2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Department of Public Policy and Administration (PPA)
Sacramento State University

Prepared by

Robert Wassmer
2013-14 PPA Chairperson

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: Master's in Public Policy and Administration

B2. Report author(s): Robert Wassmer

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 61
Based upon the *Department Fact Book 2013*:
(http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
x	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details).

PPA has the 15 specific learning goals listed below.

During this assessment cycle, PPA faculty examined a random sample of 12 completed PPA master's theses for satisfaction of 14 of the 15 PPA specific learning objectives (excluding oral communication). In addition, these 15 learning objectives map back to achievement goals for PPA core courses. PPA students, at the completion of these core courses, then stated how well these goals achieved through a paper survey given at the end of each class.

(1) Critical and Integrative Thinking: *Synthesize, analyze and offer solutions*

a. Construct clear definition of problems
b. Identify reasonable alternatives to address problems
c. Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions
d. Use relevant data
e. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy/administrative problems

f. Effectively review a literature to help address a problem

(2) Practical Applications: *Apply knowledge and skills in a professional setting*

a. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically
c. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector
d. Frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding
e. Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences
f. Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation.

(3) Professional Role: *Recognize role of profession in society*

a. Understand your obligation to advance public value
b. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration
c. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy
d. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California

My interpretation of how these 15 PPA specific learning goals match the learning objectives provided by the university is below (an "x" representing inclusion).

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [*]
x	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
x	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
x	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
x	7. Creative thinking
x	8. Reading
x	9. Team work
x	10. Problem solving
x	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
x	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
x	13. Ethical reasoning
x	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
x	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
x	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

[*] One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

After a 2012-2013 internal and external program reviews, the PPA Master's Program revised its learning objectives to include the 15 PPA specific learning objectives listed above that fall under the three general categories of (1) Critical and

Integrative Thinking, (2) Practical Applications, and (3) Professional Role. We assess the satisfaction of all 15 of the PPA learning objectives through course-specific learning objectives that are mapped to our PPA core courses as listed in Appendix One. We include these course specific learning objectives on the syllabi for each of these courses and students assess how well these achieved in the course. Besides this indirect evaluation of the achievement of these objectives, this year we began a more direct evaluation of how these learning objectives achieved in PPA master's theses. Because this direct evaluation relies on a written product, we can do this for all but one learning objective (2.F. Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation).

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
x	2. No **(If no, go to Q1.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q1.4**)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP)* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
x	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details: http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted EXPLICIT standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **ALL** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
x	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2**)
	4. Don't know (**Go to Q2.2**)
	5. Not Applicable (**Go to Q2.2**)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning

outcome.) Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

See Appendix Two for rubric used to score PPA theses regarding applicable learning objectives. The ideal we are striving for is that graduating PPA thesis students, on average, exhibit a "good" (2 out of 3) achievement of each of the applicable learning goals in their thesis. As the scoring method at the bottom of the rubric indicates, this would result in a faculty accessed score of at least 67% on a thesis.

For the student surveys of core learning objectives (results given below), we expect an achievement of "very well" (4 out of 5) in each of the learning objectives in every core course.

Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q3.1)**

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. In **SOME course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
x	2. In **ALL course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
x	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
x	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
x	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. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Part 3)**
	4. Not Applicable **(Go to Part 3)**

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Part 3)**
	4. Not Applicable **(Go to Part 3)**

Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas

do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Listed first are the student based assessment of how well learning objectives achieved in PPA core courses offered in fall of 2013. Similar course assessments for spring 2014 are not yet available and thus saved for next year's cycle of evaluation. The overall average for all of these assessment scores was 4.3; where 4 represents a "very well" achievement of an objective and 5 represents an "excellent" achievement of an objective. We have decided that a score below 4 indicates an area of possible concern that deserves further discussion on how to do it better.

As shown below, scores below 4 occurred in PPA 200 with objectives (1) Construct clear definition of problem, (4) Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration, and (6) Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in CA; and in PPA 240A with objective (8) Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance.

