Advisor. Professor Waste serves on the Board of the newly formed Institute for County Government; and professors Lasher, Jensen, and Shulock serve on the Campus Advisory Board for the Center" (Self-Study p. 9).

PPA Program faculty members have worked with faculty in the College of Business, and with the Economics and Government departments on course offerings, and continue to reach out to other departments and programs to explore interdisciplinary activities. One such effort, has been the development of a proposal for an undergraduate major in Public Policy and Administration. The review team applauds the interdisciplinary efforts of the PPA program. (The undergraduate proposal will be discussed in a later section of this report).

Catalog description of degree program requirements. Admission and degree requirements are clearly presented in the CSUS catalog. Students are required to complete 24-27 units (depending upon current professional employment). Several courses have prerequisites, including undergraduate preparation in Economics and/or Statistics.

In addition, students complete nine units of electives. The catalog states that three units must be in PPA, and lists other areas for the remaining six units. The PPA Self-Study states that the 9 units are to be in a "policy specialty area" (p. 11). The Self-Study also indicates that there is an Urban Policy and Analysis Concentration (9 units) (p. 12). However, this is not described in the catalog.
Requirements for the 3-6 unit project or thesis culminating experience are also outlined in the catalog. Students must receive approval for the policy or administrative issue proposed for the culminating requirement. While the department has proposed changes in the culminating experience, the catalog description is still relevant and can be expanded upon during advising. When program changes are completed, new information should be included for the 2002-2004 catalog.

B. **Is the program appropriately placed in the University's Academic plan?**

As stated in the Self-Study, the University Academic Plan (1993) identifies the Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration as "...central to the mission of the CSUS and should be supported for enrollment increases commensurate with university headcount increases....The program responds to the unique location of CSUS in the state capital in terms of the academic focus of the program, student interest, and demand, and the needs of the service region" (Self-Study, p. 14).

C. **How well has the Department, the College and the University responded to the recommendations from the last program review?**

The department provided a very thorough and thoughtful analysis of the prior program review recommendations, and has documented efforts to respond to these recommendations. These efforts include changes in courses and instructors; administrative organization; an on campus policy discussion group; and establishment of a community advisory group (see Appendix A). While most of these changes have been successfully implemented, the external consultant noted that the advisory group has not met recently and suggested that the group "...should meet every year or two" (Anagnoson, p. 9). The review team concurs and recommends that the PPA program continue efforts to revitalize the community advisory group.

**Students**

A. **Characteristics:**

- **Do students enrolled in the department's programs reflect the diversity of the student population at CSU Sacramento?**

As can be seen in Table 1 below, the graduate students in the PPA program basically reflect the ethnic composition of the University. There are fewer Asian students than in other programs in the
University, but in 1998 there were none; so this is an increase for the PPA program. The PPA program also has a higher percentage of white students than either the college or university.

Table 1
CSUS, Fall 1999 Vital Statistics
PPA-Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty percent of the PPA students are women, compared to 56% for the college and 66% for the university. The program discusses “expanded recruitment efforts” and the desire to “…draw more non-whites in to the program” (Self-Study p. 18).

The PPA program’s recruitment of diverse students is part of a larger effort toward recruitment of students to meet their desired goal of 30 students per year. The external consultant concurs that this is a reasonable number, and suggests “…the development of a comprehensive student recruitment and outreach program, much of which could be implemented by the department office staff. This could include:

A. Mailings of a cover letter, list of Department publications available on its www site or by sending back a card, possible poster as other universities do, and one or more brochures...
B. Some outreach meetings in the Sacramento area, depending on how successful the initial meetings are” (Anagnoson, pp.3-4)

This issue is discussed further in the following section on student retention.

❖ Are enrollment patterns in the undergraduate and graduate programs stable?

Fall, 1999 university statistics show 63 graduate students enrolled in the PPA program. Ten of these students are enrolled full time; the other 53 are part-time students. The previous fall, there were 61 students; 14 full time, 47 part-time. Enrollments in the program have gradually increased over time.
Another issue related to enrollment is the student-faculty ratio. The fall, 1999 SFR for the PPA program was 8.9:1 (University data, fall, 1999). This number is down from 10.1 in 1998-99. The comparison to other programs in the College and University is not meaningful since they include both undergraduate and graduate programs. Ric Brown, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies reported that an SFR of between 8-11 is typical for graduate programs, with class sizes ranging from 8-20 students. Professor Anagnoson reported that "...the average for graduate public administration programs (graduate division only) in CSU is about 10-11. Average class size is between 13 and 14 and could be a little higher" (p. 3). Vice President Brown suggested that the issue is one of meeting capacity vs. expansion, so the question for PPA to consider is whether the program meets the needs of the "market". He posited that through recruitment and advertising the program might expand; possibly going from an SFR of 8.9:1 to 14:1.

How do the retention and graduation rates of the program compare with the College and University?

The PPA Self-Study identified several concerns regarding student retention and program completion. The department contacted 29 students from 1994-1998 who had not finished the program and identified reasons for non-completion. Poor grades were a factor for students who dropped during the first semester, after the first year, or after the second year. Other students transferred elsewhere, or dropped because of "...lifestyle choices, career changes, or disenchantment with graduate study" (Self-Study p. 19). The department identified "...two categories of the "problem"; early or mid coursework and post coursework (thesis/project stage) retention" (Self-Study p. 19). The PPA department has worked to identify strategies to provide more support during the thesis stage including development of a second thesis/project course for students who do not finish in one semester.

The completion rate for the PPA program was 52% in 1999, up from 46% in 1998. The 1999 completion rate for the College was 45%; for the University 57% (University program data for fall, 1999). The external consultant noted problems with the University data, stating that "... Given that this is one cohort, and one that took most of its courses more than 3-4 years ago, this information is probably not all that valuable until there is a time series over several years" (Anagnoson, p. 4). In spite of this, he also observed that "...one would hope that with a small and somewhat selective program, you would have a completion rate higher than the University average."
Dr. Anagnozon suggested that "... the thesis class and the offering of an option for group projects as a capstone experience are good signs in this area" (p. 4).

