

2009-10 Assessment Report

Department of Public Policy and Administration

California State University, Sacramento

June 16, 2010

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 2009-10 academic year. Our annual assessments since 2006-07 have used a repeated 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, 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.

Note that this report is annually posted on the PPA website for all to view.

Background

The PPA Department uses a multi-pronged approach to the assessment of our Master's program in achieving its learning goals. We base all of our assessment efforts on a matrix of program-level learning objectives (see Table 2 in the appendix). From this matrix, we have developed a series of outcomes that then map to specific objectives in all the core PPA courses we teach. Each of these core courses are responsible for covering one or more learning objectives, some in a primary role, others in a secondary role (as noted by a "P" or "S" in Table 2).

Our annual assessment efforts include two summative measures: (1) an evaluation of individual course learning-objective outcomes to monitor course effectiveness and (2) policy memos completed by entering and finishing students to provide insight into the value added we offer to a student by completing the entire Master's in Public Policy and Administration Program. Every year we hold a department retreat in the late spring to review these data, draw lessons from the information, and plan curricular adjustments as necessary

Updated Assessment Measures

Table 1 in the appendix offers the assignment description that we use to assess a portion of the value added they gain through a PPA Master's Degree at Sacramento State. This assignment consists 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 1 also includes the rubric of 12 criteria that PPA full-time faculty use to evaluate the memo that students write in their first and last classes in our Master's program. Table 3 in the appendix offers the summary scores, as assigned by PPA professors reading the memo, for the 12 criteria described in Table 1.

To assess the degree of value added by our PPA Master's Program, look at the average scores in Table 2 for each of the 12 criteria for the three entering cohorts as compared to the three exiting cohorts in the available academic years (2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10). We denote the difference between the scores recorded for the entering cohort in an academic year, and the finishing cohort in the same academic year, as a measure of the "value added" we have produced for students in our program. For all criteria, for all three academic years, the finishing cohorts exhibited higher average numbers than the entering, and hence value added is positive.

As noted in Table 3, a scale of zero to two was used to assess student memos in 2007-08, while a scale of zero to three was used in the two most recent academic years. Thus, only the value added numbers for academic years 2008-09 and 2009-10 are comparable. In comparing these two academic years, value added in the 12 categories was greater in 2009-10 than 2008-09, in all but three categories. We are continuing to add value in the vast majority of learning objectives this past year at a pace equal or greater to what was added in the previous year. This is shown by the overall value added average for all 12 categories rising from 0.75 to 0.83 from 2008-09 to 2009-10.

Two of three areas where value added declined in this academic year as compared to the last are under the critical thinking general category (“are possible options describe to solve a policy problem” and “are appropriate research design/casual inference described in ways to deal with a policy problem”), and one was under the practical applications category (“are intergovernmental dimensions considered”). This fact was noted at our department’s spring 2010 retreat and the conclusion reached that part of this finding is likely due to research design and/or intergovernmental applications not being relevant to all of the different forms of memos that students chose to write. When this arose, some faculty scored their assessment of these learning outcome categories with a zero for missing, when it was more appropriate to indicate that category is not relevant. Thus, we decided to revise the memo assignment in Table 1 to include a not relevant category (that if checked will not lower average scores on that criterion) and to rewrite some of the 12 assessment categories to improve language in regard to relevance. This will be accomplished by Professor Kirlin revising the policy memo assignment in Table 1 before it is given to students next time in the fall of 2010. Though the lower average value added score on possible policy options is not for this same reason. As a possible check on this decline,

PPA Faculty agreed to further stress the importance of considering various options to policy problems where relevant in our curriculum.

The final material in the appendix (after the numbered tables) offers information on each of the primary learning outcomes desired in each of the PPA core courses taught in the fall of 2008 and fall of 2009, and for a different set of PPA core courses taught in the spring of 2009 and spring of 2010. 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. This detailed information was shared with all PPA Faculty in our spring 2010 retreat. They were asked to look closely at the outcomes for the classes they taught in both years for situations where student assessment of learning outcomes rose or fell. These findings, combined with their own knowledge of what they may have done differently in the class, provides a base of knowledge that they will use in their own self reflection of how to improve the course the next time they teach it.

An overall summary of student assessment of our learning objectives over the past two academic years is offered in the appendix's Table 4. Here, all of our core courses are indicated in column 1, and the average student assessment of all learning goals for that course for 2008-09 is in column 2, while the average assessment for 2009-10 is in column 3. The average across all courses in a given semester was always near or above four which translates into "very good". We are also pleased that these averages for both the spring and fall semesters rose from 2008-09 to 2009-2010; though, this was not always the case for all core classes. In particular, in the fall the score for PPA 240A fell from 4.5 to 4.3, and in the spring the scores for PPA 207 fell from 4.1 to 3.9, for PPA 210 from 4.4 to nearer 4.0, and for PPA 240B from 4.2 to 4.0. We devoted a significant amount of time to a discussion at our spring 2010 retreat of why this may have

occurred. This was a healthy discussion for the relevant instructors and all left confident in their thinking of what to do to possibly address why these decline may have occurred in their particular class.