Results of Course Assessments Fall 2013

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Instructor Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
			5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished										
Boilard													
PPA 230 Public Budgeting													
section 1													
■ 01. Identify reasonable alternatives to address state and local budget and fiscal problems. (1b)	9	9	4	44.4%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.33
■ 02. Analyze and evaluate alternatives for addressing state and local budget and fiscal problems, and offer solutions to these problems based upon this analysis.(1c)	9	9	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.56
■ 03. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically in the examination of budget and fiscal issues. (2a)	9	9	5	55.6%	3	33.3%	0	0%	1	11.1%	0	0%	4.33
■ 04. Understand your obligation to advance public value when considering how to raise and expend public funds.(3a.)	9	9	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.56
■ 05. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in the realm of state and local finance. (3b)	9	9	5	55.6%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.44
Overall Averages for section	9	9	5	57.8%	3	31.1%	1	8.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.44
Overall Averages for Boilard	9	9	5	57.8%	3	31.1%	1	8.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.44

Results of Course Assessments   Fall 2013

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										
Kirlin													
PPA 200 Intro to PPA													
section 1													
■ 01. Construct clear definition of problems (1a)	15	14	3	21.4%	5	35.7%	5	35.7%	1	7.1%	0	0%	3.71
■ 02. Work effectively in groups (2b)	15	14	5	35.7%	7	50.0%	0	0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	4
■ 03. Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences (2e)	15	14	6	42.9%	6	42.9%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	0	0%	4.21
■ 04. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration (3b)	15	14	5	35.7%	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	0	0%	1	7.1%	3.86
■ 05. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy (3c)	15	14	9	64.3%	4	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7.1%	4.43
■ 06. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California (3d)	15	13	3	23.1%	3	23.1%	4	30.8%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	3.38
■ 07. Understand the major research and/or professional onventions, practices, and methods of inquiry of the discipline (Writing Intensive)	15	14	6	42.9%	5	35.7%	2	14.3%	0	0%	1	7.1%	4.07
■ 08. Understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in the discipline (Writing Intensive)	15	14	9	64.3%	0	0%	4	28.6%	1	7.1%	0	0%	4.21
■ 09. Practice reading and writing within the discipline (Writing Intensive)	15	13	9	69.2%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	0	0%	1	7.7%	4.38
■ 10. Practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing (Writing Intensive)	15	13	9	69.2%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	0	0%	1	7.7%	4.38
Overall Averages for section	15	14	6	46.7%	4	27.7%	2	16.1%	1	0%	1	5.1%	4.07
PPA 240A Management I													
section 1													
■ 01. Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions (1c)	24	24	10	41.7%	9	37.5%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%	0	0%	4.17
■ 02. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy and administrative problems (1e)	24	24	11	45.8%	8	33.3%	5	20.8%	0	0%	0	0%	4.25
■ 03. Effectively review a literature to help address a problem (1f)	24	24	7	29.2%	13	54.2%	3	12.5%	1	4.2%	0	0%	4.08
■ 04. Work effectively in groups (2b)	24	24	14	58.3%	4	16.7%	5	20.8%	1	4.2%	0	0%	4.29
■ 05. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector (2c)	24	24	16	66.7%	5	20.8%	3	12.5%	0	0%	0	0%	4.54
■ 06. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California (3d)	24	22	7	31.8%	6	27.3%	7	31.8%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	3.77
Overall Averages for section	24	24	11	45.8%	8	31.7%	4	19.0%	1	2.8%	0	0.7%	4.19
Overall Averages for Kirlin	18	17	8	46.2%	5	29.7%	3	17.6%	1	3.6%	0	2.9%	4.13

