2008-09 Assessment Report

Department of Public Policy and Administration

California State University, Sacramento

June 10, 2009

Submitted by: Robert W. Wassmer, Chairperson
Approved by: All Full-Time PPA Faculty

As requested annually by Academic Affairs at California State University, Sacramento

(Sacramento State), this report offers a description of the Public Policy and Administration

(PPA) Department's assessment activities during the 2008-09 academic year. Our annual

assessments since 2006-07 have used a cycle that facilitates continuous review of the PPA

Program and the maintenance of steady progress toward achieving our identified learning

outcomes. In this report, we provide a brief background on the PPA approach to assessment,

updated assessment measures we have gathered for the past academic year, a summary of

conclusions drawn from them by faculty at our annual retreat, and a strategy for using our

assessment findings in the upcoming year. This report is posted on the PPA website.

Background

The PPA Department uses a multi-pronged approach to the assessment of our Master's program

toward achieving its learning goals. We base all of our assessment efforts on a matrix of

program-level learning objectives (see Table 1 in the appendix). From that matrix, we have

developed a series of outcomes that then map to specific objectives in all the courses we teach

(see Table 3 in the appendix). Each course is responsible for covering one or more objectives,

some in a primary role, others in a secondary role (as noted by a "P" or "S" in the matrix in

Table 1).

Our annual assessment efforts include two summative measures: (1) an evaluation of individual course level-learning, objective outcomes to monitor course effectiveness and (2) policy memos completed by entering and finishing students to provide insight into value added by completing the entire program. Every year we hold a department retreat to review these data, draw lessons from the information, and make curricular adjustments as necessary

Updated Assessment Measures

Table 4 in the appendix offers the assignment description that we use to assess the value added gained by PPA students in the form of identifying a contemporary administrative or policy issue and the offering of alternative solutions and justifications for what they view as the "best" solution. Table 4 includes the rubric that also contains the 12 criteria that PPA full-time faculty use to evaluate the memo that students write in their first and last classes in the master's program. Table 2 in the appendix offers the summary scores, as assigned by PPA professors reading the memo, for the 12 criteria described in Table 4.

To assess the degree of value added by the program, look at the average scores in Table 2 for each of the 12 criteria for the entering cohort as compared to the two exiting cohorts (fall 2008 and spring 2009). For all criteria, the finishing cohorts exhibited higher average numbers than the entering. This is summarized in the last column averages that measured 1.24 for the class entering in the fall of 2008, as compared to 2.02 to 1.96 for the two cohorts finishing in the fall of 2008 and spring of 2009.

Table 3 in the appendix offers each of the primary learning outcomes desired in each of the PPA core courses in the fall of 2008 and spring of 2009. In a given row is the learning outcome, the distribution of scores assigned by students in the class in the one (not accomplished) to five (excellently) categories allowed. The final row contains the average score.

To achieve an overall summary of these results it is perhaps most informative to examine the summative tables available in Table 3 in the appendix that appear at the end of the fall 2008 and spring 2009 results. The overall average for the fall of 2008 was 4.01. While in the spring of 2009 it was 3.94. This puts the PPA Department's achievement of learning objectives on average in the "very well" category.

Conclusions Drawn from Data

The data just described were made available to all full-time PPA Faculty at the Department's annual retreat on May 18, 2009. We devoted nearly three hours to a discussion that involved the instructor of a core PPA course giving a brief overview of their course and commenting on the observed scores in the achievement of primary learning goals for that course as described in Table 3 in the appendix. At the retreat, we also devoted an hour to discussing the results of our assessment of pre and post memos as summarized in Table 2 in the appendix.

Overall, we continue to be pleased with how well students are meeting our learning goals and the production of value added in the PPA Master's Program. Learning goals on average are being achieved at the "very well" (four out of five) level. This is clear evidence of value added being produced in the achievement of our degree by close to one point increases in average scores from entering to completing students. That said, we did note several categories of evaluation that are below our usual average for specific classes in the PPA core. As a group, we discussed these and determined that a combination of new instructors teaching new preps, outdated course objective descriptions, and in a few cases, reduced coverage, led to these lower scores. Based on our discussion, each instructor came away with specific ideas on how to better achieve their course's primary learning objectives in the upcoming academic year. Overall improvement measures being undertaken as a result of our discussions include a commitment to

department level development of our teaching in the fall (for our two junior faculty, our core adjunct team and our existing faculty), a revision of several course objectives to better reflect current course content, and an updating of the primary/secondary assignments of objectives to courses.

