2016-2017
Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

MA Public Policy Administration

OR

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [**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, Competency, and Perspectives**
- ☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning
- ☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- ☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- ☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- ☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- ☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- ☐ 19. **Professionalism**
- ☐ 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

Q1.2.1.
Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

○ 1. Yes, for all PLOs

○ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs

○ 3. No rubrics for PLOs

○ 4. N/A

○ 5. Other, specify: [   ]

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 Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip 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", see http://degreeprofile.org) 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

Q1.6.
Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.
Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Select PLO

If your PLO is **not listed, please enter it here**:

Q2.1.1.
Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Q2.2.
Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q2.3.
Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

📎 No file attached　　📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☐	☐	☐	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
☐	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☐	☐	☐	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters

☐	☐	☐	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☐	☐	☐	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
☐	☐	☐	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
☐	☐	☐	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
☐	☐	☐	10. Other, specify:

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?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)

○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

Don't know

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)

○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
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:

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.
Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?
[**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. 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 assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques

☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects

☐ 6. E-Portfolios

☐ 7. Other Portfolios

☐ 8. Other, specify: _____

Q3.3.2.
Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

```
```

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?

○ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

○ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 4. Other, specify: _____ (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.5.
How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

Q3.5.1.
How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Q3.5.2.
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

○ 4. N/A

Q3.6.
How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Q3.6.2.
How many students were in the class or program?

Q3.6.3.
How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

Q3.6.4.
Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: 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 (skip to **Q3.8**)

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 or focus groups

☐ 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:

Q3.7.1.1.
Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.7.2.
If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: 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 (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)

☐ 4. Other, specify: [_____]

Q3.8.2.
Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

[   ]

[📎 No file attached] [📎 No file attached]

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.
Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:

[   ]

[📎 No file attached] [📎 No file attached]

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

[📎] No file attached   [📎] No file attached

Q4.3.
For the 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/standard has been specified

○ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
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

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

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

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on 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 (skip to **Q5.2**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

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.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	○	○	○	○	○
2. Modifying curriculum	○	○	○	○	○
3. Improving advising and mentoring	○	○	○	○	○
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	○	○	○	○	○
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	○	○	○	○	○
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	○	○	○	○	○
7. Annual assessment reports	○	○	○	○	○
8. Program review	○	○	○	○	○
9. Prospective student and family information	○	○	○	○	○
10. Alumni communication	○	○	○	○	○
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	○	○	○	○	○
12. Program accreditation	○	○	○	○	○
13. External accountability reporting requirement	○	○	○	○	○
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	○	○	○	○	○
15. Strategic planning	○	○	○	○	○
16. Institutional benchmarking	○	○	○	○	○
17. Academic policy development or modifications	○	○	○	○	○
18. Institutional improvement	○	○	○	○	○
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	○	○	○	○	○
20. New faculty hiring	○	○	○	○	○
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	○	○	○	○	○
22. Recruitment of new students	○	○	○	○	○

23. Other, specify: [   ]

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

[   ]

Q5.3.
To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	○	○	○	○	○
2. Standards of Performance	○	○	○	○	○
3. Measures	○	○	○	○	○
4. Rubrics	○	○	○	○	○
5. Alignment	○	○	○	○	○
6. Data Collection	○	○	○	○	○
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	○	○	○	○
8. Use of Assessment Data	○	○	○	○	○
9. Other, please specify: [ ]	○	○	○	○	○

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

[   ]

(Remember: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

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

Our department faced a situation in which we were considering multiple significant program changes related to development of a Downtown School of Public Affairs. These changes all could potentially lead to significant restructuring of our main degree (the Master of Public Policy and Administration) or even replacing that degree with a Master of Public Affairs. In this situation, and with a small faculty with multiple responsibilities, we did not have the luxury to conduct the kind of focused assessment envisioned under the assessment framework. Instead, PPA needed to look more holistically at the curriculum, especially with an eye toward reducing the number of core courses since that would be necessary to implement several of the possible curricular changes. Naturally, this meant we should draw on existing assessment data as well as other information.