Issues regarding recruitment and retention of students also came up in discussions with several faculty members. Suggestions included expanding curriculum areas (e.g., Administrative Law) to attract students and formalizing and using the alumni network to identify potential students. The review team applauds the careful analysis of the department regarding retention and completion rate. The program director indicated that he would be devoting more time to recruitment and retention issues in the future. The review team recommends that the program faculty continue to explore strategies to facilitate recruitment and retention of a diverse group of students.

- To what extent do the grade distributions in the program reflect appropriate academic standards? How do they compare with College and University grade distributions?

As can be seen in Table 2 there are more A's and B's earned by students in PPA programs than in other College and University programs. Likewise there are significantly fewer C's, D's, and F's. W/U's are similar. However, data include all programs; undergraduate and graduate. According to Ric Brown, Associate Vice president for Research and Graduate Studies, the grading pattern for the PPA program is not unusual in a competency based graduate program, where a C is considered failing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/U</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- To what extent is the schedule of classes responsive to the needs of students served by the program, e.g. evening students?
As the department notes in their Self-Study: "...the PPA program serves mainly mature students who are already embarked on a career but are looking to try new things, earn a promotion, and/or obtain a new position" (PPA Self-Study, p 17). In Fall 1999 the PPA program offered ten courses; all in the late afternoon or evening. Likewise in Spring 2000, the twelve course offerings were scheduled either as evening classes or TBA (to meet students' schedules) (CSUS Class Schedule, 1999-2000). This schedule maximizes opportunities for working students to participate in the program.

B. Academic Support

The review team felt that in addition to information provided through the self-study and from discussions with faculty, perspectives of students were relevant to questions related to academic support. Thus, team members interviewed a small number of current and former students. Four students enrolled during spring semester 2000 were randomly selected from a list of 94 student provided by the PPA Department. Additionally, four students from a list of 89 alumni were randomly selected. Individual telephone interviews were conducted with these students. Students responded to questions concerning advising, coursework, professional opportunities, and mentoring. They also suggested program improvements (See Appendix B for questions).

❖ How and to what extent does the program provide adequate academic and career advising?

As reported in the PPA Self-Study, the departmental advising policy includes the following:
❖ One faculty member is assigned responsibility for admissions/first year advising
❖ An informal orientation session is held each fall with new students and all faculty

In discussions with the review team, several PPA faculty members identified advising, and general "maintenance" issues (recruitment, accessibility of faculty, responsiveness of faculty) as areas where there have been difficulties in the past.

The program document proposes strategies for improving advising in response to a student survey conducted as part of the Self-Study process. Beginning in fall 2000 the program proposes to have second year students select an academic advisor to "guide them through the remainder of the core coursework, the selection of electives, and the initial discussion of the culminating requirement. (p. 18).
Students interviewed were generally positive about the academic and career advising they had received. Current students were positive both about the quality of advising and availability of faculty. Several alumni (graduates ranged from 1996-1998) commented that career advising was not strong; suggesting that a broader range of possibilities would have been helpful. One student commented that the direction provided by a faculty member outside the department while working on the MA had been the most helpful; while another student noted that the thesis advisor was always available and she was still in contact with the advisor. Following interviews with students enrolled in PPA 207 during spring 2000, the external consultant noted in his report that "...I didn’t receive any student complaints over the quality of the courses, nor over advisement (always a perennial complaint in public administration programs)" (Anagnoson, p 3).

The review team noted the commitment of faculty members to providing student support to facilitate successful completion of the degree. The team encourages the PPA program to continue to examine and improve advising efforts.

❖ **Is there evidence that students are prepared academically to be successful in graduate coursework?**

As previously cited, students interviewed by the external consultant had no complaints about the quality of the courses. "...several students felt that the program had broadened their perspectives and presented them with interesting material and problems" (Anagnoson, p.30). Current students interviewed by the review team were generally positive, citing the relevance and applicability of course content. Academic standards were seen as average to very high. Alumni also reported coursework to be relevant and applicable to their current job situations. One student commented that flexibility in course selection and options for assignments within specific courses "...allowed me to tailor my learning experiences to meet needs within the agency in which I work". In contrast, one 1997 graduate commented that academic standards were unclear, citing the number of part time staff as a weakness in the overall program. The program has responded to the potential issue of inconsistencies due to part-time faculty by assuring that full-time faculty teach the core courses. This policy was implemented in Fall, 1999.

❖ **In what ways does the program attempt to socialize students into the discipline and/or provide opportunities for student to engage in professional activities and events?**
The department reports that several students have been recipients of awards for graduate presentations and papers. Comments from the four current students regarding opportunities to participate in professional activities and events ranged from "no opportunities" to "ample opportunities", and "students have a lot of good contacts". The alumni interviewed reported that opportunities were available, although some commented that they didn't participate because they were already involved through their work.

The self-study acknowledges that there are "...no functioning student organizations at this point, and unfortunately no alumni organization" p. 20). During interviews, several alumni commented that while they were in the program there weren't opportunities for interactions with program graduates (because there weren't many), and that there weren't really "mentors". Several felt that this was a weakness in the program, but were aware that this issue was being addressed by the program; one cited the "anniversary meeting" as an example of how the program had improved in this area.

The review team encourages the PPA program to continue to explore strategies for increasing students' participation in professional activities. A student organization may or may not be effective, given the nature of the student population (i.e. professionals already on the job), but perhaps other ongoing opportunities to participate in professional organizations and contacts with alumni could be identified to contribute to students' professional socialization.

**Faculty**

**A. Characteristics**

- **To what extent does the faculty profile reflect gender and ethnic diversity?**

  "The PPA faculty consists of six permanent or probationary members and a pool of part-time faculty. Additionally, full-time faculty from related departments (e.g. Economics, Government, Business) have and continue to teach in the program. The permanent or probationary faculty includes two women and four men. All are white" (Self-Study pp. 20-21). The department has made a commitment to insure the diversity of the applicant pool for future hires.

