

2006-07 Assessment Report

Department of Public Policy and Administration

California State University, Sacramento

November 5, 2007

Submitted by: Robert W. Wassmer, Chairperson

Approved by: All Full-Time PPA Faculty Members

As requested annually by Academic Affairs at California State University, Sacramento, this report offers a description of the Public Policy and Administration (PPA) Department's assessment activities during the 2006-07 academic year. In this report we offer a brief background on the PPA learning outcomes targeted for assessment, measures used to evaluate progress toward those goals, what the results of these measures tell us about our program, and – perhaps most importantly – changes made or planned in response to the assessments. This report concludes with how our annual assessments in 2006-7 and 2007-08 develop a re-occurring assessment cycle that will facilitate continuous review of the PPA Program and steady progress toward better achieving our identified learning outcomes.

In 2005, the Department's program review made the following recommendation:

“The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue efforts both in development of assessment measures and in utilizing results of student learning outcomes for program improvement.”

Since then, the chair and faculty of the Department of Public Policy and Administration have made a concerted effort to make assessment data, curriculum concerns, ideas for new initiatives,

and other related topics a primary point of discussion at our annual retreat and at least one of the monthly department meetings that we have during each semester of the academic year. This was again the case again for the 2006-07 academic year.

Background

The PPA Department' assessment strategy is built around a set of student learning outcomes organized by five major categories: (1) Critical Thinking, (2) Integrative Thinking, (3) Effective Communication for Policy Audiences, (4) Understanding of Professional Role, and (5) Practical Applications. Within each of these five PPA macro-level learning objective categories, the faculty have identified micro-level learning outcomes (see Table 1 at end of report). A first step in assessing whether students attain these learning outcomes is to examine the degree to which students are exposed to these knowledge sets and skills throughout the core curriculum. We have employed an updatable matrix that displays which courses cover which learning outcomes and to what degree. An indicator of "P" (primary coverage) or "S" (secondary coverage) indicates how the faculty feel that each core course addresses each learning outcome.

In addition, individual faculty who teach our 9 core courses have developed specific learning outcomes for each of these courses that fall under the five major student learning outcomes listed above. As an example, for PPA 220A (Applied Economic Analysis I) there are two student macro learning outcomes that are each designed to be met in two micro-specific ways:

- Critical Thinking

- (1) Be able to explain and offer examples of the five reasons that policy analysts offer for government intervention in a market economy (lack of information, firms acting as price setters, externalities, public goods, and an inequitable distribution of income/wealth).

(2) Develop the knowledge to understand the “Kaldor/Hicks” approach to justifying the efficiency of government intervention and the interaction of the three sources of wisdom illustrated in “Munger’s Triangle.”

- Practical Applications

(3) Have a basic understanding of some of the technical tools used in policy analysis and their application in actual policy concerns (CAM analysis, probability, time value of money, benefit/cost assessment, etc.)

(4) Understand basic microeconomic concepts such as opportunity cost, marginal decision making, supply and demand, elasticity, market equilibrium, industrial structure, etc. and their application to policy analysis using real world examples.

Our department’s assessment instruments prior to the 2007-08 academic year focused on two tools: *Surveys* and a *Review of Sample Theses*. Every semester for the last five academic years, the PPA Department has conducted end-of-semester surveys of students in each of the nine graduate core courses (excluding the thesis seminar, PPA 500, which is tailored more toward meeting the particular, individual needs of students writing theses) regarding student opinion on the attainment of specific course learning goals that are laid out in the syllabus. The department has also conducted a periodic review of a sample of theses completed during the previous academic year to determine how well these culminating projects reflect the skills we wanted students to have obtained by the end of their graduate studies.