Conclusions Drawn from Data

The data offered in the appendix of this report were available to all full-time PPA Faculty at our annual spring 2010 retreat. We devoted nearly an hour to discussing the results of our assessment of pre and post memos as summarized in Table 3 in the appendix. We also devoted nearly another hour to discussing the scores in the achievement of primary learning goals for our core courses as described in Table 4 and after 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. There is also clear evidence of value added in students in the achievement of our degree by greater than a 0.75 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. Based on our discussion, each professor came away with specific ideas on how to better achieve their course's primary learning objectives in the upcoming academic year. Some specific improvement measures being undertaken as a result of our discussions include a commitment by all to re-examine their syllabi and pedagogy, a revision of several course objectives to better reflect current course content, and a commitment to add updated final projects in some core courses that should help to better offer students ideas and methods for their thesis and at the same time better achieve the primary learning objectives set out for our PPA core courses.

The second measure we use to evaluate our program is the “assessment memo” assigned to incoming and finishing students. With an updated rubric from last year that we continued to use this year, we had two years of data by which to make comparisons. In nine of the 12 criteria used in our assessment of a student memo, value added rose from last academic year to this one.

The final item of note relates to our plans for next year. Beginning last year, we are 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 with specific advisors assigned, and then again as students prepare to begin their thesis. In addition, 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.

A final assessment tool that we will begin this year is requiring graduating Master’s students to complete a Survey Monkey (internet-based) survey of how well they thought all course learning objectives were achieved after they completed all PPA course work and their thesis. This survey will consist of all the course learning objectives listed in the appendix after the numbered tables being mixed up and presented to students with the choice of assigning a five (excellently) to zero (not accomplished) to each one of them. At end of each academic year we will then average the scores assigned for each of our 10 core courses (PPA 200, 205, 207, 210, 220A, 220B, 230, 240A, and 240B). These scores will help us compare the relative achievement of learning goals across all courses for student leaving the program and removed from directly taking the course.

APPENDIX

Table 1: 2009-10 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? (2) Are possible options described? (3) Appropriate research design/causal inference to examine options? (4) Are implementation issues considered regarding options?		Problem/issue identified but real problems in clarity. Some options described, but not enough and/or could be stated much more clearly. Some mention of design/inference to explore options, but much improvement needed. A brief mention of implementation issues, but problems in thinking about and/or much more needed.	Problem/issue identified clearly but could be improved upon. Reasonable amount of options stated, but could be improved upon. Design/inference mentioned and a specific plan of carrying out described, but could be improved upon. Implementation issues adequately covered, but room for improvement in how described.	A full appropriate problem/issue statement included. Amount and clarity of options highly appropriate. Design/inference covered and plan to carry out is highly appropriate. 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		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.

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

<u>Practical applications</u>				
(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.

TABLE 2: PPA LEARNING OBJECTIVES COVERAGE BY CORE COURSES

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	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		<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>
	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 3: SUMMARY OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT DATA BASED ON POLICY MEMOS 2009-2010

	Critical Thinking				Integrative Thinking	Effective Communication		Professional Role			Practical Applications		Average	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)		
Finishing 2009-2010	2.41	1.90	1.76	2.17	2.19	2.52	2.14	2.09	2.16	1.95	1.99	2.09	2.11	scale of 0-3
Entering 2009-2010	1.58	1.33	0.96	1.11	1.42	1.84	1.35	1.16	1.21	0.88	1.30	1.30	1.28	scale of 0-3
Value Added	0.83	0.57	0.79	1.06	0.77	0.68	0.79	0.94	0.95	1.07	0.69	0.79	0.83	scale of 0-3
Finishing 2008-2009	2.38	2.12	1.82	1.89	1.92	2.20	2.11	2.04	1.96	1.88	1.73	1.85	1.99	scale of 0-3
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	scale of 0-3
Value Added	0.69	0.96	1.01	0.98	0.68	0.40	0.60	0.70	0.92	0.96	0.97	0.63	0.75	scale of 0-3
Finishing 2007-2008	1.07	0.65	1.00	1.04	1.23	1.18	1.12	0.95	1.25	1.25	0.98	0.79	1.04	scale of 0-2
Entering 2007-2008	0.52	0.41	0.48	0.52	0.70	0.89	0.56	0.44	0.41	0.74	0.44	0.59	0.56	scale of 0-2
Value Added	0.55	0.24	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.29	0.57	0.50	0.84	0.50	0.54	0.20	0.48	scale of 0-2

TABLE 4: PPA LEARNING OBJECTIVES COVERAGE BY CORE COURSES

Course	Fall 2008 Overall Average Score	Fall 2009 Overall Average Score
PPA 200	3.7	4.4
PPA 205 (Section 1)	3.8	4.2
PPA 205 (Section 2)	4.3	4.5
PPA 220A	4.4	4.6
PPA 240A	4.5	4.3
All Semester	4.0	4.4
	Spring 2009 Overall Average Score	Spring 2010 Overall Average Score
PPA 207	4.1	3.9
PPA 210 (Section 1)	4.4	4.0
PPA 210 (Section 2)		4.1
PPA 220B	3.3	4.2
PPA 230	3.5	3.9
PPA 240B	4.2	4.0
All Semester	3.9	4.0