- **Is the full-time to part-time faculty ratio appropriate given the discipline and the availability of faculty?**
In 1998-99, full time faculty taught 77% of classes; part time faculty taught 23%. The self-study effectively describes current conditions including the fact that three of the six permanent or probationary faculty have administrative responsibilities that preclude full-time teaching. Additionally, the Department Chair is a half time administrative position. The department argues that "...the nature of our program is such that the use of well-known, competent practitioners in the field is an undeniable strength. While having core faculty teach our core courses is the Department's norm, our ability to offer students a course in Public Budgeting and Finance...taught by a former deputy Director of the state department of Finance...both enhances the content of the courses as well as the program's attractiveness to our target student population" (Self-Study p. 21). The Self-Study document suggests that part time faculty can offer electives in areas that are "often comparatively narrow in scope" (p. 21) and acknowledges that current enrollment would not justify "...the number of full-time faculty necessary to offer all the courses and electives necessary in a viable program. Hence, reliance on part-time faculty is both a necessity and an asset" (Self-Study p. 21).

B. Faculty preparation, scholarly and creative activity and currency in the field

- Is the size and preparation of the faculty appropriate for the curriculum offered? Are the faculty adequately prepared for the courses they teach?

The permanent and probationary faculty members have degrees and experiences relevant to the curriculum of the program. Four have doctorates in Political Science with varying emphases on public policy analysis, political behavior, research, and public administration. One faculty member holds a doctorate in Public Administration and one in Economics. The faculty members have the content expertise to teach the courses they offer. As discussed previously, the issue of the size of the faculty is confounded by the fact that two faculty members hold full-time administrative positions with the university; another has 40% time devoted to the Executive Fellows Program and the department chair is a half time administrative position. Other faculty because of their involvement in various activities (such as the CSU systemwide Academic Senate) are temporarily unavailable for full time teaching. Another faculty member will be on leave next year. The result of these various commitments is that the program is stretched in being able to use its full resources to address all content areas. Professor Anagnoson addresses the question of whether the faculty are
"...spread to thinly to devote the appropriate time to the program" (p.4), and concludes, "...the faculty are devoted to the program and students" (P.4). He does recommend exploring options in this area, suggesting "...certainly that should be done if the undergraduate program is added to the curriculum" (p. 4).

There is agreement from the PPA program faculty, the external consultant, and the review team, that the primary concern related to the appropriateness of the faculty for the curriculum is the need for additional faculty with expertise in the area of administration. Issues concerning the administration focus and the undergraduate program are discussed in a later section of this report.

❖ To what extent does the faculty engage in scholarly and creative activities?

The faculty members of the PPA program are outstanding in their scholarly and creative efforts. As noted by the external consultant: "The quality of the faculty is exemplary and, by CSU standards, superb. This is clear from the ...quantity and quality of research and public service being generated by the four faculty in the unit. In particular, the places where research has recently been published should be noted: books by Oxford and Georgetown University Presses, and articles in journals like the Journal of Urban Economics, Public Choice, the National Tax Journal, Journal of Public Policy and Management, and the Institute for Governmental Studies at UC Berkeley's publication series. These are very good quality places indeed and would be a credit in Ph.D. in public policy programs" (Anagnoson, p. 2)

❖ To what extent does the faculty attend and actively participate in professional organizations, conferences and workshops? Is there evidence that the faculty are maintaining currency in their fields?

A review of faculty vitae reveals that all of the PPA faculty are very active locally, nationally and internationally in professional organizations, participation in leadership roles and making many presentations at local, state and national levels. Through a combination of research and scholarly activities, involvement in professional organizations, campus and systemside Academic Senate activities, and California and international policy issues faculty have clearly demonstrated that individually and collectively they are identified as leaders in their fields.
While the faculty have described themselves as 'intense, active and hardworking', a few have acknowledged that their participation in activities other than teaching is both a strength and weakness of the program in that the core faculty is not really "core". The faculty have many competing demands on their time. However, as noted by the consultant, many of these activities can be seen "...as a plus, since they tend to broaden the perspectives of faculty beyond their own areas, something that is always useful (Anagnoson, p. 4).

The review team commends the faculty for exemplary scholarly contributions, and university and community service, but notes that they are spread very thin over many worthwhile activities that both add and detract from the core of the MPPA program; that is the teaching and maintenance of the program. 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.

C. Teaching Effectiveness

- Is there evidence that the department involves students in the evaluation of teaching? Is there evidence that the faculty uses data to enhance or improve their teaching strategies?

Using a sixteen-point teaching performance survey, the department has gathered student evaluations for all classes taught by PPA faculty. A review of data supplied by the Department office from fall 1995 through fall 1999 indicates that the evaluation averages across all courses have ranged from 4.06 to 4.64 (PPA department data). In addition to course evaluations, the PPA department also considers "...thesis/project supervision and advice, mentoring, teaching and research assistantship supervision, curriculum advising, and co-authoring with students to be important" (Self-Study p.34). Evaluation committees in the department also look at other indicators of 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 relative 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" (Self-Study, p.34). Faculty due for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review are required to participate in an in-class evaluation of teaching skills. There is not a specific discussion of how individual faculty use data for their own teaching, but the Self-Study addresses...
changes in courses based on a survey conducted with all PPA students.

The review team commends the PPA faculty for a strong teaching record as well as taking an active role in evaluating effectiveness of the teaching-learning process. These efforts are seen as useful in providing feedback to assist individual faculty members to improve overall instruction, as well as providing the department with information to make changes in teaching assignments and in student advising.

**Academic Program Goals/Student Outcomes**

**A. Academic Program Goals**

According to the external consultant, "the curriculum is a standard Masters in Public Policy program, heavy on applied microeconomics and quantitative methods, along with courses on governmental structure, budgeting, public management, and some policy areas. The books and materials used are high quality and up-to-date...For a public policy program, the curriculum is good quality" (Anagnoston, p. 2). Interviews with a small random sample of current students and alumni yielded general satisfaction with the curriculum; most students interviewed reported that courses had been relevant and applicable to their professional activities (see section on Academic Support).

