2018 - 2019
Annual Program Assessment Report

The Office of Academic Program Assessment
California State University, Sacramento

For more information visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

This year OAPA has refined the annual assessment reporting process to make it simple, clear, and of high quality at the same time.

IMPORTANT REMINDER:
Please use the "Guidelines" and "Examples for Answering Open-Ended Questions" to answer each question in the template as you complete the report. Please provide and attach the following information:

1. PLO Assessed **(Q1.1, Q2.1)**
2. Definition of the PLO(s) **(Q2.1.1)**
3. Rubrics and Explicit Program (not class) Standards of Performance/Expectations **(Q2.3)**
4. Direct Measures **(Q3.3.2)**
5. Data Table(s) **(Q4.1)**
6. Curriculum Map **(Q21.1)**
7. Most Updated Assessment Plan **(Q20.2)**

Please provide only relevant information and limit all of your attachments to 30 pages.

Please save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.

DEADLINE TO SUBMIT: JULY 1, 2019.

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 enter program name:

Section 1: Report All of the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

Question 1: All the Program Learning Outcomes Assessed

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) including Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs)or 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. **Research**
☐ 21A. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a. [   ]

b. [   ]

c. [   ]

☐ 21B. **Check here if your program has not collected any data for any PLOs**. Please go directly to Q6 (skip Q1.3.a. to Q5.3.1.)

Q1.3.a.
Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission and/or the strategic plan of the university?
◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know
[Undo]

(**Remember:** **Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.**)

Section 2: Report One Learning Outcome in Detail

Question 2: Detailed Information 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):

[**Written Communication**   ]

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

[   ]

Q2.1.1.
Please provide the definition for this PLO (**See Appendix 15 Sample Answer to Q2.1.1**).

"Practical applications: apply knowledge and skills in a professional setting" is one of three general learning objectives that we strive to impart upon holders of our MPPA. This contains six specific learning objectives of which one is "write effectively for different audiences".

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted ***explicit program standards of performance/expectations*** for this PLO? (e.g. "We expect 80% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 or higher in all dimensions of the Written Communication VALUE rubric.")

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

[Undo]

Q2.2.a.
Please provide the standards of performance/expectations for this PLO:

> At least two-thirds of the items evaluated achieve "developed" or "highly developed" scores.

Q2.3.
Please **provide and/or attach the rubric(s)** that you used to evaluate your assignment**(
[See Appendix 15 Sample Answer to Q2.3](#)):**

📎 Rubric for Assessing the Achievement of Select PPA 205 (v. 2).docx
22.64 KB   📎 Click here to attach a file

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard (stdrd)** 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**)

Undo

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

2

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**)

Undo

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:

Data was collected from the PPA 205 Research Methods course in the fall of 2018 in two ways.

First, students at the end of the semester were given a blinded paper survey and asked how well they thought the specific learning objective of "write effectively for different audiences" was achieved. Options ranged from (1) not accomplished, (2) poorly, (3) satisfactorily, (4) very well, and (5) excellently.

Second, all six PPA full-time faculty were asked to look over seven different student responses to a final assignment asked of 21 fall 2018 PPA 205 students. (Assignment prompt below.)

After looking over each response, the faculty completed the rubric previously given for three-different learning objectives, one of which (B) was for the assessment of how this assignment demonstrated the ability of the student to "write effectively for different audiences". Thus we accumulated two different assessments of initial to highly developed for every student.

(Remember: Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.)

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**)

Undo

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 **attach the assignment instructions that the students received to complete the assignment (**
See Appendix 1 Sample Answer to Q3.3.2):

> Each person is to write a separate paper based on the research you do as a group—I really want each of you to have the experience of making sense of qualitative data. It is a bit mind-numbing at times and it takes time. This will help you understand what you consume better, and it will help you decide if you want to include qualitative methods in your thesis. You will analyze the survey results and analyze the data from the interview and focus group notes. Since the analysis part is the focal point of this assignment, it does not need to be long. The paper needs to be in two parts: one with the findings framed for policymakers and one with the findings reframed for another audience of your choosing. Please keep the paper to six or fewer pages. Make sure to use graphics as relevant (such as pie charts or chi-square tables to display survey findings). Finally, add a paragraph, on a separate page, reflecting on what it was like to reframe the findings for another audience.

📎 **Click here to attach a file**   📎 **Click here to attach a file**

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.**)
[Undo]

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
[Undo]

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

Undo

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

Undo

Q3.5.