Specific Assessment Actions Completed During the 2006-07 Academic Year

During the 2006-07 Academic Year, all PPA instructors of the nine core courses listed in Table 1 gave an end of the semester survey to students asking their opinions on the degree that the specific learning goals for a course had been achieved. The results of those surveys are included in Tables 2 and 3 (at the end of this report). These results were presented to faculty during our June 2007 retreat and discussed amongst us all. These results will serve as information for further discussion during the 2007-08 academic year. Faculty who received relatively low

evaluations from students in regard to the achievement of specific course outcomes are asked to consider how they can change their pedagogy and/or content to raise these assessments in the future. We plan on using these 2006-07 student-survey assessments as a baseline that will be reported along with all future student survey assessments to see if this improvement is occurring.

In addition, at our June 2007 retreat we had an extensive discussion of the specific outcomes we chose to list under each of the five major student learning outcomes included in Table 1. This resulted in some substantial changes and we then decided to re-circulate this assessment matrix among faculty teaching these nine courses for a re-evaluation of how each course met newly chosen specific learning goals. The result was the completed matrix that is Table 1. In this table we have highlighted specific learning outcomes (in yellow) that appear to not be well covered. We have also placed question marks in cells that from an initial discussion it was thought that these areas should be covered in these courses, but for whatever reason the instructor indicated that they are not. This table now offers a basis for a future discussion on how to possibly rethink some of these courses so they better fulfill our learning objectives.

At our June 2007 retreat it was also decided that it was time for another evaluation of student theses and this should be completed in the 2007-08 academic year. Furthermore, a major innovation in our assessment practices was widely discussed and will be implanted in the 2007-08 academic year. This innovation draws upon the concept of “value added” and attempts for the first time to try and measure the change in learning outcomes from a student first enrolled in our Master’s program and taking PPA 200 (Introduction to Public Policy and Administration) to when they are done with their Master’s education and beginning their thesis in our capstone course PPA 500 (Thesis Supervision).

Instructions for an assignment due on the first day of PPA 200 are listed below:

Identify a current public (governmental) issue that you have some interest in and provide a decision maker with a briefing memo about the issue. As appropriate, consider the political, organizational and policy dimensions of the issue. Help the reader understand the complexities of the issue as well as how the issue may be understood differently by different groups of interested people. Be careful to distinguish between fact and opinion in your analysis. This paper will provide a baseline assessment of your writing.

Similarly, the exact same instructions are given on an assignment due on the first day of PPA 500. The instructors for these two courses will grade these assignments using a rubric based upon the specific student learning outcomes contained in Table 1. A comparison of these rubrics for all papers written by students before they took any PPA Master's courses, and all students who have completed the entire PPA Master's degree core courses, will provide a valuable measurement of the value added in regard to the specific learning outcomes that we wish to impart.

Specific Assessment Actions to Be Completed During the 2007-08 Academic Year

A fall 2007 PPA Department Meeting will be devoted to discussing the distribution of "Ps" and "Ss" in Table 1. Are we satisfied with both the primary and secondary coverage of our specific learning objectives throughout the PPA curriculum? If we are not satisfied, then in consultation with core instructors we will craft specific changes to increase the coverage of learning outcomes in specific courses. In this same meeting we will hear a report from the instructor(s) of PPA 200 and PPA 500 in differences in the student outcomes achieved in the same paper required to be written in both. This will generate further discussion of how to change our curriculum to better meet learning outcomes that do not appear to be being reached to the degree that we desire over the course of the Master's education we are offering in PPA.

In late fall of 2007, Chairperson Rob Wassmer will ask four full-time PPA Professors to randomly choose one PPA thesis that they have supervised in the last academic year. These six theses will then be photocopied without identification and passed out to all full-time faculty

members so they can look them over during the January intersession period. Along with the theses, full-time faculty will receive an assessment matrix based upon the general and specific learning objectives listed in Table 1. Faculty will be asked to rate these theses using this assessment matrix. A spring of 2008 department meeting will be used to discuss these results in regard to what they imply for possible curricular reform.

As has been departmental practice for the last several years, we will hold our annual retreat in early June of 2008. A significant portion of this retreat will be used to analyze and discuss the assessment data gathered over the past academic year. This includes new surveys of students in regard to the achievement of learning outcomes in specific PPA core courses, information on the degree of value added that the current PPA curriculum has generated (as assessed by the pre and post tests in PPA 200 and PPA 500), and in the achievement of our department's learning objectives by examining a mixed sample of faculty determined strong and weak theses. The focus of this discussion will be back on Table 1 and better trying to match our desired learning outcomes to what we teach in our core curriculum.