Results of Course Assessments   Fall 2013

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										
Lascher													
PPA 205 Research													
section 2													
■ 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)	16	15	11	73.3%	4	26.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.73
■ 02. Understand the advantages and limitations of using different ways to collect data, such as experiments, surveys, field research, and secondary data sets. (2a)	16	14	10	71.4%	4	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.71
■ 03. Work effectively in groups. (2b)	16	15	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.6
■ 04. Frame and present problems effectively to different audiences. (2d)	16	15	10	66.7%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	4.6
■ 05. Write effectively for different audiences. (2e)	16	15	9	60.0%	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.47
■ 06. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy. (3c)	16	13	9	69.2%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.54
Overall Averages for section	16	14	10	69.0%	3	23.0%	1	8.0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.61
Overall Averages for Lascher	16	14	10	69.0%	3	23.0%	1	8.0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.61

Results of Course Assessments Fall 2013

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

	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
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)	18	18	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.78
02. Understand the advantages and limitations of using different ways to collect data, such as experiments, surveys, field research, and secondary data sets. (2a)	18	18	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.78
03. Work effectively in groups.(2b)	18	18	11	61.1%	5	27.8%	2	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.5
04. Frame and present problems effectively to different audiences. (2d)	18	18	5	27.8%	11	61.1%	2	11.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.17
05. Write effectively for different audiences. (2e)	18	18	7	38.9%	5	27.8%	6	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.06
06. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy. (3c)	18	17	9	52.9%	4	23.5%	4	23.5%	0	0%	0	0%	4.29
Overall Averages for section	18	18	10	56.1%	6	30.8%	2	13.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.43
Overall Averages for Venezia	18	18	10	56.1%	6	30.8%	2	13.1%	0	0%	0	0%	4.43

Results of Course Assessments Fall 2013

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										

Wassmer
PPA 220A Economic Analysis I
section 1

	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
01. Using the methods of Bardach and CAM analysis, learn to effectively construct and use a clear definition of a policy problem. (1a)	16	16	7	43.8%	6	37.5%	3	18.8%	0	0%	0	0%	4.25
02. Using the methods of Bardach and CAM analysis, identify reasonable alternatives to address a clearly defined policy problem. (1b)	16	15	4	26.7%	8	53.3%	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	0	0%	4
03. Using the methods of Bardach and CAM analysis, identify and use appropriate criteria to evaluate these alternatives. (1c)	16	15	5	33.3%	6	40.0%	3	20.0%	1	6.7%	0	0%	4
04. Understand the important role of economic concepts (i.e., supply, demand, markets, perfect competition, monopoly, consumer and producer surplus, externalities, public goods) in public policy. (1e)	16	15	10	66.7%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	4.6
05. Practice writing clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences to summarize the application of economic concepts to policy issues.(2e)	16	16	11	68.8%	4	25.0%	1	6.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.62
06. Understand that the role of the policy analyst is to offer advice to policymakers on the desirability of alternative solutions to a policy problem. Both ethical and value neutrality are desired in policy analysis. If personal values enter a policy analysis, they must be noted.(3c)	16	15	10	66.7%	2	13.3%	3	20.0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.47
07. Understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry used in economics for policy analysis. Writing Intensive)	16	15	9	60.0%	3	20.0%	3	20.0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.4
08. Understand the major formats, genres, and styles of writing used in economics for policy analysis(Writing Intensive)	16	15	8	53.3%	2	13.3%	5	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.2
09. Understand the major research and/or professional conventions, practices, and methods of inquiry of economics for policy analysis. Writing Intensive)	16	15	7	46.7%	3	20.0%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	0	0%	4.07
10. Practice reading and writing as a learning process that involves peer and instructor feedback, revision, critical reflection, and self-editing. (Writing Intensive)	16	15	8	53.3%	7	46.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.53
Overall Averages for section	16	15	8	52.0%	4	29.6%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.32
Overall Averages for Wassmer	16	15	8	52.0%	4	29.6%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.32

Data from our assessment of the completed PPA theses from last academic year are in Appendix Three. At the very bottom right of this table is the average score of 73.83% assigned these theses by PPA faculty in the achievement of relevant learning goals. **Thus, on average, we are achieving our goal of being above the 67% strived for thesis completers achieving a "good" on the achievement of specific learning goals in their theses.** However, there were four occasions (out of 22) that a faculty evaluator rated a thesis at less than 67%. These include Thesis B by Evaluator 2 (B2) at 38.2%, C1 at 61.9, E2 at 52.4, and I1 at 46.7. For each of these four lower performing theses we feel it

appropriate to note any consistencies on a specific learning objective for why they achieved a lower score. We do this below by noting where more than half of the four under-performing theses received a score less than two on a learning objective.