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento										Ranked				
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average						
EdD 602														
section 1														
1. Explain and evaluate the roles in policy making for education in view of theories of governmental intervention in society.	15	14	<u>5</u>	35.7%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	14.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21	
2. Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.	15	14	<u>4</u>	28.6%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	14.3%	<u>1</u>	7.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	4	
3. Explain the theories of public and private benefits of education	15	14	<u>6</u>	42.9%	<u>5</u>	35.7%	<u>3</u>	21.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21	
4. Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.	15	13	<u>4</u>	30.8%	<u>6</u>	46.2%	<u>3</u>	23.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.08	
Overall Averages for section			<u>5</u>	34.5%	<u>6</u>	45.5%	<u>2</u>	18.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.13	
EdD 603														
section 1														
1. Critical analysis: causal and correlation analysis	16	16	<u>9</u>	56.3%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.38	
2. Critical analysis: delineation of options	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.88	
3. Critical analysis: ethical implications of choices	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.56	
4. Critical analysis: Problem definition	16	16	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.31	
5. Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders: effective use of presentation technology	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.62	
6. Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders: professional writing (reports, memos, e-mails)	16	16	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.62	
7. Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders: public presentation (information and technical)	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.88	
8. Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders: public relations	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.56	
9. Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders: writing in academic contexts	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.75	
10. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): budgeting concepts and budget analysis	16	16	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	3.62	
11. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): cultural context and analysis	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.69	
12. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): economic concepts and analysis	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.75	
13. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): legal context and analysis	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.5	
14. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): organizational analysis/change/development	16	16	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.62	
15. Integrative thinking (interdisciplinary skill sets brought to bear on K-14 policy and administrative analysis): socio-political environment and analysis	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.56	
16. Practical applications: analysis of qualitative and quantitative data	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	3.62	
17. Practical applications: data collection -- how and where to get data	16	16	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.06	
18. Practical applications: implementation of data-based decisions	16	16	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4	

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked											
Course	Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1			average			
19 .	Understanding professional role: federal/California policy context	16	16	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.88
20 .	Understanding professional role: role of public/private/non-profit sectors in education	16	16	<u>6</u>	37.5%	<u>3</u>	18.8%	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.94
Overall Averages for section				<u>6</u>	37.2%	<u>3</u>	19.1%	<u>5</u>	32.8%	<u>1</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	0%	3.79
PPA 200 Intro to PPA														
section 1														
1 .	Develop a more analytical approach to problem definition	36	26	<u>9</u>	34.6%	<u>9</u>	34.6%	<u>8</u>	30.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.04
2 .	Develop an appreciation of the complexity of approaches that must be employed to fully understand public issues	36	27	<u>10</u>	37.0%	<u>12</u>	44.4%	<u>3</u>	11.1%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>6</u>	22.2%	<u>12</u>	44.4%	<u>5</u>	18.5%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	3.67
4 .	Familiarize students with the key institutional features of government especially at the California state and local level	36	27	<u>6</u>	22.2%	<u>13</u>	48.1%	<u>7</u>	25.9%	<u>1</u>	3.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.89
5 .	Improve the capacity of students to think and write analytically and practically about public problems	36	27	<u>8</u>	29.6%	<u>9</u>	33.3%	<u>8</u>	29.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	3.78
6 .	Sensitize students to the complexities of making ethical decisions in the public sector	36	27	<u>5</u>	18.5%	<u>10</u>	37.0%	<u>9</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	3.7%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	3.56
7 .	Understand the role of the policy analyst and public manager	36	27	<u>6</u>	22.2%	<u>8</u>	29.6%	<u>11</u>	40.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	7.4%	3.59
8 .	Work towards development of strong oral presentation skills	36	23	<u>3</u>	13.0%	<u>3</u>	13.0%	<u>14</u>	60.9%	<u>1</u>	4.3%	<u>2</u>	8.7%	3.17
Overall Averages for section				<u>7</u>	25.1%	<u>10</u>	36.0%	<u>8</u>	30.8%	<u>1</u>	3.3%	<u>1</u>	4.7%	3.73
PPA 205 Research														
section 1														
1 .	Differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.	7	4	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
2 .	Differences between experimental and non-experimental research.	7	4	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4
3 .	How to find and use archival data.	7	4	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3
4 .	How to proceed from a concept to measuring the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.	7	4	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
6 .	Major ethical and legal considerations for research involving human subjects.	7	4	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.25
7 .	Methods of data collection commonly used in the social sciences, including surveys, interviews, and textual content analysis.	7	4	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>3</u>	75.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.25
9 .	The importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.	7	4	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>1</u>	25.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.75
10 .	The main approaches for establishing causality in scientific research.	7	4	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
11 .	The politics of research, and how to position a study to influence policy decisions.	7	3	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	66.7%	<u>1</u>	33.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.67