The second measure we use to evaluate our program is the "assessment memo" assigned to incoming and finishing students. We updated the rubric this year, but did not find significantly different results from what we have found in the past. We continue to tinker with the prompt and scales, attempting to find a reasonable mechanism for assessing what students can do as they enter and exit the program.

The final item of note relates to our plans for next year. We have begun tracking our retention, time to graduation, and graduation rates more proactively and anticipate that we will have both historical and "baseline" data to report next year. We have recently been turning our attention to thesis completion, historically a stumbling block for students, and have had good results. We are also stepping up our front and back end advising, providing more intensive advising through the first term and second term, and then again as students prepare to begin their thesis. Finally, we are more aggressively tracking down students who have simply quit taking classes, especially those who are in the "all but thesis" category. Several of them have returned and are working to complete their thesis. One challenge is the lack of program level data from CMS. We can get reasonably good student level data but not aggregated information for our program. We look forward to kinks in that system being addressed.

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

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

Table 2: Summary of Student Assessment Data 2008-2009

	Critical Thinking				Integrative Thinking	Effective Communication		Professional Role			Practical Applications			Average	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)		Average	
Entering 2008-2009	1.69	1.16	0.81	0.91	1.24	1.80	1.51	1.34	1.04	0.92	0.76	1.22		1.24	0-3 scale
Finishing Fall 2008	2.18	1.94	1.82	2.00	2.06	2.29	2.18	2.12	2.06	2.06	1.82	1.76		2.02	0-3 scale
Finishing Spring 2009	2.59	2.30	1.81	1.78	1.78	2.11	2.04	1.96	1.85	1.70	1.63	1.93		1.96	0-3 scale

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by Course   Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration

5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average

PPA 200 Intro to PPA
section 1

				5		4		3		2		1		
1 .	Develop a more analytical approach to problem definition	36	26	9	34.6%	9	34.6%	8	30.8%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.04**
2 .	Develop an appreciation of the complexity of approaches that must be employed to fully understand public issues	36	27	10	37.0%	12	44.4%	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	0	0%	**4.11**
3 .	Familiarize students with the interdisciplinary roots of the study of public policy and administration including political science, economics and social psychology/administration	36	27	6	22.2%	12	44.4%	5	18.5%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	**3.67**
4 .	Familiarize students with the key institutional features of government especially at the California state and local level	36	27	6	22.2%	13	48.1%	7	25.9%	1	3.7%	0	0%	**3.89**
5 .	Improve the capacity of students to think and write analytically and practically about public problems	36	27	8	29.6%	9	33.3%	8	29.6%	0	0%	2	7.4%	**3.78**
6 .	Sensitize students to the complexities of making ethical decisions in the public sector	36	27	5	18.5%	10	37.0%	9	33.3%	1	3.7%	2	7.4%	**3.56**
7 .	Understand the role of the policy analyst and public manager	36	27	6	22.2%	8	29.6%	11	40.7%	0	0%	2	7.4%	**3.59**
8 .	Work towards development of strong oral presentation skills	36	23	3	13.0%	3	13.0%	14	60.9%	1	4.3%	2	8.7%	**3.17**
	Overall Averages for section			7	25.1%	10	36.0%	8	30.8%	1	3.3%	1	4.7%	**3.73**

PPA 205 Research
section 1

				5		4		3		2		1		
1 .	Differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.	7	4	0	0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.5**
2 .	Differences between experimental and non-experimental research.	7	4	2	50.0%	0	0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4**
3 .	How to find and use archival data.	7	4	0	0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0%	**3**
4 .	How to proceed from a concept to measuring the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.	7	4	0	0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0%	**3**
5 .	Major criticisms of social science, and how to defend or critique a study from both positivist and post-positivist perspectives.	7	4	0	0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.5**
6 .	Major ethical and legal considerations for research involving human subjects.	7	4	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.25**
7 .	Methods of data collection commonly used in the social sciences, including surveys, interviews, and textual content analysis.	7	4	2	50.0%	0	0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4**
8 .	Strengths and limitations of various non-experimental designs including single case studies, small-n case comparisons, and large-n studies.	7	4	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.25**
9 .	The importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.	7	4	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.75**
10 .	The main approaches for establishing causality in scientific research.	7	4	0	0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.5**
11 .	The politics of research, and how to position a study to influence policy decisions.	7	3	0	0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.67**