Learning Objective	# Theses Receiving Less than Two for Learning Objective
1(a) Construct clear definition of problem	2
1(c) Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions	3
1(e) Draw upon multiple disciplines to help address a problem	2
3(a) Understands your obligation to advance public value	2
3(b) Consider the ethical dimensions of choice in PPA	2

The consistencies that emerge through both the student assessment of course specific learning objectives, and faculty assessment of a sample of PPA theses are possible concerns relating to PPA learning objectives: 1(A) Construct clear definition of problem, 3(B) Consider ethical dimensions of choices, and 4(D) Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in CA.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes?

Q3.4.1. PLO1: [_____Critical Thinking_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO2: [_____Information Literacy_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO3: [_____Written Communication_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO4: [_____Oral Communication_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO5: [_____Quantitative Literacy_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard

	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO6: [_____Inquiry and Analysis_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO7: [_____Creative Thinking_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO8: [_____Reading_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO9: [_____Team Work_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO10: [_____Problem Solving_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO11: [_____Civic Knowledge and Engagement_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO12: [_____Intercultural Knowledge and Competency_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set

	5. Don't know

PLO13: [_____Ethical Reasoning_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
x	3. Do not **fully** meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO14: [_____Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning _____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO16: [_____Integrative and Applied Learning_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

PLO18: [_____Overall Competencies' in discipline_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
x	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? 16

Q4.2. Please choose ONE ASSESSED PLO as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency

x	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

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.4)**
	3. Don't know (**Go to Q4.4)**

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [Check all that apply]

x	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other 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:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

We chose the spring 2013 and fall 2013 semesters to draw a random of sample of approximately half (12) of the total PPA theses completed. Since we had eight PPA faculty available to assess these theses, and we desired each thesis to be assessed by at least two faculty, each faculty was assigned three theses to look over and evaluate according to the rubric in Appendix Two. One faculty member took an unexpected medical leave and was unable to complete the assignment (hence, the missing values in the results recorded in Appendix Three).

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
x	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
x	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

As noted above, we randomly selected about half of PPA master's theses completed within the past academic year.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.5)**

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
x	3. College/Department/program conducted 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. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

We administered the student surveys of core learning objectives in paper form on the last day of meeting for all PPA Core Courses. We then compiled results and entered them into a database used to generate the previously shown summary results. Participation rates were from 60 to 100 percent of the students enrolled in these classes.

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.6)**

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was 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. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
x	2. No **(Go to Q4.7)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.7)**

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]
Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data?

As described above, paper surveys given to students in all nine PPA core courses: PPA 200, 205, 207, 210, 220A, 220B, 230, 240A, and 240B.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? 2
 NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results from 2012-2013 been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
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		x
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

During the 2012-13 academic year, the PPA Master's Program went through an internal review (required by the university every five years) that also involves an external visit. We used the findings from our previously developed assessment practices as evidence in these reviews. The PPA Department received high praise in general from internal and external reviewers and some suggestions that we incorporated into some revisions of PPA Program learning objectives. (see http://www.csus.edu/ppa/about/programreview/2012/2013%20Final%20Internal%20Report%20PPA%20Program%20Review.pdf and http://www.csus.edu/ppa/about/programreview/2012/2013%20Final%20Internal%20Report%20PPA%20Program%20Review.pdf . Because of these reviews, we added the direct assessment of PPA theses completed this spring.