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked										average
			5	4	3	2	1						
12. The role of theories and hypotheses in applied policy research.	7	3	<u>1</u> 33.3%	<u>2</u> 66.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.33
Overall Averages for section			<u>1</u> 19.6%	<u>1</u> 37.0%	<u>2</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	3.72
section 2													
1. Differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.	16	15	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>8</u> 53.3%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.33
2. Differences between experimental and non-experimental research.	16	15	<u>9</u> 60.0%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.6
3. How to find and use archival data.	16	15	<u>3</u> 20.0%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	3.8
4. How to proceed from a concept to measuring the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.	16	15	<u>7</u> 46.7%	<u>4</u> 26.7%	<u>4</u> 26.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>8</u> 53.3%	<u>4</u> 26.7%	<u>3</u> 20.0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.33
6. Major ethical and legal considerations for research involving human subjects.	16	15	<u>9</u> 60.0%	<u>5</u> 33.3%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.53
7. Methods of data collection commonly used in the social sciences, including surveys, interviews, and textual content analysis.	16	15	<u>8</u> 53.3%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>9</u> 60.0%	<u>5</u> 33.3%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.53
9. The importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.	16	15	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>7</u> 46.7%	<u>2</u> 13.3%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.27
10. The main approaches for establishing causality in scientific research.	16	15	<u>7</u> 46.7%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.27
11. The politics of research, and how to position a study to influence policy decisions.	16	14	<u>2</u> 14.3%	<u>7</u> 50.0%	<u>3</u> 21.4%	<u>2</u> 14.3%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	3.64
12. The role of theories and hypotheses in applied policy research.	16	13	<u>6</u> 46.2%	<u>3</u> 23.1%	<u>4</u> 30.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.15
Overall Averages for section			<u>7</u> 45.2%	<u>6</u> 37.9%	<u>2</u> 15.3%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>18</u> 54.5%	<u>13</u> 39.4%	<u>2</u> 6.1%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>18</u> 54.5%	<u>9</u> 27.3%	<u>5</u> 15.2%	<u>1</u> 3.0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>15</u> 45.5%	<u>12</u> 36.4%	<u>5</u> 15.2%	<u>1</u> 3.0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 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	<u>19</u> 57.6%	<u>12</u> 36.4%	<u>2</u> 6.1%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.52
Overall Averages for section			<u>18</u> 53.0%	<u>12</u> 34.8%	<u>4</u> 10.6%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	4.39
PPA 240A Management I													

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked										average
			5	4	3	2	1						
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	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>13</u>	81.3%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>8</u>	47.1%	<u>8</u>	47.1%	<u>1</u>	5.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>14</u>	82.4%	<u>2</u>	11.8%	<u>1</u>	5.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>7</u>	43.8%	<u>8</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>12</u>	70.6%	<u>4</u>	23.5%	<u>1</u>	5.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.65
Overall Averages for section			<u>9</u>	51.8%	<u>7</u>	42.2%	<u>1</u>	6.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.46

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2008

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

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%	

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked										
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
PPA 200 Intro to PPA													
section 1													
1. Critical thinking and analysis: a. problem definition.	22	19	<u>9</u> 47.4%	<u>9</u> 47.4%	<u>1</u> 5.3%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.42		
2. Critical thinking and analysis: b. delineate options for solving those problems.	22	19	<u>12</u> 63.2%	<u>5</u> 26.3%	<u>2</u> 10.5%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.53		
3. Critical thinking and analysis: c. maintaining a logical relationship between problem and solutions throughout your analysis.	22	19	<u>11</u> 57.9%	<u>4</u> 21.1%	<u>4</u> 21.1%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.37		
4. Develop skills in working effectively in groups.	22	19	<u>9</u> 47.4%	<u>7</u> 36.8%	<u>3</u> 15.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.32		
5. Effective communication for policy audiences: a. Construct a policy document that is clearly written (see 1c above), and includes data and technical information as appropriate.	22	19	<u>9</u> 47.4%	<u>7</u> 36.8%	<u>2</u> 10.5%	<u>1</u> 5.3%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.26		
6. Effective communication for policy audiences: b. practice giving oral presentations.	22	19	<u>5</u> 26.3%	<u>11</u> 57.9%	<u>3</u> 15.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.11		
7. Effective communication for policy audiences: c. understand the effective use of oral presentation aids including power point and handouts.	22	19	<u>8</u> 42.1%	<u>8</u> 42.1%	<u>3</u> 15.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.26		
8. Insure you have a baseline understanding of the context for policy analysis in California. In particular the role of initiatives, fiscal austerity, and changing demographics.	22	19	<u>12</u> 63.2%	<u>6</u> 31.6%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>1</u> 5.3%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.53		
9. Understand the different roles of the public, private and nonprofit sectors.	22	18	<u>15</u> 83.3%	<u>3</u> 16.7%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.83		
Overall Averages for section			<u>10</u> 52.9%	<u>7</u> 35.3%	<u>2</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.4		
PPA 205 Research in PPA													
section 1													
1. Appreciate some of the ethical considerations applicable to applied social science research.	18	16	<u>7</u> 43.8%	<u>6</u> 37.5%	<u>2</u> 12.5%	<u>1</u> 6.3%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.19		
2. Appreciate specific design principles that are common to a number of different types of research, such as the critical role of theories and hypotheses.	18	16	<u>8</u> 50.0%	<u>6</u> 37.5%	<u>1</u> 6.3%	<u>1</u> 6.3%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.31		
3. Appreciate the importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.	18	16	<u>10</u> 62.5%	<u>3</u> 18.8%	<u>3</u> 18.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.44		
4. Learn how to proceed from a concept to a variable designed to measure the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.	18	16	<u>5</u> 31.3%	<u>5</u> 31.3%	<u>6</u> 37.5%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				3.94		
5. Learn how to write an effective research proposal.	18	16	<u>6</u> 37.5%	<u>7</u> 43.8%	<u>3</u> 18.8%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.19		
6. Understand the advantages and limitations of various types of data collection methods, including: a) surveys; b) interviews; c) participant observations; d) content analysis, and; e) secondary data.	18	16	<u>9</u> 56.3%	<u>6</u> 37.5%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>1</u> 6.3%	<u>0</u> 0%				4.44		
7. Understand the differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.	18	16	<u>8</u> 50.0%	<u>5</u> 31.3%	<u>2</u> 12.5%	<u>0</u> 0%	<u>1</u> 6.3%				4.19		
8. Understand the main approaches for detecting cause-and-effect relationships in scientific research, including those based on experimental and non-experimental designs.	18	15	<u>5</u> 33.3%	<u>6</u> 40.0%	<u>3</u> 20.0%	<u>1</u> 6.7%	<u>0</u> 0%				4		