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by course   Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration

5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled		Ranked 5		4		3		2		1	average
12 .	The role of theories and hypotheses in applied policy research.	7	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.33**
	Overall Averages for section			1	19.6%	1	37.0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.72**
section 2															
1 .	Differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.	16	15	6	40.0%	8	53.3%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.33**
2 .	Differences between experimental and non-experimental research.	16	15	9	60.0%	6	40.0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.6**
3 .	How to find and use archival data.	16	15	3	20.0%	6	40.0%	6	40.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.8**
4 .	How to proceed from a concept to measuring the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.	16	15	7	46.7%	4	26.7%	4	26.7%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.2**
5 .	Major criticisms of social science, and how to defend or critique a study from both positivist and post-positivist perspectives.	16	15	8	53.3%	4	26.7%	3	20.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.33**
6 .	Major ethical and legal considerations for research involving human subjects.	16	15	9	60.0%	5	33.3%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.53**
7 .	Methods of data collection commonly used in the social sciences, including surveys, interviews, and textual content analysis.	16	15	8	53.3%	6	40.0%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.47**
8 .	Strengths and limitations of various non-experimental designs including single case studies, small-n case comparisons, and large-n studies.	16	15	9	60.0%	5	33.3%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.53**
9 .	The importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.	16	15	6	40.0%	7	46.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.27**
10 .	The main approaches for establishing causality in scientific research.	16	15	7	46.7%	6	40.0%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	0	0%	**4.27**
11 .	The politics of research, and how to position a study to influence policy decisions.	16	14	2	14.3%	7	50.0%	3	21.4%	2	14.3%	0	0%	**3.64**
12 .	The role of theories and hypotheses in applied policy research.	16	13	6	46.2%	3	23.1%	4	30.8%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.15**
	Overall Averages for section			7	45.2%	6	37.9%	2	15.3%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.27**
PPA 220A Economic Analysis I															
section 1															
1 .	Be able to explain and offer examples of the five reasons (lack of information, firms acting as price setters, externalities, public goods, and an inequitable distribution of income/wealth) that policy analysts provide for government intervention in a market economy.	45	33	18	54.5%	13	39.4%	2	6.1%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.48**
2 .	Develop the knowledge to understand and apply the "Kaldor/Hicks" approach to justifying the efficiency of government intervention and the interaction of the three sources of policy wisdom illustrated in "Munger's Triangle."	45	33	18	54.5%	9	27.3%	5	15.2%	1	3.0%	0	0%	**4.33**
3 .	Exhibit a basic understanding 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.)	45	33	15	45.5%	12	36.4%	5	15.2%	1	3.0%	0	0%	**4.24**
4 .	Understand basic microeconomic concepts such as opportunity cost, marginal decision making, supply and demand, elasticity, market equilibrium, industrial structure, etc. and the application of these to policy analysis using real world examples.	45	33	19	57.6%	12	36.4%	2	6.1%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.52**
	Overall Averages for section			18	53.0%	12	34.8%	4	10.6%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.39**
PPA 240A Management I															

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by course   Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration

5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
section 1														
1.	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.	19	16	2	12.5%	13	81.3%	1	6.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.06
2.	Familiarity with graduate level literature review skills, including: data mining for articles, report and experts on a given policy topic; and the construction of traditional literature review tables on definitions, researcher venues, research methodologies, and research findings.	19	17	8	47.1%	8	47.1%	1	5.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.41
3.	Familiarity with key scholars and theories in the organization theory literature 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.	19	17	14	82.4%	2	11.8%	1	5.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.76
4.	Familiarity with problems in organizations "when generations collide," and strategies for solving the generational puzzle in the public sector workplace. In doing so, we will examine the generational puzzle aspects of organizational disasters such as the City of Sacramento Fire Department scandal, and the steps that can be taken to prevent such tragedies.	19	16	7	43.8%	8	50.0%	1	6.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.38
5.	Familiarity with the concept of "organization culture" and how crucial understanding org culture is to creating a healthy and well-functioning workplace. We will examine the role of org culture in contributing to and - in the future - preventing and correcting organizational disasters such as the Space Shuttle Challenger tragedy.	19	17	12	70.6%	4	23.5%	1	5.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.65
	Overall Averages for section			9	51.8%	7	42.2%	1	6.0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.46