Q5.2. As a result of the assessment effort in 2013-2014 and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q5.3)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q5.3)**

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications?

Changes that we will implement based upon the three PPA learning objectives found to be less than fully satisfied, are:

(1) Construct clear definition of problem: After thorough discussions among faculty as to why this may have emerged as a concern in the student survey of PPA 200 course learning objectives, and in some of the PPA thesis evaluated, a consensus emerged that a remedy is likely through new methods of teaching the construction of a clear definition of problem. There was also an agreement reached among PPA faculty that thesis primary advisors pay closer attention to this essential aspect of PPA theses when advising.

(2) Understand the ethical dimensions of Choices to PPA: After receiving the outcome from student surveys that the achievement of this goal is not at the desired level in the PPA gateway course, we held a series of discussions at bi-weekly PPA department meetings on relevant ethics to consider for a PPA curriculum. This discussion begin with PPA faculty reading "Re-thinking Ethical Leadership: An interdisciplinary integrative approach" that appeared in the academic journal *The Leadership Quarterly* in 2012, and reviewing the American Society of Public Administrator's (ASPA) code of ethics . We then held structured discussions that resulted in a greater understanding of the role of ethics in our curriculum, and in particular how to better integrate it into PPA 200. This issue was also a topic of discussion at our annual spring PPA retreat when confirmed that this concern also arose in our evaluation of some PPA master's theses. The consensus reached was that primary thesis advisors pay closer attention to asking the PPA student to include appropriate elements of ethics in their theses, especially in the concluding chapter.

(3) Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in CA: After receiving the outcome from student surveys that achievement of this goal below the desired level in the PPA gateway course, we asked all faculty their thoughts on what this learning goal signified for the PPA Program (the results are included in Appendix Four). We followed this with a reading by all PPA faculty of the academic article on "Organizational Culture, Social Equity, and Diversity: Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern Era" that appeared in the *Journal of Public Affairs Education* in 2004. We then held structured discussions at PPA faculty meetings that resulted in a greater understanding by all on the role of diversity in our curriculum, and in particular how to better integrate it into PPA 200 and 240A. This issue was also a topic of discussion at our spring PPA retreat when confirmed that this concern also arose in our evaluation of PPA master's theses. The consensus reached being that primary thesis advisors pay closer attention to asking the PPA student to include appropriate elements of diversity in their theses, especially in the concluding chapter.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here.

We continually collect data, and discuss this data at biweekly department meetings, on the concerns that specific students are having in PPA courses taught in a semester, their overall progress and time to degree completion, and their specific progress in PPA 500 toward completing their thesis. Overall, desired outcomes in these areas have improved over the last few years due to these discussions and the specific changes instituted in new student orientation, advising, and expectations to begin PPA 500 (our culminating project course).

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

We will employ the same assessment methodology next year. Thus, we will assess the same PLOs as this year.

x	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [*]
x	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
x	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
x	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
x	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
x	7. Creative thinking
x	8. Reading
x	9. Team work
x	10. Problem solving
x	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
x	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
x	13. Ethical reasoning
x	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
x	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
x	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you develop the current assessment plan?

x	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010

	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **developed** a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last update your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
x	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: PPA 500

A6. Does the program have ANY capstone project?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Public Policy and Administration

A9. 2014-15 Department Chair's Name: Mary Kirlin

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: 1

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
x	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A12.1. List all the name(s):

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 0

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 2

A13.1. List all the name(s): Master's in Public Policy and Administration and Master's of Science in Urban Land Development

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 1 for MPPA

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A14.1. List all the names:

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s):

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

x	1. Yes
	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: Master's of Science in Urban Land Development

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: Concentration in Collaborative Governance

APPENDIX ONE: Mapping of PPA Learning Objectives to Specific PPA Core Courses

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											

RUBRIC FOR SCORING PPA THESES REGARDING GENERAL AND SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Thesis Author: _____   **Percentage Overall Score:** _____