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked										
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
Overall Averages for section			<u>7</u>	45.7%	<u>6</u>	34.6%	<u>2</u>	15.7%	<u>0</u>	3.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21
section 2													
1. A. Appreciate the importance of the "front end" of research (i.e., research design).	18	15	<u>10</u>	66.7%	<u>5</u>	33.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.67
2. B. Appreciate specific design principles that are common to a number of different types of research, such as the critical role of theories, hypotheses, and comparisons.	18	15	<u>8</u>	53.3%	<u>7</u>	46.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.53
3. C. Appreciate the importance of thinking systematically about establishing causality.	18	15	<u>11</u>	73.3%	<u>4</u>	26.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.73
4. D. Understand how to proceed from a concept to a means of measuring the concept.	18	15	<u>6</u>	40.0%	<u>7</u>	46.7%	<u>2</u>	13.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.27
5. E. Understand the attributes, advantages, and limitations of various types of data collection methods, including: a) experiments; b) surveys; c) field research; d) accessing electronic data archives; and e) conducting historical analysis.	18	15	<u>10</u>	66.7%	<u>5</u>	33.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.67
6. F. Appreciate how to use simple data analysis techniques to draw tentative conclusions.	18	15	<u>7</u>	46.7%	<u>4</u>	26.7%	<u>4</u>	26.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.2
7. G. Understand how to write an effective research proposal.	18	15	<u>6</u>	40.0%	<u>7</u>	46.7%	<u>2</u>	13.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.27
8. H. Appreciate some of the ethical considerations applicable to applied social science research.	18	13	<u>10</u>	76.9%	<u>2</u>	15.4%	<u>1</u>	7.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.69
Overall Averages for section			<u>8</u>	57.6%	<u>5</u>	34.7%	<u>1</u>	7.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.5
PPA 220A, Applied Economic Analysis I													
section 1													
1. A. Critical Thinking (1) Problem definition: Understand the appropriateness of beginning a policy analysis by first defining the policy prolem in a statement that does not include solution option(s) to the "true" policy problem.	34	26	<u>15</u>	57.7%	<u>10</u>	38.5%	<u>1</u>	3.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.54
2. A. Critical Thinking (2) Delineation and evaluation of options: Understand the desirability of offering multiple solution options to a policy problem and evaluating these options in terms of criteria that include at least measures of efficiency and equity.	34	26	<u>14</u>	53.8%	<u>10</u>	38.5%	<u>2</u>	7.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.46
3. B. Integrative Thinking (3) Techniques of policy analysis: Understand that wisdom to be drawn upon in making policy decisions comes from the market, experts, and politics; that this wisdom is usually conflicted from two of the sources, and mitigated by the third source (as illustrated by Munger's triangle).	34	25	<u>15</u>	60.0%	<u>8</u>	32.0%	<u>2</u>	8.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.52
4. B. Integrative Thinking (4) Economic concepts and analysis: Understand that important role that economic concepts (supply, demand, markets, perfect competition, monopoly, consumer and producer surplus, externalities, public goods, etc.) and thinking (rational prioritization, marginal analysis, equilibrium, probability, time discounting, benefit/cost, "bang for the buck, etc.) play in policy analysis.	34	25	<u>19</u>	76.0%	<u>4</u>	16.0%	<u>2</u>	8.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.68

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked										average
			5		4		3		2		1		
5. C. Understanding Professional Role (5) Role of public sector in democratic/market system: Understand that even competitive market systems can "fail" under certain circumstances (related to market structure, externalities, public goods, and information asymmetry), that a market system offers no guarantee that an outcome is viewed as "equitable" by society, and that the choice of different political institutions in a democracy yield different political/policy outcomes. Thus, there may be a role for public sector involvement in all these areas.	34	27	<u>19</u>	70.4%	<u>7</u>	25.9%	<u>1</u>	3.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.67
6. C. Understanding Professional Role (6) Role of policy analyst: 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 ethics and value neutrality are desired in policy analysis. If personal values enter a policy analysis, they should be noted.	34	26	<u>15</u>	57.7%	<u>10</u>	38.5%	<u>1</u>	3.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.54
7. D. Practical Applications (7) Practical problem solving: Be able to conduct a basic policy analysis that involves the appropriate identification of the problem, the environment and sources of wisdom regarding the problem, solution alternatives, appropriate criteria to evaluate each alternative, and a recommendation on a course of action.	34	26	<u>15</u>	57.7%	<u>8</u>	30.8%	<u>3</u>	11.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.46
Overall Averages for section			<u>16</u>	61.9%	<u>8</u>	31.5%	<u>2</u>	6.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.55
PPA 240A, Policy Management and Administration I													
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.	27	26	<u>13</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	7.7%	<u>8</u>	30.8%	<u>3</u>	11.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.96
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.	27	26	<u>13</u>	50.0%	<u>9</u>	34.6%	<u>2</u>	7.7%	<u>2</u>	7.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.27
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.	27	26	<u>15</u>	57.7%	<u>7</u>	26.9%	<u>3</u>	11.5%	<u>1</u>	3.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.38
4. Familiarity with the concept of "organization culture" and how crucial understanding org culture is to creating a healthy and well-functioning workplace.	27	26	<u>17</u>	65.4%	<u>7</u>	26.9%	<u>1</u>	3.8%	<u>1</u>	3.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.54
Overall Averages for section			<u>14</u>	55.8%	<u>6</u>	24.0%	<u>4</u>	13.5%	<u>2</u>	6.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.29