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

| 6 |

Q3.5.1.

Please enter the number (#) of faculty members who participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

| 6 |

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

Undo

Q3.6.

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

It was not a sample, but all 21 papers turned in by each student. Each of these was evaluated by two separate faculty.

Q3.6.1.

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

Full sample

Q3.6.2a.
Please enter the number (#) of students *__from ONLY your program__* that were assessed for this program learning outcome (not all students in the class).

21

Q3.6.3a.
Please enter the number (#) of samples of student work *__from ONLY your program__* that were evaluated for this program learning outcome.

21

Q3.6.4.
Was the sample size of student work for this program assessment adequate for assessing this program learning outcome?

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Undo

(Remember: Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.)

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**)

Undo

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:

📎 **Results of Course Assessments PPA 205 Fall 2018.pdf**
68.67 KB   📎 **Click here to attach a file**

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

Handed out in last day of class to all there. Asked to complete in class and turn in without name. All registered students were in attendance and completed the survey.

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

See above, 19/21 students participated.

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, please enter the response rate:

90%

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**)

Undo

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**)

Undo

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

| ⬚ Click here to attach a file | ⬚ Click here to attach a file |

(Remember: Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.
Please provide tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1** (see Appendix 12 in our Feedback Packet Example.) Please do **NOT** include student names and other confidential information. This is going to be a **PUBLIC** document:

| 📎 Sp 19 PPA Assess Score Sheet Final Univ.xlsx 13.17 KB | ⬚ Click here to attach a file |

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 **(See Appendix 15 Sample Answers to Q4.1-Q4.3)**?

The desired standard described earlier is that two-thirds of students receive a score of developed (2) or highly developed (3) from faculty regarding whether their assignment demonstrates an ability to "write effectively for different audiences." As the above EXCEL spreadsheet shows, this was achieved through 29/42 (69%) achieving this.

Regarding the students' indirect assessment of this learning objective, 15/19 (79%) believe that they achieved the goal of "writing effectively for different audiences"

| ⬚ Click here to attach a file | ⬚ Click here to attach a file |

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
Undo

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
Undo

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
Undo

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**)
Undo

Q5.1.1.
Please describe **what changes** you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO.

We discussed these assessment results, along with other information from Professor Andrea Venezia on changes that she made in PPA 205 in fall 2018, at our all-day June 14, 2019, PPA Department Retreat. Based on the discussion, Professor Venezia has decided to make significant changes to the assignment that data gathered from. This primarily involves creating a rubric to evaluate that better aligns with PLO and is give to students along with the assignment instructions.

Q5.1.2.
Do you have a plan to assess the **impact of the changes** that you anticipate making?
◉ 1. Yes, describe your plan:

Professor Venezia will provide an update at spring 2020 PPA department meeting.

○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Undo

Q5.2.

To what extent did you apply **previous assessment results** collected through your program in the following areas? Undo 1-12 Undo 12-23	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improved specific courses	○	○	◉	○	○
2. Modified curriculum	○	○	◉	○	○
3. Improved advising and mentoring	○	◉	○	○	○
4. Revised learning outcomes/goals	○	○	○	◉	○
5. Revised rubrics and/or expectations	○	○	◉	○	○
6. Developed/updated 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:

Altered the material and methods covered in PPA 205, assessed in 2018-19 cycle, will make changes to fall 2019 PPA 205 material and pedagogy.

Q5.3.
To what extent did you apply **previous assessment feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

Undo 1-9

	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 **previous feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

Used a formal rubric to assess PPA 205 assignment's student results to PLO.

(Remember: Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.)

Section 3: Report Other Assessment Activities

Other Assessment Activities

Q6.
If your program/academic unit conducted assessment activities that are **not directly related to the PLOs** for this year (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.), please provide those activities and results here:

Began NASPPA Accreditation process in spring 2019 and will complete in spring 2020.

📎 Click here to attach a file | 📎 Click here to attach a file

Q6.1.
Please explain how the assessment activities reported in **Q6** will be linked to any of your PLOs and/or PLO assessment in the future and to the mission, vision, and the strategic planning for the program and the university:

Need to align or current PLOs with NASPPA accreditation standards. This may require some changes in PPA PLOs.

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. **Research**
- ☐ 21. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q8.
Please explain how this year's assessment activities help you address recommendations from your department's last program review?