This cycle of examining student surveys, pre and post tests, and thesis will consistently be repeated every academic year and will be our method of generating a culture of continual improvement regarding using student assessment tools to improve student learning outcomes.

TABLE 1: ASSESSMENT MATRIX FOR PPA CORE										
General	Specific	<u>200</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>220A</u>	<u>220B</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>240A</u>	<u>240B</u>
		=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
Critical thinking										
	problem definition	P	S	P	P	P			S	S
	research design and causal inference		P							
	delineation of options				S	P			S	S
	implementation considerations						P		S	S
	ethical implications of choices	S	S	S		S	S		S	
Integrative thinking										
(interdisciplinary skill sets	economic concepts and analysis					P	P			
brought to bear on public	political environment and analysis				P	S	S		S	S
policy analysis)	techniques of policy analysis	S				P	S			
	budgeting concepts and budget analysis									
	organizational analysis/change/development								P	P
	statistical analysis		S	P			S			
Effective communication for policy audiences										
	report writing	P	P	P		S	S		S	?
	memo writing	P			P	S	S		?	?
	presentation of technical information	S	S	S		S	S			
	oral presentations	P	S	S					S	S
	effective use of presentation technology	P								S

		<u>200</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>220A</u>	<u>220B</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>240A</u>	<u>240B</u>
Understanding professional role		=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=	=
	role of public sector in democratic/market system	P			S	P	S			
	role of nonprofit sector	P							?	?
	California policy context	P			?	S	P		S	
	intergovernmental relations	S			S		P		S	
	role of policy analyst	S	P	P	S	P	S			
	role of public manager	S							P	P
	public sector workplace and role ethics	S			P					S
Practical applications										
	influencing the policy process				P	S	S			S
	practical problem solving		?			P	P		P	
	data collection -- how and where to get data		P	P		S	S			?
	use of statistical and other data		S	P			S			
	benefit/cost analysis					P	P			
	group collaboration skills	S			S	S	S			S
	understanding budgets									
	performance measurement								S	S
	strategic planning								S	P
	conflict resolution				P				S	
Key:										
P = primary coverage										
S = secondary coverage										
Blank = not covered										

Fall 2006 Learning Objective Averages by Course

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course	Outcome Category	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked					average
					5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 200 Intro to PPA			5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Effective Communication									
	Improving written and oral presentation skills		17	16	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.56
	Integrative Thinking									
	Developing an appreciation of the complexity of approaches that must be employed to fully understand public issues and organizations		17	16	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.75
	Familiarizing students with the major intellectual traditions of the study of public policy and administration including political science, economics and social psychology/public administration		17	16	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Understanding the key institutional features of governmental structures, especially at the California state and local level		17	16	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	3.38
	Practical Applications									
	Developing ethical perspectives relative to the roles and responsibilities of those individuals working on public issues		17	16	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Enhancing the ability of students to work effectively in small groups		17	16	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.88
	Understanding Professional Role									
	Strengthening the capacity of students to accurately assess their own professional strengths and weaknesses and work towards accomplishment of professional goals		17	16	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.25
	Overall Averages for course				<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.29
PPA 205 Research			5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking									
	Appreciate some of the ethical considerations applicable to applied social science research.		24	17	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.59
	Appreciate some of the ethical considerations applicable to social science research		21	17	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.59
	Appreciate the importance of thinking systematically about establishing causality.		24	17	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	1	1	<u>0</u>	4.35
	Appreciate the use of literature in developing sound research question		21	17	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.76
	Understand and appreciate the appropriate use of case studies.		24	17	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.47
	Understand key methods of assessing research reliability and validity		21	17	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.47
	Understand the differences between experimental and non-experimental research.		24	17	<u>15</u>	<u>1</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.82
	Effective Communication									
	Develop skills for effective research presentation		21	17	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.59
	Integrative Thinking									
	Appreciate specific design principles that are common to a number of different types of research.		24	16	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.25
	Appreciate the importance of "front end" of research (i.e., research design).		24	17	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.65
	Appreciate the use of theory in the research design process		21	17	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	1	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.59