The program review team agrees with the external consultant that the PPA program is an excellent program, with a sound curriculum and a mix of courses that is "...not only appropriate, it is desirable. The two semesters of quantitative methods with a one course statistics prerequisite is standard for programs of this type, and the two semesters of applied microeconomics are also standard for MPP programs...The present program contains an introductory course that should fit both (policy and administration) areas, plus four courses on the public policy/quantitative side of the curriculum (205, 207, 220A, 220B), three course on the administrative side (210) 230), 240), plus the concentration and the thesis/project" (p. 5).

Faculty members describe the PPA core as rigorous and strong, with a good theory/practice balance, but identify four areas of focus for curricular development: "1) a strengthened administrative related coursework in the core; 2) enhanced attention to the ethical dimension of our field and strengthened effectiveness of our pedagogies; 3) a more focused set of electives; and 4) the appropriate balance between PPA sponsored electives and coursework from other disciplines/fields which can be effective electives" (Self-Study, p. 35)
The issue of a strengthened administration component to the PPA was clearly identified by faculty and the external consultant. As Professor Anagnoson stated "compared with public administration programs, there is more applied economics and a higher level of proficiency required in quantitative methods. There is less of the applied administration sorts of stuff that one finds - computer applications in spreadsheet form, applied budgeting and personnel analysis, organization and management, and the like...I think the program could profitably add an administration person, particularly someone focused on human resource management" (p. 5)

The review team concurs with the need for an additional faculty member in administration to strengthen the program in this area. The review team recommends that the College support at least one additional faculty position.

In terms of future plans, the PPA department has developed a proposal for an undergraduate major and an undergraduate minor in Public Policy and Administration. The core for the major would include a new introductory course in PPA, a new undergraduate capstone seminar, and seven additional courses drawn from Government (or Sociology), Economics, and OBE. In addition students would select one of ten proposed 9-unit policy tracks.

The external reviewer did not specifically identify a need for such a program, but argued that "...we offer many majors simply because there are faculty interests in the area, there is the potential for student interest in the area, the students would qualify for a wide variety of jobs (something appropriate for a BA program), and because intellectually it is interesting to the faculty to put together a concentration in this area" (p. 6). He goes on to say that "...if that be the case, then some kind of pilot status (as in what the Chancellor's Office allows for these five year pilot majors) might be a good way to see if a proposed public policy undergraduate major would be appealing to students, and if alumni and employers would find graduates of the program of some interest" (p. 6). Professor Anagnoson provides several recommendations to strengthen the proposed major, given that so many of the courses come from other departments. The review team suggests the PPA faculty consider his recommendations in their ongoing planning.

The review team had a similar perspective on the undergraduate program after reviewing the document and having discussions with faculty members. The concern that the major has only two courses actually taught by the MPPA faculty raises issues of quality control,
coordination of students, cooperation from and coordination with other departments regarding scheduling and potential tailoring of course content, and a host of other logistical problems that are often difficult to see until a program is implemented. The program has used excellent outside faculty in the past, but perhaps a new endeavor such as this would require more full-time PPA faculty participation. Given the current situation in which faculty are already stretched in terms of their teaching time commitments, these issues need to be addressed, whether through a new hire, or through possible modifications in the proposal.

An alternative discussed by some faculty members would be to proceed initially with the proposal for the 21 unit minor and continue to explore the possibilities for expansion to a major when there are additional faculty resources to bring to the issue. The review team encourages the PPA program to continue discussion of the proposal for the major/minor, considering the issues discussed above with the suggestions from the outside consultant.

Another potential future activity for the PPA department includes accreditation. Dr. Anagnoson outlines issues and strategies for the PPA program to consider regarding the possibility of seeking NASPAA accreditation. Overall, the program is clearly excellent and with an additional faculty member can apply and will likely succeed in their accreditation efforts. The review team sees this as a program decision not appropriate as a University review team recommendation.

B. Student Outcomes

Dr Anagnoson, the external consultant observes that "...the students are very positive on the conduct of the classes (with one exception, a part-time instructor from the year before) and the quality of instruction. The program requires students to do a thesis or project, a higher and more demanding standard in my view than comprehensive examinations. Many students use the data set they have worked on in the regression course, on which they have done a multiple regressions for the final exam, as the core of their thesis, something very desirable in my view for students who wish to pursue this path. The program has taken positive action to give students extra help in doing their theses with a two semester course where they can produce chapters, proposals, and analyses according to a schedule, receiving feedback from the instructor and the other students" (p. 2).

Several faculty members identified the MPPA thesis/project approach as economic in scope and demand. While commending Rob Wassmer
for his outstanding job in this area, it was suggested that a broader choice of approaches be encouraged, since not all students are interested in nor can they apply economic models to the areas they wish to write about. One faculty member commented that with further expansions of the administration side of the program, students eventually would move to a specific PA or PP focus for the thesis/project.

The PPA Self-Study reports that the faculty developed "...a set of learning outcomes organized by five major categories: critical thinking, integrative thinking, effective communication, understanding of professional role, and practical applications...within each category the faculty identified four-to-five specific learning outcomes" (p. 39). The Department has identified "...which courses cover which learning outcomes and to what degree" (p. 39), and are planning to develop standards "...by which student outcomes in each of these areas can be measured" (p. 39). Initial review of course coverage has resulted in identification of areas such as effective communication, workplace ethics, and practical applications, which need to be strengthened in the core curriculum. Strategies have been proposed by the faculty to incorporate assignments in communication and ethics, for example. However, the department's analysis also highlighted the need for PPA 230 to be taught by core faculty not part-timers, and the need for new faculty hires to enable the program to effectively cover management and administration topics.

Additionally, the PPA department is proposing several changes in the graduate program based on faculty analysis and results from a survey of current students and alumni. Proposed improvements include changes in the current thesis/project requirements that "would give student more opportunities to work on projects for public sector clients. We believe that client-oriented projects, more than traditional theses, will require student to use the full range of skills and will provide a better basis for assessment of the full range of student learning outcomes that have been adopted by the faculty" (Self-Study, p.42). The department also has plans for using portfolios "...at key benchmark periods throughout the core curriculum" (p.42).