The PPA 240A assignment is the basis of helping students learn how to craft a professional literature review on public management topic and using primarily qualitative research studies. This is essential to completing a thesis in the same area.

Paper 4: For this literature review, choose a topic related to organizations and public management that interests you. The review will describe what is known about the topic, what researchers are exploring, and how the ideas are being used in organizations currently. This will require you to review older research in our textbooks, and then search for more current literature. You should conclude this paper with thoughts about what we know, what seems to be missing from our understanding, and what might be possible research or thesis topics based on this review of existing literature. Plan to select a literature review topic by October 3 and clear it with me before you proceed. You should be reading over the course of the semester as I will expect you to be conversant in the topic. A well done literature review involves reading many articles that don't wind up in the review, so anticipate spending a large amount of time reading. We will discuss this paper in class as the semester progresses.

Q9. Please attach any additional files here:

| 📎 Click here to attach a file | 📎 Click here to attach a file |
| 📎 Click here to attach a file | 📎 Click here to attach a file |

Q9.1.
If you have attached **any** files to this form, please list **every** attached file here:

Section 4: Background Information about the Program

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

(If you typed in your program name at the beginning, please skip to **Q11**)

Q10.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name is already selected or appears above]

MA Public Policy Administration

Q11.
Report Author(s):

Rob Wassmer

Q11.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Ted Lascher

Q11.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Ted Lascher

Q12.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit (select):

Public Policy Admin.

Q13.
College:

College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

Q14.
What is the total enrollment (#) for Academic Unit during assessment (see Departmental Fact Book):

70

Q15.
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:

Undo

Q16. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q16.1. List all the names:

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

N/A

Q17. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

Q17.1. List all the names:

Master's in Public Policy and Administration

Master's in Urban Land Development

Q17.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

1

Q18. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q18.1. List all the names:

Q19. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q19.1. List all the names:

Partner with the College of Education for Ed.D.

When was your **Assessment Plan**...	1. Before 2012-13	2. 2013-14	3. 2014-15	4. 2015-16	5. 2016-17	6. 2017-18	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Undo								
Q20. Developed?	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Q20.1. Last updated?	○	○	○	○	○	○	◉	○

Q20.2. (Required)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

📎 **Click here to attach a file**

Q21.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map? Please note: A curriculum map is not a roadmap. A roadmap is a graphical representation of the courses students must take to graduate. A curriculum map is the matrix that represents in which course a certain program learning outcome (PLO), student learning outcome (SLO), or course learning outcome (CLO) was introduced, developed, and/or mastered.**

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know
Undo

Q21.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

📎 Copy of 2013 Revised Mapping of PPA Specific Learning Objectives.pdf
110.95 KB

Q22.
Has your program indicated explicitly in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

◉ 1. Yes
○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know
Undo

Q23.
Does your program have a capstone class?
◉ 1. Yes, specify:

PPA 500

○ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Undo

Q23.1.
Does your program have a capstone project(s)?
○ 1. Yes
◉ 2. No
○ 3. Don't know

Undo

Q24.
BEFORE YOU SUBMIT: Please **check** that you have included all of the following key evidences:
☑ 1. PLO Assessed **(Q1.1, Q2.1)**
☑ 2. Definition of the PLO(s) **(Q2.1.1)**
☑ 3. Rubrics and Explicit Program (not class) Standards of Performance/Expectations **(Q2.3)**
☑ 4. Direct Measures **(Q3.3.2)**
☑ 5. Data Table(s) **(Q4.1)**
☑ 6. Curriculum Map **(Q21.1)**
☐ 7. The Most Updated Assessment Plan **(Q20.2)**

Please do **NOT** include student names and other confidential information. This is going to be a **PUBLIC** document.

<div align="center">

Save When Completed!
(**Remember**: **Save your progress. There is NO "submit" button. After July 1, 2019, the saved report will be considered the final submission.**)

DEADLINE: July 1, 2019.