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by course   Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration   5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Overall Totals and Averages   Fall 2008

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
1219	1024	393	327	244	39	21	4.01
100%	84.00%	32.24%	26.83%	20.02%	3.20%	1.72%	

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by Course   Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration

5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
EdD 602 section 1													
1 . Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.	15	14	7	50.0%	4	28.6%	3	21.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.29
2 . Analyze proposed legislation affecting California education.	15	14	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	2	14.3%	0	0%	3.71
Overall Averages for section			6	39.3%	4	28.6%	4	25.0%	1	7.1%	0	0%	4
PPA 207 Quantitative Analysis section 1													
1 . Be able to put together a research paper that describes a policy problem and undertakes a regression based research study to help offer a solution.	30	26	11	42.3%	8	30.8%	7	26.9%	0	0%	0	0%	4.15
2 . Have a working knowledge of regression analysis and the value it offers to answer policy questions.	30	26	10	38.5%	10	38.5%	4	15.4%	2	7.7%	0	0%	4.08
3 . Have a working knowledge of where to begin to gather data for policy analysis.	30	27	12	44.4%	10	37.0%	4	14.8%	1	3.7%	0	0%	4.22
4 . Possess the ability to accumulate data and do basic descriptive analysis of it using the Excel spreadsheet program and a more advanced statistical program (SPSS).	30	26	14	53.8%	7	26.9%	5	19.2%	0	0%	0	0%	4.35
5 . Strengthen your ability to identify and utilize organization theories for solving public problems.	17	14	6	42.9%	6	42.9%	2	14.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.29
6 . Understand the appropriate use of bivariate and multivariate statistical techniques to identify causal relationships between variables.	30	27	9	33.3%	7	25.9%	8	29.6%	3	11.1%	0	0%	3.81
7 . Understand the basic theory and techniques for conducting a benefit-cost assessment.	34	29	4	13.8%	15	51.7%	8	27.6%	2	6.9%	0	0%	3.72
8 . Understand the importance of causal modeling before undertaking a statistical analysis.	30	27	12	44.4%	9	33.3%	6	22.2%	0	0%	0	0%	4.22
Overall Averages for section			10	38.6%	9	35.6%	6	21.8%	1	0%	0	0%	4.09
PPA 210 section 1													
1 . Appreciate the role of the policy community in developing policy options	31	29	14	48.3%	14	48.3%	1	3.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.45
2 . Be better able to write effective short memos and papers	31	29	7	24.1%	11	37.9%	11	37.9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86
3 . Engage in more effective policy negotiations than would have been possible at the beginning of the course	31	29	10	34.5%	16	55.2%	2	6.9%	1	3.4%	0	0%	4.21
4 . Understand a useful way of thinking about how and why policies are adopted: the "multiple streams" (Kingdon) model	31	29	20	69.0%	8	27.6%	1	3.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.66
5 . Understand how policy problems are identified and policies may be attached to them	31	29	17	58.6%	11	37.9%	1	3.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.55
6 . Understand how problems are framed more or less effectively.	31	29	17	58.6%	10	34.5%	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	0	0%	4.48
7 . Understand key ethical frameworks for assessing public policy choices	31	29	16	55.2%	10	34.5%	3	10.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.45
8 . Understand the critical role of "policy entrepreneurs" in policy development	31	29	17	58.6%	11	37.9%	1	3.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4.55
9 . Understand the ethical subtleties of role obligations facing political entrepreneurs and other policy actors	31	29	13	44.8%	12	41.4%	4	13.8%	0	0%	0	0%	4.31
10 . Understand the pervasive nature of collective action problems and their impact on political mobilization	31	28	13	46.4%	10	35.7%	4	14.3%	1	3.6%	0	0%	4.25

