

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess in 2014-2015?** [Check all that apply]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☒ | 1. Critical thinking |
| ☐ | 2. Information literacy |
| ☒ | 3. Written communication |
| ☐ | 4. Oral communication |
| ☐ | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| ☒ | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| ☐ | 7. Creative thinking |
| ☐ | 8. Reading |
| ☐ | 9. Team work |
| ☐ | 10. Problem solving |
| ☐ | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| ☐ | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| ☒ | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| ☐ | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| ☐ | 15. Global learning |
| ☒ | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| ☐ | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| ☐ | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| ☒ | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |

PPA has 16 specific learning objectives (Appendix 1) falling broadly under 3 categories. We assessed 14 of the 16 objectives, as demonstrated in Master's theses (Appendix 2).

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ☒ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know |

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ☐ | 1. Yes |
| ☒ | 2. No (Go to Q1.5) |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know (Go to Q1.5) |

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| ☐ | 1. Yes |
| ☐ | 2. No |
| ☐ | 3. Don't know |

Q1.5. Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ☐ | 1. Yes |
| ☒ | 2. No, but I know what the DQP is |
| ☐ | 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. |
| ☐ | 4. Don't know |

Conceptually we are largely aligned with the DQP focus but our efforts pre-date this work and contain PLO's specific to our program.

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)?

Yes. We understand that you would like the terms further modified, however, given the short turn around between receiving the report and the end of the term (when faculty were available to assist), we did not tackle refinements this year.

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs: The PLO's were developed several years ago and have been continually refined. We use the program objectives to design course objectives. For purposes of the annual assessment we eliminate those PLO's that cannot be assessed in a thesis (oral communication and group work) and then select a subset of completed theses to review. The PLO's are not tied to the BLGs since we are a graduate-only program.	Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs? <table border="1"> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>1. Yes, for all PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>2. Yes, but for some PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☒</td> <td>3. No rubrics for PLOs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>N/A, other (please specify):</td> </tr> </table>	☐	1. Yes, for all PLOs	☐	2. Yes, but for some PLOs	☒	3. No rubrics for PLOs	☐	N/A, other (please specify):
☐	1. Yes, for all PLOs								
☐	2. Yes, but for some PLOs								
☒	3. No rubrics for PLOs								
☐	N/A, other (please specify):								
<i>IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015</i>									
Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO									
Q2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1): This year we were particularly interested in the broader question of how students are being prepared to undertake the thesis. This is larger than a single PLO but as a faculty we were expressing concerns that theses were taking more support at the front end than seemed necessary. We use nearly all of our PLO's to assess thesis quality but some are not relevant for all theses (for example, not every thesis will present alternatives to a particular problem). Using our existing, PLO's we focused on clear problem definition as a starting point (PLO 1.a.) For purposes of this exercise we will describe our assessment of that PLO.	Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO? <table border="1"> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>1. Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☒</td> <td>2. No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>3. Don't know</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐</td> <td>4. N/A</td> </tr> </table>	☐	1. Yes	☒	2. No	☐	3. Don't know	☐	4. N/A
☐	1. Yes								
☒	2. No								
☐	3. Don't know								
☐	4. N/A								
Q2.3. <u>Please provide the rubric(s)</u> and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: [Word limit: 300] We sought a score of 2 (out of 3) or better on the thesis assessment and a 4 (out of 5) or better on the student ratings of course objectives.									

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

☐	1. Critical thinking
☐	2. Information literacy
☐	3. Written communication
☐	4. Oral communication
☐	5. Quantitative literacy
☐	6. Inquiry and analysis
☐	7. Creative thinking
☐	8. Reading
☐	9. Team work
☐	10. Problem solving
☐	11. Civic knowledge and engagement
☐	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
☐	13. Ethical reasoning
☐	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
☐	15. Global learning
☐	16. Integrative and applied learning
☐	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
☐	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
☒	19. Other: "Construct clear definitions of problems.", from our program PLO's.

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	(3) Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	x		
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	x		
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters	x		
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	x		
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university			
8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents	x		
9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents			
10. Other, specify: The PLO's are also shared with the students in the introductory course. We spend considerable time discussing the program expectations, course sequencing, and how the PLO's are taught and expressed throughout the program.			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?

☒	1. Yes
☐	2. No (Skip to Q6)
☐	3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)
☐	4. N/A (Skip to Q6)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2014-2015?

☒	1. Yes
☐	2. No (Skip to Q6)
☐	3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)
☐	4. N/A (Skip to Q6)

Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? 2		Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300] We reviewed six theses (selected to get an array of first readers as well as a mix of quantitative and qualitative theses). Each thesis was read and scored by 2 faculty members. We also asked the faculty who were first readers to independently rate the thesis with an eye towards how much the final product reflected the work of the student versus work driven by faculty. Second, for each course, we publish the PLO's for that course and ask students to rate how well they think the course met the PLO's. While we realize this measure is indirect but we find that it a helpful additional piece of information.	
Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)			
Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Go to Q3.7) ☐ 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)		Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply] ☒ 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences ☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program ☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects ☐ 6. E-Portfolios ☐ 7. Other portfolios ☐ 8. Other measure. Specify:	
Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. Appendix 2 is our assessment rubric for reviewing theses.			
Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one] ☐ 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5) ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty ☒ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) ☐ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) ☐ 7. Used other means. Specify:			
Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☒ 3. Don't know	
		Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	