Thank you and have a great summer!
</div>

ver. 03.**11**.19

Rubric for Assessing the Achievement of Select PPA 205 (Research in Public Policy and Administration) Core Learning Objectives Through Final Assignment*

Core Learning Objective/ Criterion	Initial (0)	Emerging (1)	Developed (2)	Highly Developed (3)
(A) Frame and present problems effectively to different audiences	Very little to no demonstration of an understanding that different audiences require different framing of the problem.			Demonstrates clear delineations in frame, tone, and purpose for different audiences that are appropriate for those audiences.
(B) Write effectively for different audiences	Organizational structure is minimally logical, and purpose of the written work is not readily apparent; only some wording is direct and coherent; there are too many incomplete or run-on sentences or major grammatical or spelling errors.			Organizational structure fully logical, and the purpose of the written work is apparent and explicitly stated; wording is direct and coherent; very few to no incomplete or run-on sentences, or grammatical or spelling errors.
(C) Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy**	Minimal to no mention an understanding that there are differences between taking an advocacy-based approach as compared to an analyst-based approach.			Demonstrates clear delineation – through examples, descriptions, or other means – between differences in evidence use, framing, tone, purpose, and audience between analysis and advocacy.

*** Evaluate this learning objective only if applicable to the audience that the student wrote for.**

Each person is to write a separate paper based on the research you do as a group—I really want each of you to have the experience of making sense of qualitative data. It is a bit mind numbing at times and it takes time. This will help you understand what you consume better, and it will help you decide if you want to include qualitative methods in your thesis. You will analyze the survey results and analyze the data from the interview and focus group notes. Since the analysis part is the focal point of this assignment, it does not need to be long. The paper needs to be in two parts: one with the findings framed for policymakers and one with the findings reframed for another audience of your choosing. Please keep the paper to six or fewer pages. Make sure to use graphics as relevant (such as pie charts or chi square tables to display survey findings). Finally, add a paragraph, on a separate page, reflecting on what it was like to reframe the findings for another audience.

Results of Course Assessments Fall 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Instructor Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
							Ranked						
				5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished									
Venezia													
PPA 205 Research													
section 1													
■ 01. Understand the importance of thinking systematically about how to answer social science questions, including understanding the advantages and limitations of different research designs and methods. (1c)	21	19	8	42.1%	8	42.1%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	**4.11**
■ 02. Understand the advantages and limitations of experiments, surveys, field research, secondary data sets and other approaches to data collection. (2a)	21	19	9	47.4%	7	36.8%	2	10.5%	0	0%	1	5.3%	**4.21**
■ 03. Work effectively in groups.(2b)	21	19	9	47.4%	2	10.5%	5	26.3%	2	10.5%	1	5.3%	**3.84**
■ 04. Frame and present problems effectively to different audiences. (2d)	21	20	5	25.0%	8	40.0%	2	10.0%	3	15.0%	2	10.0%	**3.55**
■ 05. Write effectively for different audiences. (2e)	21	19	4	21.1%	11	57.9%	0	0%	2	10.5%	2	10.5%	**3.68**
■ 06. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy. (3c)	21	17	7	41.2%	5	29.4%	3	17.6%	2	11.8%	0	0%	**4**
Overall Averages for section	21	19	7	37.2%	7	36.3%	2	11.5%	2	8.8%	1	0%	**3.89**
Overall Averages for Venezia	21	19	7	37.2%	7	36.3%	2	11.5%	2	8.8%	1	0%	**3.89**

Results of Course Assessments   Fall 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

						Ranked			
Instructor	**Course**	**Learning Objective**	**Enrolled**	**Polled**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**average**

Overall Totals and Averages   Fall 2018

	Number Enrolled	**Number Polled**	**ranked5**	**ranked4**	**ranked3**	**ranked2**	**ranked1**	**Overall Average**
totals	931	762	429	214	96	15	8	
averages	22.71	18.59	10.46	5.22	2.34	0.37	0.2	4.37
	100%	81.85%	46.08%	22.99%	10.31%	1.61%	0.86%	

Venezia
Course assessment
PPA 205 F2018

At first I was frustrated by the process but ended up learning so much from it. I think making expectations clear in the beginning would help a ton. ☺

I know it is hard, but please just be specific when it is a graded assignment. I thought the question round one was ungraded, would have been good to know when graded.

Allowing us to do a draft of our paper. All professors should use the same standards and platform (canvas)

Great class. Came away feeling very informed.