The review team commends the PPA program for ongoing efforts to evaluate and improve student outcomes, and encourages the faculty to continue efforts both in development of assessment measures and in utilizing results of student learning outcomes for program improvement.
Institutional Support for the Program

The external consultant writes: "Library resources seem to be in good shape, and what is even more significant is that the subject librarian in the area has paid some attention, as have the faculty, to the adequacy of the collection" (Anagnoson, p.3). He notes further that "...resources (ole, travel, research funds, etc.) seem to be adequate or sufficient for this program, in contrast to every other review I have ever done in CSU. Congratulations to the powers that be" (p. 3).

The review team met with the department chair, who also reported that the Resource Librarian is excellent and there are extensive library resources. However, the Department is seeking to expand certain holdings to better enable students to complete research without having to advise students to use the UC Davis library for essential public policy and administration materials. Computer resources were reported to be adequate.

According to the self-study and discussions with the department chair and faculty, institutional support is adequate to support existing faculty and program efforts. The program has excellent office support and good collegial relationships with other departments. The program has strong relationships "downtown" through the Fellows programs. The self-study notes that as a small, graduate program the PPA department does not generate the FTES to justify expanded resource allocation. However, proposed plans for recruitment of additional students and the need for additional faculty will necessitate commitment of additional physical and fiscal resources. The review team recommends that the College provide the support necessary to enable the PPA program to meet these goals.

The self-study states that "...the PPA faculty is committed to effective and collegial program governance" (p. 20). The program has by-laws which cover: "...department meetings and voting; qualifications, selection, and duties of the Program Chair, personnel policies and procedures; and procedures for amending the by-laws" (p. 20). A common perspective that emerged from discussions with faculty members is that this is a talented faculty, who respect each other and work collegially to implement and evaluate the program.

In summary, the review team found the PPA department to offer an excellent graduate program. There is a strong, committed faculty engaged in many exciting activities both as part of and outside of their teaching responsibilities. The program is poised to grow; the department has identified strengths and needs, and proposed strategies for program improvement. The review team recognizes and supports these development activities, and encourages the department to continue to
thoughtfully plan for expansion including consideration of programmatic options and faculty needs.

Based on the review process the team recommends to the Faculty Senate that the PPA program be approved for six years or until the next program review.
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Report of the PPA External Evaluator, 2000
After reviewing thoroughly the attached Report of the Program Team for the Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration in the School of Arts and Sciences, prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations, and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Review Report.)

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM FOR
THE GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
IN THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

COMMENDATIONS:

The Review Team commends Public Policy and Administration for:

1) its excellent Self Study and professional cooperation with the Program Review Team;

2) its dedicated and effective leadership;

3) the high quality of its faculty;

4) the high quality of graduating students; and

5) its efforts to improve its already-sound curriculum.

Recommendations to the Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration

1. PPA should review its syllabuses and course content to ensure that instructors teach according to the catalog course descriptions and that those descriptions are properly specific in the guidelines they provide for instructors. Instructors teaching the same course should further agree on a list of topics to be covered. (p. 15)

2. PPA should investigate the special needs and strengths of its student body and adopt the teaching methods best suited to that special clientele. PPA should consult with current students in the consideration of this issue. (p. 15)
3. PPA should reevaluate its internship requirement; it should consider (1) making the internship an elective, (2) giving students exempted from the requirement credit for the course, and (3) associating its internship program with the California Studies fellowship program. (p. 20)

4. PPA should evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of an administrative transfer out of the School of Arts and Sciences. (p. 27)

5. PPA should consider the advantages of reporting to (1) the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies; (2) the Dean for General Education; (3) the President's office. (p. 27)

6. PPA should establish an on-campus discussion group of persons and units interested in policy studies and research. (p. 28)

7. PPA should establish a community advisory group to advise it on how best to serve the Sacramento community and to help it develop contracts for research and executive training. (p. 28)

**Recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

1. Academic Affairs should consider recommending an institute run by PPA, or the formal union of PPA with the Center for California Studies. The institute should seek contracts for policy studies and executive training. (p. 27)

2. Academic Affairs should fund the institute with units to be used for released research time for PPA faculty. (p. 27)

3. Academic Affairs should consider recommending that departments contributing faculty to interdisciplinary programs receive .25 positions compensation for each faculty member teaching a course in an interdisciplinary program. (p. 28)

**Recommendations to the Academic Senate**

The Master of Arts degree in Public Policy and Administration be approved for six years or until the next program review. (p. 33)
PPA Review
Potential Student Interview Questions/Topics

Current position

When graduated

Academic and career advising

- Availability of faculty

- Relevance of information

Coursework

- Relevance

- Applicability

- Academic standards

Opportunities for students to participate in professional activities and events

Interactions with alumni/ mentoring

Suggested Improvements
Report of the External Evaluator on the California State University, Sacramento, Department of Public Policy and Administration

By
J. Theodore Anagnoson (tanagno@calstatela.edu)
Department of Political Science
California State University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90032-8226
(323) 343-2245

May 26, 2000
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Introduction

I should state at the outset that the hospitality shown by the University and the Department Chair was exceptional, and I appreciate having had the opportunity to visit with another department in the CSU.

1. Selection of the evaluator

I would just like to note here vis a vis my own qualifications that I was chair of my Department for seven years (1986-1993) and have been the primary person responsible for both two internal program reviews while chair and two re-accreditations of the Master of Science in Public Administration by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), the accrediting body responsible for programs producing leaders in public policy and administration.

I have also done site visits either for the Department or for the public administration program to the CSU campuses at Chico, Stanislaus, Fresno, San Jose, and Long Beach.

I am presently the chair of a three member committee producing a plan for the assessment of general education at Cal State LA (CSLA) and the primary author and coordinator of our Self-Study for the reaccreditation of the MSPA, due in August, 2000.