GENERAL (SPECIFIC) LEARNING OBJECTIVES	(3 Points) Exceptional - complete and thorough	(2 Points) Good - mostly complete	(1 Point) Fair - incomplete	(0 Point) Poor - not addressed and should be or incorrect/misapplied	(One If) Applicable
(1) Critical and Integrative Thinking: *Synthesize, analyze and offer solutions*					
a. Construct clear definition of problems					
b. Identify reasonable alternatives to address problems					
c. Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions					
d. Use relevant data					
e. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy/administrative problems					
f. Effectively review a literature to help address a problem					
(2) Practical Applications: *Apply knowledge and skills in a professional setting*					
a. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically					
c. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector					
d. Frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding					
e. Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences					
(3) Professional Role: *Recognize role of profession in society*					
a. Understand your obligation to advance public value					
b. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration					
c. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy					
d. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California					
	A	B	C	D	E
Totals					

Instructions to Score:

There are 14 possible categories. If no "not applicable" (value E is 14), then 42 (14 x 3) possible points, and % score is (value A + value B + value C + value D) / 42. If value E is greater than zero, then calculate % score as (value A + value B + value C + value D) / (value E x 3)

Handwrite qualitative comments here:

THESIS IDENTIFIER / REVIEWER NUMBER	A-1	A-2	B-1	B-2	C-1	C-2	D-1	D-2	E-1	E-2	F-1	F-2	G-1	G-2	H-1	H-2	I-1	I-2	J-1	J-2	K-1	K-2	L-1	L-2	Row Total	[(Row Total / (# Reviewer Responses*3))]*100
(1) Critical and Integrative Thinking: Synthesize, analyze and offer solutions																										
a. Construct clear definition of problems	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2		2		2	3	3		2	3	52	82.5%
b. Identify reasonable alternatives to address problems	2	2	3	1	2	3			3		2	3	3	2	3						2	3	3	3	43	84.3%
c. Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	3		3	2		1				2	3	2	3	43	75.4%
d. Use relevant data	2		3	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2		0		3	2	3		2	3	46	76.7%
e. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy/administrative problems			2	1	2	3	3	2	3		2	2	3	1	2		1		3	1	3		2	2	38	70.4%
f. Effectively review a literature to help address a problem	3	3	1	1	2	3	3	2	3		2	3	3	3	2		2		3	3	3		2	3	53	84.1%
(2) Practical Applications: Apply knowledge and skills in a professional setting																										
a. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically	2		2	2	2	2	3	2	2		2	3			3	2	1		3	2	3		2	2	40	74.1%
c. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector	3	2	1	1	2	3		1	3		2	3	1	3	1				3	2	2				33	68.8%
d. Frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding	2	2		1	2		2	2	3			3			3	2	2			2			2		28	71.8%
e. Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to various audiences	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3		3	3			3	2	2		2	2	1				38	74.5%
(3) Professional Role: Recognize role of profession in society																										
a. Understand your obligation to advance public value	3	3	3	1	2	2		1	3		3	3	2	3	1		2		2	3	2		2	3	42	77.8%
b. Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration		1	1	1	1	3	2		3		2	1	2	0	1	2			1	3	2	3			29	56.9%
c. Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy		1	2	0	2	3	3	1	3		3	3			3		1		2	3	3	2			35	72.9%
d. Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California		1	1	2	2		2	3	2	1	2	0	1	2			3			1	2				25	55.6%
Row Total	23	22	26	16	26	33	28	21	41	11	35	36	17	33	28		14		20	26	35		27	27		Average Overall Score
% Overall Score	77%	73%	66.7%	38.1%	61.9%	84.6%	93.3%	58.3%	97.6%	52.4%	83.3%	92.3%	63.0%	84.6%	66.7%	#DIV/0!	46.7%	#DIV/0!	95.2%	66.7%	89.7%		69.2%	90.0%		

APPENDIX FOUR: PPA Faculty statements on the role of diversity in PPA curriculum

Thoughts on PPA Core Learning Objective: "Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in CA".