☐ 4. N/A	☐ 4. N/A	☐ 4. N/A
Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? All faculty members.		Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know
Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? Of the 18 completed theses we randomly chose a selection to insure that all first readers were represented at least once and that we had some quantitative and some qualitative theses.		Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review? Approximately a third was deemed reasonable, but in addition we wanted to keep the total thesis reading load manageable.
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 18	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 6	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)		
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply] ☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) ☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) ☒ 3. College/Department/program student surveys ☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews ☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews ☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews ☐ 7. Other, specify:
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided? All students in each class are surveyed every semester.		
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.		Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate? All students attending class respond, although some classes had absences, most were quite high.
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)		
Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes ☒ 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) ☐ 3. Don't know		Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) ☐ 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? ☐ 1. Yes ☒ 2. No (Go to Q3.9) ☐ 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)	Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:
--	---

Q3D: Alignment and Quality

Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO? ☒ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know
---	--

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III)
[Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]

We found that the PLO is generally being met in the theses (a 2.4 out of possible 3), although 60% of the time the first reader thought the student had struggled more than the reviewers could see in the final product. Two courses, PPA 200 and PPA 220A, include this PLO in learning objectives and thus students were surveyed. In PPA 200 the rating was 3.94 out of a possible 5, in PPA 220A the rating was 4. 24. Attachments 3 (all course PLO assessments) and 4 (our internal thesis assessments) include all of our assessments.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

We had an extensive conversation at our annual retreat and while we were generally comfortable with the results we think there is room for improvement. First, we anticipate changing the wording of the PLO's to better reflect the specific content of the course. This has been done in most courses but not in PPA 200, 240A or 240B. Clarifying the linkage between the specific course objectives and the PLO seems to have helped students to better respond to the specific question.

Second, we will be working on two courses next year to more specifically help students to work on problem definition, a key element in their professional training as well as the thesis.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| ☐ | 1. Exceeded expectation/standard |
| ☒ | 2. Met expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 3. Partially met expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 4. Did not meet expectation/standard |
| ☐ | 5. No expectation or standard has been specified |
| ☐ | 6. Don't know |

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (Go to **Q6**)
☐ 3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No (not formally although the thesis discussion is ongoing)
☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

The changes were discussed above in question 4.2. We will reassess using the same tools next year.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum					x
3. Improving advising and mentoring					x
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			x		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					x
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			x		
7. Annual assessment reports		x			
8. Program review					x
9. Prospective student and family information					x
10. Alumni communication					x
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					x
12. Program accreditation					x
13. External accountability reporting requirement					x
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations			x		
15. Strategic planning					x
16. Institutional benchmarking					x
17. Academic policy development or modification					x
18. Institutional Improvement					x
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					x
20. New faculty hiring					x
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					x
22. Recruitment of new students			x		

23. Other Specify:

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

We use the data as part of our annual retreat to assess program direction. As indicated, this year's focus was on how to improve the thesis preparation. The data allowed us to explore both how thesis questions are being designed, but also questions of data collection and use. The discussions and data led us to develop a new thesis prospectus form and hold "pre-thesis" orientations with all students who anticipate working on a thesis next year.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ | 1. Critical thinking |
| ☐ | 2. Information literacy |
| ☐ | 3. Written communication |
| ☐ | 4. Oral communication |
| ☐ | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| ☐ | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| ☐ | 7. Creative thinking |
| ☐ | 8. Reading |
| ☐ | 9. Team work |
| ☐ | 10. Problem solving |
| ☐ | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| ☐ | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| ☐ | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| ☐ | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| ☐ | 15. Global learning |
| ☐ | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| ☐ | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| ☒ | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline –
We assess similar items comprehensively each year and then
select items for discussion based on either problems we
discover or issues we are concerned about. |
| ☐ | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but
not included above:
a.
b.
c. |

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

1. Program Learning Objectives for the Masters in Public Policy and Administration
2. Scoring rubric and PLO's that were utilized for the review of theses.
3. Student evaluation of course objectives
4. Findings from analysis of theses

Program Information**P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):**
Masters in Public Policy and Administration**P1.1. Report Authors:**
Mary Kirlin**P2. Program Director:****P2.1. Department Chair:**
Mary Kirlin**P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College:**
Public Policy and Administration**P4. College:**
SSIS**P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See [Department Fact Book 2014](#) by the Office of****P6. Program Type: [Select only one]**

- ☐
1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major

Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 45				☐ 2. Credential ☒ 3. Master's degree ☐ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) ☐ 5. Other. Please specify:						
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: P7.1. List all the name(s): P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?				Master Degree Program(s): P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 2 P8.1. List all the name(s): Masters in Public Policy and Administration Masters in Urban Land Development P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 0						
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0 P9.1. List all the names:				Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0 P10.1. List all the name(s):						
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed	x									
P12. Last updated		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								x		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								x		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?								x		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?								x		

Assessing Other Program Learning Outcomes (Optional)

If your program assessed PLOs not reported above, please summarize your assessment activities in the table below. If you completed part of the assessment process, but not the full process (for example, you revised a PLO and developed a new rubric for measuring it), then put N/A in any boxes that do not apply.

Report Assessment Activities on Additional PLOs Here

Q1: Program
Learning
Outcome (PLO)



Q2: Standard of
Performance/ Target
Expectation



Q3: Methods/
Measures
(Assignments)



Q4: Data/Findings/
Conclusions



Q5: Use of
Assessment Data/
Closing the Loop