2. Site visit

The visit took place on Wednesday, May 10 and Thursday, May 11, 2000, on campus. Interviews were held with the following:

Administrators:
- Cecelia Gray, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Joseph Shely, Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
- Ric Brown, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
- Tim Hodson, Director, Center for California Studies

Faculty:
- Maurine Ballard-Rosa, Professor of Education and Chair of the Review Team for PPA
• Bob Friedman, Department of Government, member of the Review Team for PPA
• Anne Cowden, Department of Organizational Behavior and Environment, Member of the Review Team for PPA
• Bob Waste, Chair, PPA
• Cristy Jensen, Faculty, PPA
• Nancy Shulock, Faculty, PPA and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
• Ted Lascher, Faculty PPA
• Ben Amata, Librarian responsible for the public policy/administration area
• Peter Lund, Chair, Economics

Students:
• Members of the PPA 207 class, 5/10/00
• No alumni groups or other classes were available during the two days available for the site visit.

Commendations to the Department

I want to begin with some aspects of the program that will help to set the stage.

1. Quality of the faculty.

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 being placed on the students, and the quantity and quality of research and public service being generated by the four faculty in the unit.

In particular, the places where research has recently been published should be noted: books by Oxford and Georgetown University Presses, and articles in journals like the Journal of Urban Economics, Public Choice, the National Tax Journal, Journal of Public Policy and Management, and the Institute for Governmental Studies at UC Berkeley’s publication series. These are very good quality places indeed and would be a credit in PhD in public policy programs.

2. Quality of the curriculum.

The curriculum is a standard Masters in Public Policy program, heavy on applied microeconomics and quantitative methods, along with courses on governmental structure, budgeting, public management, and some policy areas. The books and materials used are high quality and up-to-date. The students are very positive on the conduct of the classes (with one exception, a part-time instructor from the year before) and the quality of the instruction. The program requires students to do a thesis or project, a higher and more demanding standard in my view than comprehensive examinations. Many students use the data set they have worked on in the regression course, on which they have done a multiple regression for the final exam, as the core of their thesis, something very desirable in my view for students who wish to pursue this path. The program has taken positive action to give students extra help in doing their theses with a two semester course where they can produce chapters, proposals, and analyses according to a schedule, receiving feedback from the instructor and the other students.

For a public policy program, the curriculum is good quality. No problems here.

3. The quality of the students.

With an admission standard at 3.0 in the last two years of undergraduate work and a requirement that students take the GRE, the program has standard requirements for public policy programs. In the public administration programs common in the CSU, either 2.75 or 3.0 in the last two years of undergraduate work is standard, and more and more programs are requiring the GRE as a diagnostic
tool or with some score as a minimum standard for entrance. In this respect the program is not unusual.

The requirements that students have had four lower division courses prior to a full admission – statistics, macro and micro economics, and an introduction to American government – are appropriate.

I didn’t receive any student complaints over the quality of the courses, nor over advisement (always a perennial complaint in public administration programs). Several students felt that the program had broadened their perspectives and presented them with interesting material and problems. Several complimented one instructor in particular (one of the part-timers) who had worked them particularly hard.

4. Faculty activity level.

The level of activity of the faculty is high. One of the faculty has been an officer in the campus Academic Senate, and another has been active in the CSU systemwide Academic Senate. They have started on “occasional paper series.” One of them has coordinated a college colloquium/speaker series. They are involved with several other programs around the campus.

5. Synergy with the Departments of Economics and Public Policy and Administration and the Center for California Studies.

Finally, the campus is to be complimented for having these three departments in close physical proximity. On my own campus the Pat Brown Institute of Public Affairs is on the 4th floor of another building, not one that faculty normally visit, and clearly things happen at CSUS with the close physical proximity that do not happen when offices with similar missions are physically separated.

6. Resources.

Resources (o/e, travel, research funds, etc.) seem to be adequate or sufficient for this program, in contrast to every other review I have ever done in CSU. Congratulations to the powers that be.

Library resources seem to be in good shape, and what is even more significant is that the subject librarian in the area has paid some attention, as have the faculty, to the adequacy of the collection. I was particularly impressed with the quality of the report on the adequacy of the library collection prepared by the subject librarian responsible for public policy and administration.

Areas for Improvement:

1. Student recruitment and numbers.

The program presently has a student-faculty ratio of 8.9:1 (Fall, 1999). The average for graduate public administration programs (graduate division only) in CSU is about 10-11. Average class size is between 13 and 14 and could be a little higher. The program is aiming to recruit almost 30 students per year, which is a reasonable number. It is currently running a bit below that.

Given that the program has not been doing all that much student recruitment, I would suggest the development of a comprehensive student recruitment and outreach program, much of which could be implemented by the department office staff. This could include:

A. Mailings of a cover letter, list of Department publications available on its www site or by sending back a card, possible poster as other universities do, and one or more brochures, to:

(1) Department chairs and possibly other identified faculty at UC and CSU departments in the social sciences
(2) Undergraduate departments at CSUS, particularly departments from which the program has received majors in the past
(3) All or part of the Center for California Studies mailing list
(4) A list developed by position of office directors and staff persons in the state administration and some of the local cities and counties

Sometimes it is more effective to offer interested faculty copies of a paper that has been recently produced by the faculty on California public policy. I would urge the theme to be the quality of the program, possibly (taking off after the UC Davis MBA that apparently recruits for its public sector option) using a theme like “The MBA for the Public Sector” or something like that.

B. Some outreach meetings in the Sacramento area, depending on how successful the initial meetings are.

2. The student completion rate.

The University’s standard data had a new item in it this year, the “Student Completion Rate,” for which the program’s rate was 52%, the college’s 45%, and the University’s 57%. This turns out to be the rate at which a cohort from seven years ago finished the program. Given that this is one cohort, and one that took most of its courses more than 3-4 years ago, this information is probably not all that valuable until there is a time series over several years, but one would hope that with a small and somewhat selective program, you would have a completion rate higher than the University average.

The thesis class and the offering of an option for group projects as a capstone experience are good signs in this area.