Results of Course Assessments by course Fall 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

Overall Totals and Averages

Fall 2009

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
832	700	386	227	73	13	1	4.41
100%	84.13%	46.39%	27.28%	8.77%	1.56%	0.12%	

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked										
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
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	<u>11</u>	42.3%	<u>8</u>	30.8%	<u>7</u>	26.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.15
2. Have a working knowledge of regression analysis and the value it offers to answer policy questions.	30	26	<u>10</u>	38.5%	<u>10</u>	38.5%	<u>4</u>	15.4%	<u>2</u>	7.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.08
3. Have a working knowledge of where to begin to gather data for policy analysis.	30	27	<u>12</u>	44.4%	<u>10</u>	37.0%	<u>4</u>	14.8%	<u>1</u>	3.7%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>14</u>	53.8%	<u>7</u>	26.9%	<u>5</u>	19.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.35
5. Understand the appropriate use of bivariate and multivariate statistical techniques to identify causal relationships between variables.	30	27	<u>9</u>	33.3%	<u>7</u>	25.9%	<u>8</u>	29.6%	<u>3</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.81
6. Understand the importance of causal modeling before undertaking a statistical analysis.	30	27	<u>12</u>	44.4%	<u>9</u>	33.3%	<u>6</u>	22.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.22
Overall Averages for section			<u>11</u>	42.8%	<u>8</u>	32.1%	<u>6</u>	21.4%	<u>1</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.14
PPA 210													
section 1													
1. Appreciate the role of the policy community in developing policy options	31	29	<u>14</u>	48.3%	<u>14</u>	48.3%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.45
2. Be better able to write effective short memos and papers	31	29	<u>7</u>	24.1%	<u>11</u>	37.9%	<u>11</u>	37.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.86
3. Engage in more effective policy negotiations than would have been possible at the beginning of the course	31	29	<u>10</u>	34.5%	<u>16</u>	55.2%	<u>2</u>	6.9%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21
4. Understand a useful way of thinking about how and why policies are adopted: the "multiple streams" (Kingdon) model	31	29	<u>20</u>	69.0%	<u>8</u>	27.6%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.66
5. Understand how policy problems are identified and policies may be attached to them	31	29	<u>17</u>	58.6%	<u>11</u>	37.9%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.55
6. Understand how problems are framed more or less effectively.	31	29	<u>17</u>	58.6%	<u>10</u>	34.5%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.48
7. Understand key ethical frameworks for assessing public policy choices	31	29	<u>16</u>	55.2%	<u>10</u>	34.5%	<u>3</u>	10.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.45
8. Understand the critical role of "policy entrepreneurs" in policy development	31	29	<u>17</u>	58.6%	<u>11</u>	37.9%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.55
9. Understand the ethical subtleties of role obligations facing political entrepreneurs and other policy actors	31	29	<u>13</u>	44.8%	<u>12</u>	41.4%	<u>4</u>	13.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.31
10. Understand the pervasive nature of collective action problems and their impact on political mobilization	31	28	<u>13</u>	46.4%	<u>10</u>	35.7%	<u>4</u>	14.3%	<u>1</u>	3.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.25
Overall Averages for section			<u>14</u>	49.8%	<u>11</u>	39.1%	<u>3</u>	10.0%	<u>0</u>	1.0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>2</u>	6.9%	<u>9</u>	31.0%	<u>11</u>	37.9%	<u>6</u>	20.7%	<u>1</u>	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	<u>6</u>	20.7%	<u>7</u>	24.1%	<u>9</u>	31.0%	<u>6</u>	20.7%	<u>1</u>	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	<u>3</u>	10.3%	<u>12</u>	41.4%	<u>10</u>	34.5%	<u>3</u>	10.3%	<u>1</u>	3.4%	3.45