	Student	Learn Obj A	Learn Obj B - Write effectively for different audiences	Learn Obj C	COMMENTS
Evaluator	S1	2	3	2	
One	S2	1	2	2	Notes: They provided only minimal problem/need framing in their introductions; paper was relatively well structured, but included several instances of passive voice and lack of subject-verb agreement, etc.
	S3	3	3	3	
	S4	2	1	2	
	S5	2	3	NA	Notes: They provided a clear problem/need statement and (re)framed their writing effectively for different audiences--although impact for policy makers was still a bit of a stretch (but this is a tricky challenge); in a few cases, recommendations were not well supported and slipped into
	S6	1	2	NA	
	S7	3	3	3	
	S8	1	2	3	Notes: They generally provided thoughtful analysis, but dove into their findings for political leaders with limited explanation of value or initial source of survey topic identification, etc. The writing structure was generally clear and effective, but there were several proofing errors; they
	S9	2	2	NA	
	S10	1	2	1	
	S11	1	2	1	Notes: I only saw analysis tareted to one (rather than multiple) audiences; they only set up the problem/need in a limited way; their writing is generally clear with some awkward passive voice; they slip into advocacy towards the end of the paper with limited evidence for claims.
	S12	2	2	2	
	S13	2	2	2	
	S14	1	1	2	Notes: They framed the problem effectively for political leaders, but a bit less clearly for Suzi and PPA program readers; they provided appropriate framing and examples/quotes to call out key survey themes and tensions; the writing included significant passive voice and their reflectio
	S15	2	2	2	
	S16	2	2	2	
	S17	1	1	2	Notes: They used questions (including rhetorical questions) rather than clear statements to frame the problem; they summarized findings, but did not include concrete examples or quotes to highlight key findings/themes or tensions; they used significant passive voice and awkward fra
	S18	2	2	1	
	S19	0	0	1	
	S20	2	2	3	Notes: This paper provides a strong description of the research methods and overall aims; I'm not sure, however, that they understood that each section should stand alone targeting a specific audience; the writing is generally clear and concise with only a few modest proofing errors a
	S21	2	1	1	
Evaluator	S1	1	2	2	
Two	S2	1	2	3	
	S3	2	2	2	
	S4	2	1	2	
	S5	2	2	2	
	S6	2	2	1	
	S7	1	2	1	
	S8	3	2	NA	
	S9	3	2	NA	
	S10	2	2	NA	
	S11	0	0	NA	
	S12	3	3	3	
	S13	2	1	NA	
	S14	2	1	NA	
	S15	2	2	NA	
	S16	1	1	NA	
	S17	1	1	NA	
	S18	2	2	NA	
	S19	2	2	1	
	S20	1	1	NA	
	S21	1	1	NA	
Average		1.69	1.76	1.93	
St Dev		0.75	0.73	0.73	
Count 0 - Initial		2	2	0	
Count 1 - Emerging		14	11	8	
Count 2 - Developed		21	24	13	
Count 3 - Highly Developed		5	5	6	

2013 Revised Mapping of PPA Specific Learning Objectives to PPA Core Courses by Primary and Secondary Coverage

GENERAL (SPECIFIC) LEARNING OBJECTIVES	PPA 200	PPA 205	PPA 207	PPA 210	PPA 220A	PPA 220B	PPA 230	PPA 240A	PPA 240B	# Ps	# Ss
(1) Critical and Integrative Thinking: *Synthesize, analyze and offer solutions*											
a. Construct clear definition of problems	P	S		S	P					2	2
b. Identify reasonable alternatives to address problems	S	S			P		P	S		2	2
c. Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions		P	S	S	P	P	P	P	S	5	3
d. Use relevant data	S		P			P		S		2	1
e. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy and administrative problems	S		P	S	P			P	P	4	1
f. Effectively review a literature to help address a problem		S	P	S		S		P	S	2	4
(2) Practical Applications: *Apply knowledge and skills in a professional setting*											
a. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically		P	S	P	S	P	P	S	P	5	3
b. Work effectively in groups	P	P		S		S		P	P	4	2
c. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector				P			S	P	P	3	1
d. Frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding	S	P	P	P	S	P	S		S	4	3
e. Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences	P	P	P		P	S			S	4	2
f. Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation	S			S	P				P	2	1
(3) Professional Role: *Recognize role of profession in society*											
a. Understand your obligation to advance public value	S	S				S	P	S	P	2	3
b. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration	P		S	P	S		P		S	3	3
c. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy	P	P	S	P	P	S				4	2
d. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California	P			P				P		3	0
# Ps	6	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	6		
# Ss	6	3	4	5	3	5	2	4	5	51	33
P = Primary Coverage, S = Secondary Coverage											