3. Are the faculty spread too thin?

With half of the Department Chair’s position being devoted to administration, and with two faculty involved in the Academic Senate (either local or statewide) and with half of Prof. Lascher’s position being devoted to the Executive Fellowship program, there is certainly a question about whether the faculty are being spread too thinly to devote the appropriate time to the program (although the students did not mention this factor in any way, and it is clear from the Self-Study that the faculty are devoted to the program and the students).

I would certainly explore options in this area, particularly if perhaps one or both sections of the Executive Fellowship program could be done by a part-time faculty member, with the full-time faculty member either doing the other or receiving some smaller amount of release time to coordinate? There might be possibilities in this area. I regard the activities in the Academic Senate as a plus, since they tend to broaden the perspectives of faculty beyond their own areas, something that is always useful.

My recommendation here is only to explore the options, and it sounded from what I was told that the faculty and program are doing just that. Certainly that should be done if the undergraduate program is added to the curriculum.

4. The “A-side” (administrative) side of PP-A.

A definite need, and recognized by all, both inside and outside the program. The one area of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration’s standards for accreditation that would need to be covered differently from what is done now is human resource management/personnel, which doesn’t seem to be covered at all at this point, so that is an obvious area to consider. The job might well be teamed with an interest area for the undergraduate degree (see below).
Other possible areas in which I heard interest being expressed include administrative law, ethical concerns, and negotiation/conflict resolution.

One thing that might be done here is to add a Certificate program in Public Administration or Public Management – this would enable the program to tap into the Master in Public Administration market without going so far as to add an entire degree, one that might overwhelm the current Master of Public Policy and Administration. The certificate would have upper division prerequisites (or typically certificates of this type do), which could include one or both of the core courses for the Public Policy BA, or perhaps one or more of the Government Department’s courses in state and local government (180), public policy development (170), or bureaucracy (150). Some of the present courses that could be included would be 210, 230 and 240, possibly 200, and with a couple of electives, plus the new human resource management “A-side” course.

There is a comparable certificate in “Advanced Business Studies” on p. 172 of the current catalog.

5. The thesis as a barrier to completion of the degree.

I think that with the thesis class (two semesters) and the offering of group or individual projects that this should become a non-issue, if it isn’t already. Dr. Waste’s data on the 27-29 dropouts over the last four years or so does not indicate a huge number dropping out at the thesis stage; instead it indicates that most students who drop out (about 2/3rds) do so in the first year, either because their interests change, their grades are poor, or something else happens.

Questions and concerns from the review team:

1. Focus of the MPPA:

A. Balance of administration vs. public policy in the core curriculum

If the program were a traditional Master of Public Administration or (as my campus titles it) a Master of Science in Public Administration, we would certainly conclude that absent a call from the program’s clientele for a healthy dose of quantitative methods, quantitative methods are overemphasized.

However, the program is not primarily focused on public administration, and in that context, I think the mix of courses is not only appropriate, it is desirable. The two semesters of quantitative methods with a one course statistics prerequisite is standard for programs of this type, and the two semesters of applied microeconomics are also standard for Master of Public Policy programs.

The present program contains an introductory course that should fit both areas, plus four courses on the public policy / quantitative side of the curriculum (205, 207, 220A, 220B), three courses on the administrative side (210, 230, 240), plus the concentration and the thesis/project.

As stated elsewhere, I think the program could profitably add an administration person, particularly someone focused on human resource management, and this person could assist with a two semester core course for the undergraduate degree as well.

B. How the core curriculum compares with other MPPA programs

It has a standard format – I don’t see any real differences here.

Compared with public administration programs, there is more applied economics and a higher level of proficiency required in quantitative methods. There is less of the applied administration sorts of stuff that one finds – computer applications in spreadsheet form, applied budgeting and personnel analysis, organization and management, and the like.
C. Need for additional courses at the graduate level

I don’t see a need for a copious number of additional graduate courses without an increase in the number of graduate students. Presently the program is offering seven electives within the PPA Department, although three of them are offered as special topics courses (296). The program seems well served by the graduate concentrations and options in other programs, and I heard no mention of scheduling difficulties, something that one often hears when courses are offered by other units. I would definitely consider a course in human resource management and perhaps a concentration course in whatever specialty the human resource management / A-side person wishes to offer, however.

D. Adequacy of student preparation based on syllabi description

I didn’t quite understand this comment until the end of my visit, but I suspect that the question is whether there are really hidden prerequisites behind the quantitative courses or the applied economics. With students who are required to have the prerequisites and with the current content of the courses as exemplified in the course syllabi and descriptions in the self-study, I don’t have a sense that there is really a much stronger background required that is not being stated fully. Both of the applied microeconomics courses are using material that is applied rather than theoretical (for which one would have to have a background in calculus and symbolic logic/set theory, for example), and the regression course is quite applied as well. I don’t see a problem here, now that I understand the comment.

2. Undergraduate major

A. Purpose and need for the new program

Always a good question, and one worth asking rigorously. Let us consider several situations:

- First, if there were some major gap in the undergraduate curriculum by classic standards, we might well consider adding the particular department and major — for example, political science, or economics, or English, or psychology.

- A second possibility is the location of the campus and its student recruitment area in a geographic area where there is a high demand for some particular occupation, the campus does not offer the obvious major to prepare for that occupation, and the students are interested in having that particular training or concentration — for example, civil engineering, or a government/political science major in a state capital, or such.

Neither of these seems to fit the case for the undergraduate major in public policy. However, I would submit that most majors, particularly small ones, do not fit these situations either. Instead, I suspect that we offer many majors simply because there are faculty interests in the area, there is the potential for student interest in the area, the students would qualify for a wide variety of jobs (something appropriate for a BA program), and because intellectually it is interesting to the faculty to put together a concentration in this area. If that be the case, then some kind of pilot status (as in what the Chancellor’s Office allows for these five year pilot majors) might be a good way to see if a proposed public policy undergraduate major would be appealing to students, and if alumni and employers would find graduates of the program of some interest.

There is also a minor proposed, which seemed well put together from my standpoint.