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked										
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
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	<u>3</u>	10.3%	<u>3</u>	10.3%	<u>12</u>	41.4%	<u>9</u>	31.0%	<u>2</u>	6.9%	2.86
5. Understand the basic theory and techniques for conducting a benefit-cost assessment.	34	29	<u>4</u>	13.8%	<u>15</u>	51.7%	<u>8</u>	27.6%	<u>2</u>	6.9%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.72
Overall Averages for section			<u>4</u>	12.4%	<u>9</u>	31.7%	<u>10</u>	34.5%	<u>5</u>	17.9%	<u>1</u>	0%	3.32
PPA 230													
section 1													
1. Develop a working knowledge of the California state and local budget process, budget concepts, and budget terminology	19	19	<u>4</u>	21.1%	<u>6</u>	31.6%	<u>5</u>	26.3%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>2</u>	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	<u>6</u>	33.3%	<u>8</u>	44.4%	<u>3</u>	16.7%	<u>1</u>	5.6%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>4</u>	22.2%	<u>4</u>	22.2%	<u>8</u>	44.4%	<u>2</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.56
4. Develop some basic skills in the selection and use of performance measures in the context of performance budgeting	19	18	<u>2</u>	11.1%	<u>3</u>	16.7%	<u>7</u>	38.9%	<u>3</u>	16.7%	<u>3</u>	16.7%	2.89
5. Gain an understanding of budgets as tools for accountability	19	19	<u>3</u>	15.8%	<u>6</u>	31.6%	<u>6</u>	31.6%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	3.32
6. Improve written and verbal communication skills, including the presentation of budgetary information	19	18	<u>1</u>	5.6%	<u>6</u>	33.3%	<u>5</u>	27.8%	<u>5</u>	27.8%	<u>1</u>	5.6%	3.06
7. Learn some basic skills in budget development, analysis and implementation	19	18	<u>3</u>	16.7%	<u>6</u>	33.3%	<u>6</u>	33.3%	<u>2</u>	11.1%	<u>1</u>	5.6%	3.44
8. Understand the role of budgets for of a state or local agency or department	19	18	<u>2</u>	11.1%	<u>11</u>	61.1%	<u>5</u>	27.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.83
9. We ask that you rate each instructor individually. Overall Rating -- Instruction by Pat Leary.	19	18	<u>2</u>	11.1%	<u>8</u>	44.4%	<u>8</u>	44.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.67
10. We ask that you rate each instructor individually. Overall Rating -- Instruction by Russ Fehr.	19	16	<u>1</u>	6.3%	<u>8</u>	50.0%	<u>5</u>	31.3%	<u>2</u>	12.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
Overall Averages for section			<u>3</u>	15.6%	<u>7</u>	36.7%	<u>6</u>	32.2%	<u>2</u>	10.6%	<u>1</u>	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	<u>6</u>	42.9%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	7.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.36
2. Create a more integrated sense of organizational structure, goal setting, strategic planning, leadership and performance measurement and management.	17	14	<u>6</u>	42.9%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	7.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.36
3. Improve your ability to make concise effective presentations of complex material.	17	14	<u>2</u>	14.3%	<u>8</u>	57.1%	<u>4</u>	28.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	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	<u>4</u>	28.6%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>3</u>	21.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.07
5. Strengthen your ability to identify and utilize organization theories for solving public problems.	17	14	<u>6</u>	42.9%	<u>6</u>	42.9%	<u>2</u>	14.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.29
Overall Averages for section			<u>5</u>	34.3%	<u>7</u>	50.0%	<u>2</u>	15.7%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.19

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2009

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

Overall Totals and Averages

Spring 2009

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
935	843	282	311	182	54	14	3.94
100%	90.16%	30.16%	33.26%	19.47%	5.78%	1.50%	

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2010

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento			Ranked										
Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
PPA 207													
section 1													
1. (1) Have a working knowledge of regression analysis and the value it offers to answer policy questions.	39	22	<u>8</u>	36.4%	<u>8</u>	36.4%	<u>4</u>	18.2%	<u>1</u>	4.5%	<u>1</u>	4.5%	3.95
2. (2) 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).	39	22	<u>9</u>	40.9%	<u>6</u>	27.3%	<u>5</u>	22.7%	<u>2</u>	9.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	4
3. (3) Understand the importance of causal modeling before undertaking a statistical analysis.	39	22	<u>7</u>	31.8%	<u>9</u>	40.9%	<u>3</u>	13.6%	<u>2</u>	9.1%	<u>1</u>	4.5%	3.86
4. (4) Understand the appropriate use of bivariate and multivariate statistical techniques to identify causal relationships between variables.	39	21	<u>3</u>	14.3%	<u>7</u>	33.3%	<u>9</u>	42.9%	<u>1</u>	4.8%	<u>1</u>	4.8%	3.48
5. (5) Have a working knowledge of where to begin to gather data for policy analysis.	39	22	<u>9</u>	40.9%	<u>4</u>	18.2%	<u>8</u>	36.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	4.5%	3.91
6. (6) 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.	39	21	<u>7</u>	33.3%	<u>7</u>	33.3%	<u>6</u>	28.6%	<u>1</u>	4.8%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.95
Overall Averages for section			<u>7</u>	33.1%	<u>7</u>	31.5%	<u>6</u>	26.9%	<u>1</u>	5.4%	<u>1</u>	0%	3.86
PPA 210													
section 1													
1. (1) Appreciate the role of the policy community in developing policy options	16	11	<u>8</u>	72.7%	<u>1</u>	9.1%	<u>1</u>	9.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	9.1%	4.36
2. (2) Be better able to write effective short memos and papers	16	10	<u>1</u>	10.0%	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>4</u>	40.0%	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.3
3. (3) Engage in more effective policy negotiations than would have been possible at the beginning of the course	16	10	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>4</u>	40.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	10.0%	3.5
4. (4) Understand a useful way of thinking about how and why policies are adopted: the "multiple streams" (Kingdon model)	16	10	<u>7</u>	70.0%	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.7
5. (5) Understand how policy problems are identified and policies may be attached to them	16	10	<u>5</u>	50.0%	<u>5</u>	50.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.5
6. (6) Understand how problems are framed more or less effectively	16	10	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>6</u>	60.0%	<u>1</u>	10.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.2
7. (7) Understand key ethical frameworks for assessing public policy choices	16	10	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>3</u>	30.0%	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
8. (8) Understand the critical role of "policy entrepreneurs" in policy development	16	10	<u>7</u>	70.0%	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>1</u>	10.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.6
9. (9) Understand the ethical subtleties of role obligations facing political entrepreneurs and other policy actors	16	9	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>4</u>	44.4%	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.78
10. (10) Understand the pervasive nature of collective action problems and their impact on political mobilization	16	10	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>2</u>	20.0%	<u>5</u>	50.0%	<u>1</u>	10.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.5
Overall Averages for section			<u>4</u>	39.0%	<u>3</u>	32.0%	<u>2</u>	21.0%	<u>1</u>	6.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4
section 2													
1. (1) Appreciate the role of the policy community in developing policy options	10	9	<u>5</u>	55.6%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.44
2. (2) Be better able to write effective short memos and papers	10	9	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.67
3. (3) Engage in more effective policy negotiations than would have been possible at the beginning of the course	10	9	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.67
4. (4) Understand a useful way of thinking about how and why policies are adopted: the "multiple streams" (Kingdon model)	10	9	<u>6</u>	66.7%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.44