Course Outcome Category Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked					average
			5	4	3	2	1	
Understand how to proceed from a concept to a means of measuring the concept.	24	17	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.18
Understand the importance of the "front end" of the research process	21	17	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.35
Practical Applications								
Understand how to find and use archival data	21	17	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.18
Understand how to find and use archival data.	24	17	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.24
Understand the principles of survey and interview protocol design	21	17	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.65
Understand the principles of survey design.	24	17	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.47
Understand the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies	21	17	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.65
Overall Averages for course			<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.49
PPA 220A Economic Analysis I								
5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished								
Critical Thinking								
Be able to explain and offer examples of the five reasons that policy analysts offer for government intervention in a market economy (lack of information, firms acting as price setters, externalities, public goods, an inequitable distribution of income/wealth).	32	12	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.58
Develop the knowledge to defend the basic Kaldor/Hicks approach to justifying the efficiency of government intervention through benefit/cost assessment.	32	12	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.08
Practical Applications								
Have a basic understanding of some of the technical tools used in policy analysis, and their application in actual policy concerns (probability, time value of money, benefit/cost assessment,	32	12	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.58
Understand basic microeconomic concepts such as opportunity cost, supply and demand, elasticity, market equilibrium, industrial structure, etc. and there application to policy analysis using real world examples.	32	12	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.75
Overall Averages for course			<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.5
PPA 240A Management I								
5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished								
Integrative Thinking								
Familiarity with the concept of "organization culture" and how crucial understanding org culture is to creating a healthy and well-functioning workplace, in preventing and correcting organizational disasters such as the Space Shuttle Challenger tragedy, and also the City of Sacramento Fire Department scandal.	28	23	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.48
Practical Applications								
Familiarity with active listening and HR intervention strategies, with particular emphasis on affirmative action, sexual harassment, disciplining and responding to employees exhibiting alcohol/drug impairment problems, and hiring and firing.	28	23	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.09
Understanding Professional Role								
Familiarity with leadership literature, leadership skill building, and hands-on experience developing a personal/professional leadership development plan.	28	23	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.3
Familiarity with organization theory as it applies to the public sector. Subjects to be examined include: the origin of the concept of bureaucracy; the origin of the field of public sector administration; the life cycle of public agencies; differences between vertical and horizontal communication; early leadership and management theories; and contemporary theories of org behavior and human relations in public agencies.	28	23	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	3.96
Overall Averages for course			<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.21

Course	Outcome Category	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked					average
					5	4	3	2	1	
Overall Totals and Averages					Fall 2006					
	Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average		
	841	634	337	216	72	9	0	4.39		
	100%	75.39%	40.07%	25.68%	8.56%	1.07%	0.00%			

Fall 2006 Outcome Category Averages by Course

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course	Outcome Category	Responses		Ranked					average
		possible	# of	5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 200 Intro to PPA		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Effective Communication	28	27	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.22
	Integrative Thinking	84	81	<u>38</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	4.32
	Practical Applications	56	54	<u>30</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.41
	Understanding Professional Role	28	27	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4
	Overall Averages for course			<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.29
PPA 205 Research		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	159	119	<u>76</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.58
	Effective Communication	21	17	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.59
	Integrative Thinking	114	84	<u>43</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.4
	Practical Applications	111	85	<u>49</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Overall Averages for course			<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.49
PPA 220A Economic Analysis I		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	64	24	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.33
	Practical Applications	64	24	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.67
	Overall Averages for course			<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.5
PPA 240A Management I		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Integrative Thinking	28	23	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.48
	Practical Applications	28	23	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.09
	Understanding Professional Role	56	46	<u>19</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	4.13
	Overall Averages for course			<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.21