B. Coordination of coursework to form a cohesive and integrated program

The proposed undergraduate major, which I had not seen until my arrival on campus, contains a core of one course in public policy, a senior seminar/capstone course in public policy, an internship in public policy, seven core courses in other departments, and three units in a policy
track, of which nine were specified. The courses in other departments include Government, Economics, Organizational Behavior and Environment and possibly Sociology if the students elect the Sociology research methods course rather than the similar course in Government. Basically, the proposed major would tie together courses from three other departments plus Public Policy and Administration.

These are standard kinds of things for an undergraduate public policy program. These programs typically center on bringing together economics and political science at their core, with a little bit of quantitative methods and some courses in different policy areas. Typically students with these kinds of skills are well prepared for the job market.

Given that so many of the courses come from other departments, I would consider:

1. **Developing the junior year public policy course into a one-year sequence for the junior year** that would seek to tie together some of the material from other courses as well as covering core public policy material. The second semester could be a course that does international comparisons of public policy, possibly around the Pacific Rim, or one that focuses on urban and minority communities in the U.S., an area that might tie nicely with the proposed person in human resource management / A-side for the graduate program.

2. **Teaching the internship course with a weekly seminar** of some kind along the model of the Assembly, Senate, and Executive fellowship programs, so that more of the tying together of material from different courses and worksites could go on.

3. **Clearly stating whether students have to take the policy track concentrations of three courses all in one department** or whether substituting across departments would be allowed. Should the students have a course’s worth of knowledge from two or three different areas rather than being more concentrated as is appropriate for a graduate level program?

With the internship course and the junior year sequence, you would have a course in the core department for every semester of the junior and senior years, which should tie together the material rather nicely with a minimum expenditure of resources. The courses on public policy might be good electives for majors in other departments as well.

3. **Adequacy of faculty resources for the MPPA program and expansion to the undergraduate major**

See comments above on the faculty being spread too thin. I would think that the addition of one more faculty member and perhaps some work on the workloads of the faculty in the program would enable the undergraduate program to be offered within the current (with the one more person) limits.

4. **Possibility of the PPA program seeking accreditation**

Having been through two accreditation visits from the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, I feel qualified to offer some comments in this area.

First, with the addition of the human resource management person, the program would seem to be accreditable, perhaps even easily or strongly accreditable. The level of proficiency in economics and quantitative methods is very strong by NASPAA standards. Some of the considerations that have come up as being significant in our visits, not to mention the site visits for NASPAA I have done with other CSU campuses and the Master of Public Administration programs, are:

A. **Purpose**—"to provide professional education for leadership in public affairs, policy, administration." These are the purposes of the PPA graduate program.

B. **Program length**—must have been in operation for four years prior to application for accreditation. Program has been in operation for just over a decade.
C. Mission statement – must state a clear mission. My sense is that the mission of the program is clear.

D. Assessment – I found a lot of assessment activities going on, and the program is being and has been modified to take account of these findings.

E. Administrative organization – you need an “identifiable component of faculty and an administrative organization capable of conducting the program effectively.” This area chiefly affects programs that are parts of other units, like Departments of Political Science. Should be no problem.

F. Curriculum – the only missing area is Human Resources – see the NASPAA Standards at http://www.naspaa.org/copra/standards.htm – the others include:
   1. Budgeting and financial processes – covered in PPA 230
   2. Information, including computer literacy and applications – you would argue that this requirement is met through the methods courses, PPA 205 and 207
   3. Application of quantitative and qualitative techniques of analysis, including policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation — met through 200, plus parts of other courses
   4. Decision-making and problem solving – met through several courses
   5. Political and legal institutions and processes – PPA 210 plus others
   6. Economic and social institutions and processes – PPA 220A and 220B plus others
   7. Organization and management concepts and behavior – PPA 240

G. Two years of full time study for beginning students – program now requires this.

H. Five full-faculty at a minimum – program needs one more person.

I. At least 50% of the core and 50% of all courses must be offered by full-time faculty – program exceeds this standard now.

A broader question is whether to seek accreditation. Here I have three thoughts:

- First, most programs in California are accredited. Virtually every program in Southern California is accredited, and in Northern California the CSU campuses at San Jose, Chico, Stanislaus and Fresno are accredited, as is the Naval Postgraduate School. Golden Gate, San Francisco State University, CSUS, and the Monterey Institute of Foreign Study are not accredited.

- Second, accreditation is costly financially and more costly in faculty and administrative time. For accreditation every seven years, a detailed self-study is required (ours typically runs over 100 single spaced pages) with many tables and detailed information by August 30th, with the payment of about $2,000. By late fall, the Committee on Peer Review and Accreditation sends the program a set of questions it has; these require an answer. In winter, a site visit team of three faculty visits the campus and writes a report. The campus is responsible for the site visit team's travel expenses. The program responds, if it wishes, to the site visit team's report. And in June, the Committee on Peer Review and Accreditation makes its decision.

In addition, a report each year on any changes in the program is also required and is reviewed by the Committee.

- The third thought is that I have not as yet seen positive benefits from accreditation in terms of students who are attracted to the program and the like. This may be because the Southern California environment contains only accredited programs, with the exception of an
external degree program coordinated by CSU Northridge and offered in the San Fernando Valley and Ventura.

Other concerns raised by reviewing bodies in my discussions

1. **Admissions standards** – they seem standard for public policy and public administration programs, as I discussed above. I asked each of the faculty whether there was any sense that they had either exhausted the pool or were turning away a lot of potential students. No one had that sense at this time.

2. **Where do students go with the degree?** I didn’t see anything unusual regarding the placements for the degree; no negative comments from the students I spoke with.

3. **PhD in Public Policy** – probably much later. One might need 2-3 additional faculty to support this possibility, given that faculty would need release time for dissertation supervision and other research functions.

4. **Advisory group** – the program has a group, and the group should meet every year or two. It has not met recently.

5. **Is the curriculum too large?** Given that the accreditation group states that two years full time is the appropriate amount for Masters level programs in public policy and administration, I thought the program was appropriate.