ROB: CA, by many different metrics, has grown far more diverse in terms of race/ethnicity and household income/wealth than it was just 30 or 40 years ago. In fact, some have called it one of the most diverse group of people ever in human history to fall under one form of government. Diversity also arises in terms of geographical size and the economic bases that make up the multiple and distinct regions of CA. PPA students should comprehend this diversity and the unique challenges/opportunities it presents for effective governance at the state, county, and city levels. Perhaps this is best done in 200. While 210 emphasizes the practical political challenges/opportunities this generates and 240A the public administrative challenges/opportunities.

"Organization Cultures, Social Equity, and Diversity: Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern Era" *Journal of Public Affairs Education* (2004)
http://www.naspaa.org/initiatives/jpae/pdf/organizational.pdf

Diversity Teaching Game http://mije.org/diversitygame?gclid=CKffpIrv07wCFcNffgoduk4AkQ

STEVE: As for the learning objective concerning diversity: I tend to take a literal view of the term. As applied in the social sciences, the term connotes (for me) a broad range of individuals, not simply the presence of individuals belonging to a minority group. (I feel a need to make this distinction because I occasionally hear "diverse" as a substitute for "minority," as in "those students are diverse" when they are all black.) More to the point, diversity (for our purposes) can encompass different facets: race, gender, ethnicity, ideology, party affiliation, age, religion, etc. So, when we talk about "Understanding the significance of diversity in effective public governance in CA," I think of this essentially as related to pluralism. How a group of people with diverse views/beliefs/backgrounds/values be effectively governed? How can they be represented in a single-member district? How can policies be developed that are appropriate for all the individuals in this diverse group? I believe these are import and difficult questions.

SU JIN: http://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/NS/document/DiversityGuideline.pdf
NASPAA guidelines
Diversity = minorities, women, people w/ disabilities students to develop a capacity to function in organizational settings with diverse work forces, clients and related groups 1. Development of specific course and/or workshops dealing with race and gender.
2. Use of prominent women and minority officials as guest speakers in courses, workshops or special programs.
3. Design of internship experiences to place students under the supervision of women and minority agency mentors.
4. Throughout the curriculum, use of case studies, simulations and problem solving exercises which either feature women and/or minorities in leadership roles or which examine issues of particular concern for women and minorities.
5. Integration within a range of courses of research studies relating to women and minorities.

http://www.naspaa.org/jpaemessenger/article/vol16-4/11_16n04_ricehand.pdf
Changes in demographics of who use public services (schools, jails, transit, parks, etc)
Administration – how have organizations dealt with these changes?

Culture, equity, administrative neutrality, organizational efficiency and effectiveness
Diversity management, cultural competence

http://www.naspaa.org/accreditation/ns/document/UofMinnesota.pdf
U of minn diversity plan – see starting on page 4

1. Expand the aspects of diversity discussed in the classroom (privilege, class, gender, race, ability, sexuality, etc.), with attention to historical and contemporary instances of institutional discrimination.
2. Continue to incorporate non-Western perspectives in readings, case studies, and theories.
3. Require an explicit diversity statement for all class syllabi.
4. Create a training module or experience that prepares students for teamwork in diverse groups at the beginning of each degree program (fall semester, year 1).
5. Hire a graduate research assistant to help faculty and staff members develop and integrate new diversity content and assignments into their courses.

http://www.naspaa.org/jpaemessenger/Article/VOL18-4/09_ryan.pdf
student-led self-study

DAVID: My thanks for the info on NASPA. I wonder if they have a resource for faculty members to share information about how to teach this concept of diversity? I assume it would be helpful to know how others teach the content, the books and activities, etc.