1. <u>Review of Student Learning Outcome Surveys</u>. For many years, we have conducted end of semester surveys of students about how well we met our program learning outcomes. We do this by collecting data on a five point Likert scale, summarized for each course, and shared with all faculty. We use this information to compare the apparent success at meeting learning goals across objectives, across courses, and over time.

2. <u>Review of Syllabi</u>. The faculty review syllabi for potential errors of overlap between classes and areas that need reinforcement to meet learning goals.

3. <u>Review of Assignments</u>. At our retreat, the faculty discuss in depth the specific assignments used to meet particular learning goals, and especially how well these prepare students to meet the culminating experience (thesis) requirement.

4. <u>Input from Meetings with Graduate Coordinators and Downtown Task Force</u>. The Department has been engaged in extended efforts over a year and half to develop new curricular initiatives, especially that can take advantage of the new Sacramento State downtown building and the proposed Downtown School of Public Affairs. Numerous campus units and stakeholders have been involved, but PPA's role has always been central.

Because of these efforts, we determined it desirable to merge two existing core courses, PPA 220B, "Applied Economic Analysis II" and PPA 240B, "Public Management and Administration II." We concluded students would learn better by *combining* key elements from two quite different disciplines (economics and public management) into a single course that had an especially applied focus.

We drew on multiple sources of information to reach this conclusion:

• Student surveys and other information showed very effective learning occurring for a major group assignment for PA 240B, which aimed at working with Yolo County to develop a county level intervention that would enhance public value. In spring 2017, *all specific survey questions related to how well learning goals were met in that context showed evaluations of above 4.5*. The assignment culminated in a group presentation to Yolo County officials. *These officials uniformly praised the group presentations,* suggesting that students were gaining practical knowledge directly relevant to their careers.

• At the same time, careful review of syllabi & assignments for both PPA 240B and 220B showed that both courses put a major emphasis on a group oral presentation on a topic of practical concern. Faculty determined that there was some redundancy in the presentation sills that each of the courses was aiming to advance. Additionally, the positive experience with Yolo County suggested that it might be possible to combine the management lessons of PPA 240B with the economic lessons of PPA 220B in a single presentation to state/local elected or appointed officials, and/or other stakeholder groups (depending on the particular topics chosen.

• One of the major themes emerging from the work on the Downtown School of Public Affairs was that PPA would need to consolidate its curriculum to make feasible collaborations with various other units.

So in nutshell, we followed our own approach to drawing on assessment data and other information to produce a major curricular change that promises to improve student learning outcomes.

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q7.
What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**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, Competency, and Perspectives**

☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning

☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning

☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**

☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning

☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge

☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**

☐ 19. **Professionalism**

☐ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q8.1.
Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

Program Information (Required)

Program:

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

Q9.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]
MA Public Policy Administration

Q10.
Report Author(s):
Ted Lascher

Q10.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:
Ted Lascher

Q10.2.
Assessment Coordinator:
Ted Lascher

Q11.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Public Policy Admin.

Q12.
College:

College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

Q13.
Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

65

Q14.
Program Type:

○ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major

○ 2. Credential

◉ 3. Master's Degree

○ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)

○ 5. Other, specify:

Q15. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q15.1. List all the names:

Q15.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

N/A

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

Q16.1. List all the names:

Master of Public Policy and Administration

Master of Science in Urban Land Development

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

Q17. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q18. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q18.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan**…	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q19. developed?	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Q19.1. last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●

Q19.2. (REQUIRED)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

📎 **No file attached**

Q20.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q20.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

📎 No file attached

Q21.
Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q22.
Does your program have a capstone class?

◉ 1. Yes, indicate: PPA 500

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q22.1.
Does your program have **any** capstone project?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17