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by Course   Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration   5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked 5		Ranked 4		Ranked 3		Ranked 2		Ranked 1		average
	Overall Averages for section			14	49.8%	11	39.1%	3	10.0%	0	1.0%	0	0%	**4.38**
PPA 220B section 1														
1 .	Develop a basic level of proficiency and confidence using quantitative methods to inform policy questions.	34	29	2	6.9%	9	31.0%	11	37.9%	6	20.7%	1	3.4%	**3.17**
2 .	Gain sufficient knowledge to critique an actual benefit-cost analysis, such as one issued by a government agency, think tank, or interest group.	34	29	6	20.7%	7	24.1%	9	31.0%	6	20.7%	1	3.4%	**3.38**
3 .	Know the limitations of benefit-cost analysis, and know how integrate the technique into a comprehensive policy analysis.	34	29	3	10.3%	12	41.4%	10	34.5%	3	10.3%	1	3.4%	**3.45**
4 .	Learn how to analyze, from an economic perspective, how different types of government intervention (e.g. subsidies, taxation, and regulation) can be used to correct various forms of market failure (e.g. public goods, externalities, and monopoly).	34	29	3	10.3%	3	10.3%	12	41.4%	9	31.0%	2	6.9%	**2.86**
	Overall Averages for section			4	12.1%	8	26.7%	10	36.2%	6	20.7%	1	4.3%	**3.22**
PPA 230 section 1														
1 .	Develop a working knowledge of the California state and local budget process, budget concepts, and budget terminology	19	19	4	21.1%	6	31.6%	5	26.3%	2	10.5%	2	10.5%	**3.42**
2 .	Develop an appreciation for the intergovernmental dynamics (particularly the relationships between the State of California, counties, and cities) of budgeting and their impact on budgeting behavior	19	18	6	33.3%	8	44.4%	3	16.7%	1	5.6%	0	0%	**4.06**
3 .	Develop an understanding of the political context of budget development and implementation at the federal, state and local (city and county) levels	19	18	4	22.2%	4	22.2%	8	44.4%	2	11.1%	0	0%	**3.56**
4 .	Develop some basic skills in the selection and use of performance measures in the context of performance budgeting	19	18	2	11.1%	3	16.7%	7	38.9%	3	16.7%	3	16.7%	**2.89**
5 .	Gain an understanding of budgets as tools for accountability	19	19	3	15.8%	6	31.6%	6	31.6%	2	10.5%	2	10.5%	**3.32**
6 .	Improve written and verbal communication skills, including the presentation of budgetary information	19	18	1	5.6%	6	33.3%	5	27.8%	5	27.8%	1	5.6%	**3.06**
7 .	Learn some basic skills in budget development, analysis and implementation	19	18	3	16.7%	6	33.3%	6	33.3%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	**3.44**
8 .	Understand the role of budgets for of a state or local agency or department	19	18	2	11.1%	11	61.1%	5	27.8%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.83**
9 .	We ask that you rate each instructor individually. Overall Rating -- Instruction by Pat Leary.	19	18	2	11.1%	8	44.4%	8	44.4%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.67**
10 .	We ask that you rate each instructor individually. Overall Rating -- Instruction by Russ Fehr.	19	16	1	6.3%	8	50.0%	5	31.3%	2	12.5%	0	0%	**3.5**
	Overall Averages for section			3	15.6%	7	36.7%	6	32.2%	2	10.6%	1	0%	**3.47**
PPA 240B section 1														
1 .	Begin learning how to assess the strengths and weaknesses (the "what is going on" aspect) of organizations.	17	14	6	42.9%	7	50.0%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.36**
2 .	Create a more integrated sense of organizational structure, goal setting, strategic planning, leadership and performance measurement and management.	17	14	6	42.9%	7	50.0%	1	7.1%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.36**

Table 3: Results of Course Assessments by Course   Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration

5 = excellently, 4 = very well, 3 = satisfactorily, 2 = poorly, 1 = not accomplished

Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
								Ranked						
3 .	Improve your ability to make concise effective presentations of complex material.	17	14	2	14.3%	8	57.1%	4	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	**3.86**
4 .	Improve your comfort and competence using written documentation (web sites, budgets, strategic plans, annual reports etc.) to understand organizations.	17	14	4	28.6%	7	50.0%	3	21.4%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.07**
	Overall Averages for section			4	32.1%	7	51.8%	2	16.1%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.16**

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration

Overall Totals and Averages   Spring 2009

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
965	871	293	319	189	56	14	3.94
100%	90.26%	30.36%	33.06%	19.59%	5.80%	1.45%	

Wednesday, June 10, 2009   Spring 2009 Course Assessment Averages   Public Policy and Administration   CSUS Page 4 of 4

15

Table 4: 2008-09 ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION AND RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION

Assignment Description: Identify a current public (governmental) problem/issue that you have some interest in and provide a decision maker with a briefing memo about the issue and possible options to deal with it. As appropriate, consider the economic, 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. How you would recommend appropriate option(s) to deal with chosen problem/issue.

Rubric for evaluating PPA briefing memos

	Missing (Zero Point)	Included but unsatisfactory (One Point)	Satisfactory (Two Points)	Very well done (Three Points)
<u>Critical Thinking</u> (1) Is the problem/issue well defined?		Problem/issue identified but real problems in clarity.	Problem/issue identified clearly but could be improved upon.	A full appropriate problem/issue statement included.
(2) Are possible options described?		Some options described, but not enough and/or could be stated much more clearly.	Reasonable amount of options stated, but could be improved upon.	Amount and clarity of options highly appropriate.
(3) Appropriate research design/causal inference to examine options?		Some mention of design/inference to explore options, but much improvement needed.	Design/inference mentioned and a specific plan of carrying out described, but could be improved upon.	Design/inference covered and plan to carry out is highly appropriate.
(4) Are implementation issues considered regarding options?		A brief mention of implementation issues, but problems in thinking about and/or much more needed.	Implementation issues adequately covered, but room for improvement in how described.	Issues of implementation of options fully covered in an appropriate manner.
<u>Integrative thinking</u> 5) Are appropriate economic, political, economic, policy, budget, and/or administrative concepts and analyses considered?		A mention of some of these concepts, but not adequate and/or mistakenly applied.	All appropriate concepts described, but mistakes/ confusion in application.	All concepts considered; little room for improvement.

Effective communication (6) Is memo well written?		Written at a minimally acceptable level. Grammatical, organization, and/or style concerns remain.	Written at a basic level appropriate for someone earning a Master's degree. Still room for some minor improvements.	Superb writing. No concerns and a pleasure to read.
7) Is previous findings and technical info appropriately presented?		Minimal previous findings and tech info, but much more needed.	Previous findings and tech info offered at an acceptable level, but still room for improvement.	Appropriate amount of previous findings and tech info included. The issue is framed well by this inclusion.
Professional role (8) Is the role of public and/or non-profit sector appropriately recognized?		Role of public/non-profit sector mentioned, but in far too little detail.	Public/non-profit sector role described adequately, but could improve upon and/or something left out.	Excellent coverage of these sectors in memo in a manner that fully clarifies their role.
(9) Does it integrate the political context?		The politics surrounding the chosen problem/issue are only mentioned, but covered in far too little detail.	A serious attempt is made to integrate the political context of the problem/issue but still lacking in some way.	Political context is appropriately and fully described.
(10) Are intergovernmental dimensions appropriately considered?		Intergovernmental dimensions are only mentioned in passing.	A serious attempt is made to discuss the intergovernmental issues, but it is still lacking in some way.	Intergovernmental issues are appropriately covered and there is little to criticize.

Practical applications				
(11) Does it describe the practical considerations to influencing the policy process?		Brief mention of practical considerations, but by far not enough.	Practical considerations are described, but still lacking in form of not fully enough or mistakes made.	Practical considerations fully described in appropriate manner and very little are left out.
(12) Is data appropriately used?		Very limited mention of data, but does little to help clarify the issue/problem.	Data is used throughout memo, but could use could be improved upon by more appropriate choices to include or application of data.	Data is integrated into the memo in a manner that helps illuminate the issue/problem and very little could be improved upon.