The use of the objective of diversity in collaborative policy is more along the lines that Steve described. As we relate in our book diversity is one of the key conditions to achieving collaborative rationality. This relates to the idea that anyone who is effected or has information about an issue should be involved or represented in decision making and that all forms of knowledge are legitimate. It also goes to the idea that diversity in this sense is central to achieving better and more innovative decisions, a more adaptive and learning public, and a more just society. There is a literature in collaborative policy that addresses this and I do use some lessons and activities in my class to get this approach to diversity across.

ANDREA: About the learning objective regarding diversity -- this is a useful exchange. I would add to Rob's that I think it's constructive also to discuss the possible benefits of a diverse group of backgrounds, perspectives, etc. I think Steve brought up critically important questions that I think are at the heart of the issues our students should be discussing with regard to this issue.

NANCY: I don't know that I have anything to add to the good thoughts on diversity that I have seen others send around. I remember last time we talked about this I mentioned the treatment that Peter Schrag gives to the topic in one of his books in which he argues that CA has lost its communitarian ethic as a result of the inability of its governance to accommodate increased diversity. He is dealing mostly with ethnic diversity in that argument, but not exclusively, also mentioning the diverse economies of the state's regions. He talks about how the increased use of the initiative has been an accommodation to the lack of representative democracy to feel representative in this new diverse order. So I think any treatment of the issue should include looking at the impact on mechanisms of governance, including the initiative.

PIERRE: Regarding the teaching objective on "significance of diversity" in effective public governance, I don't have much to add to Su Jin, Steve, and your contributions. While I was Chair of the UCD Graduate Student Association (a while ago), I was signatory to the "Principles of Community" document. I found it more than a bit ironic that even in a place

like UCD, breakdowns in effective governance occur in response to diversity of views - expressed as non-violent protest. Below are those principles. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on how to incorporate within a public policy course, a greater understanding of the importance of diversity to effective public policy.

The Principles of Community - "The University of California, Davis, is first and foremost an institution of learning and teaching, committed to serving the needs of society. Our campus community reflects and is a part of a society comprising all races, creeds and social circumstances. The successful conduct of the university's affairs requires that every member of the university community acknowledge and practice the following basic principles:

*We affirm the inherent dignity in all of us, and we strive to maintain a climate of justice marked by respect for each other. We acknowledge that our society carries within it historical and deep-rooted misunderstandings and biases, and therefore we will endeavor to foster mutual understanding among the many parts of our whole.

*We affirm the right of freedom of expression within our community and affirm our commitment to the highest standards of civility and decency towards all. We recognize the right of every individual to think and speak as dictated by personal belief, to express any idea, and to disagree with or counter another's point of view, limited only by university regulations governing time, place and manner. We promote open expression of our individuality and our diversity within the bounds of courtesy, sensitivity and respect.

*We confront and reject all manifestations of discrimination, including those based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, status within or outside the university, or any of the other differences among people which have been excuses for misunderstanding, dissension or hatred. We recognize and cherish the richness contributed to our lives by our diversity. We take pride in our various achievements, and we celebrate our differences.

*We recognize that each of us has an obligation to the community of which we have chosen to be a part. We will strive to build a true community of spirit and purpose based on mutual respect and caring."

MARY: I asked 240B students to weigh in on what the diversity objective should/does mean. Not everyone weighed in but there are some interesting perspectives. Here are their thoughts, copied from the page I circulated:

Recognize that different cultural groups relate differently to public organizations.

Understanding the interconnectivity between one's role/decisions and how those decisions/actions affect other people and public organizations.

The "diversity" learning objective seems like a piece of the broader concept of understanding context and its implications for what a job in policy requires. (Understanding differing cultures, interests/values, audiences.)

Developing cultural competence to treat colleagues, clients, and constituents with respect.

How large an effect diversity can have on the way government organizations operate.

The challenges facing policymakers given competing interests and how to make decisions.

Diversity of interests and perspectives from different groups in CA that influence darning public policy problems and developing solutions to address those problems.

How the multiple groups and perspectives form public organizations.

Diversity means that no matter the minority, its views are considered in the debate.

How to get questions, challenges and perspectives heard.