Overall Totals and Averages

Totals and Averages						Fall 2006	
Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
841	634	337	216	72	9	0	4.39
100%	75.39%	40.07%	25.68%	8.56%	1.07%	0.00%	

Spring 2007 Learning Objective Averages by Course

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course	Outcome Category	Responses		Ranked					average
		possible	# of	5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 100 undergrad Intro to PPA		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	25	21	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	4.14
	Effective Communication	25	22	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	3.77
	Practical Applications	50	42	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.19
	Understanding Professional Role	25	21	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.24
	Overall Averages for course			<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.1
PPA 207 Quantitative Analysis		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	18	16	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Effective Communication	34	25	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Integrative Thinking	102	75	<u>39</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.41
	Practical Applications	66	42	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.21
	Overall Averages for course			<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.37
PPA 210 Political Env. of Policy Making		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	68	64	<u>39</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.52
	Effective Communication	34	32	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	3.94
	Integrative Thinking	136	119	<u>68</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.48
	Practical Applications	102	97	<u>47</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	4.32
	Understanding Professional Role	34	32	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.38
	Overall Averages for course			<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.38
PPA 220B Economic Analysis II		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Integrative Thinking	66	57	<u>20</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	3.84
	Understanding Professional Role	22	19	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.16
	Overall Averages for course			<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	3.92
PPA 230 Public Budgeting		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Effective Communication	25	22	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	3
	Integrative Thinking	100	88	<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	3.35
	Practical Applications	25	22	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	3.18
	Understanding Professional Role	25	22	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	3.45
	Overall Averages for course			<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	3.29

Course	Outcome Category	Responses		Ranked					average
		possible	# of	5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 240B Management II		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	46	38	<u>20</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.34
	Effective Communication	23	19	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.37
	Integrative Thinking	23	19	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.32
	Practical Applications	23	19	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.26
Overall Averages for course				<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.33

Overall Totals and Averages

Spring 2007

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
1097	933	407	304	167	41	14	4.12
100%	85.05%	37.10%	27.71%	15.22%	3.74%	1.28%	

Spring 2007 Outcome Category Averages by Course

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course	Outcome Category	Responses		Ranked					average
		possible	# of	5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 100 undergrad Intro to PPA		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	25	21	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	4.14
	Effective Communication	25	22	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	3.77
	Practical Applications	50	42	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.19
	Understanding Professional Role	25	21	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.24
	Overall Averages for course			<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.1
PPA 207 Quantitative Analysis		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	18	16	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Effective Communication	34	25	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.44
	Integrative Thinking	102	75	<u>39</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.41
	Practical Applications	66	42	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.21
	Overall Averages for course			<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.37
PPA 210 Political Env. of Policy Making		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	68	64	<u>39</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.52
	Effective Communication	34	32	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	3.94
	Integrative Thinking	136	119	<u>68</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.48
	Practical Applications	102	97	<u>47</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	4.32
	Understanding Professional Role	34	32	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.38
	Overall Averages for course			<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.38
PPA 220B Economic Analysis II		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Integrative Thinking	66	57	<u>20</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	3.84
	Understanding Professional Role	22	19	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.16
	Overall Averages for course			<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	3.92
PPA 230 Public Budgeting		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Effective Communication	25	22	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	3
	Integrative Thinking	100	88	<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	3.35
	Practical Applications	25	22	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	3.18
	Understanding Professional Role	25	22	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	3.45
	Overall Averages for course			<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	3.29

Course	Outcome Category	Responses		Ranked					average
		possible	# of	5	4	3	2	1	
PPA 240B Management II		5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished							
	Critical Thinking	46	38	<u>20</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.34
	Effective Communication	23	19	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.37
	Integrative Thinking	23	19	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	4.32
	Practical Applications	23	19	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.26
Overall Averages for course				<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	4.33

Overall Totals and Averages

Spring 2007

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
1097	933	407	304	167	41	14	4.12
100%	85.05%	37.10%	27.71%	15.22%	3.74%	1.28%	