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2010

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

California State University, Sacramento					Ranked									
Course Learning Objective		Enrolled	Polled	5	4	3	2	1	average					
5.	(5) Understand how policy problems are identified and policies may be attached to them	10	9	<u>6</u>	66.7%	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.44
6.	(6) Understand how problems are framed more or less effectively	10	9	<u>4</u>	44.4%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.11
7.	(7) Understand key ethical frameworks for assessing public policy choices	10	9	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>4</u>	44.4%	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	3.67
8.	(8) Understand the critical role of "policy entrepreneurs" in policy development	10	9	<u>5</u>	55.6%	<u>3</u>	33.3%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.44
9.	(9) Understand the ethical subtleties of role obligations facing political entrepreneurs and other policy actors	10	9	<u>2</u>	22.2%	<u>5</u>	55.6%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>1</u>	11.1%	3.78
10.	(10) Understand the pervasive nature of collective action problems and their impact on political mobilization	10	9	<u>4</u>	44.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>5</u>	55.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.89
Overall Averages for section				<u>4</u>	42.2%	<u>3</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	21.1%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.06
PPA 220B														
section 1														
1.	(1) Develop basic proficiency using quantitative spreadsheet models to inform policy questions.	27	20	<u>9</u>	45.0%	<u>4</u>	20.0%	<u>7</u>	35.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.1
2.	(2) Understand the basic theory and techniques for conducting a benefit-cost assessment.	27	20	<u>11</u>	55.0%	<u>2</u>	10.0%	<u>7</u>	35.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.2
3.	(3) Learn the limitations of benefit-cost analysis and economic efficiency and their proper role in a more comprehensive policy analysis.	27	20	<u>13</u>	65.0%	<u>5</u>	25.0%	<u>2</u>	10.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.55
4.	(4) Gain sufficient knowledge to critique an actual benefit-cost analysis, such as one issued by a government agency, think tank, or interest group.	27	20	<u>9</u>	45.0%	<u>6</u>	30.0%	<u>5</u>	25.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.2
5.	(5) Learn how to analyze, from an economic perspective, how different types of government intervention (e.g. subsidies, taxation, cap-and-trade, technology forcing) can be used to correct market failures rooted in externalities.	27	20	<u>9</u>	45.0%	<u>5</u>	25.0%	<u>5</u>	25.0%	<u>1</u>	5.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.1
Overall Averages for section				<u>10</u>	51.0%	<u>4</u>	22.0%	<u>5</u>	26.0%	<u>0</u>	1.0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.23
PPA 230														
section 1														
1.	(1) Develop an understanding of the political context of budget development and implementation at the federal, state and local (city and county) levels (Wassmer, Jez, and Leach)	20	17	<u>3</u>	17.6%	<u>7</u>	41.2%	<u>7</u>	41.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.76
2.	(2) Develop a working knowledge of the California state and local budget process (Wassmer), budget concepts, and budget terminology (Kirlin)	20	17	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>7</u>	41.2%	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4
3.	(3) Learn some basic skills in budget development, analysis and implementation and cash and debt management (Kirlin and Leach)	20	17	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>8</u>	47.1%	<u>4</u>	23.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.06
4.	(4) Understand the role of budgets for a state or local agency or department (Kirlin and Wassmer)	20	17	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.06
5.	(5) Gain an understanding of budgets as tools for accountability (Kirlin and Leach)	20	17	<u>4</u>	23.5%	<u>7</u>	41.2%	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.88
6.	(6) Develop and appreciation for the intergovernmental dynamics (particularly the relationships between the State of California, counties, and cities) of budgeting and their impact on budgeting behavior (Wassmer and Jez)	20	17	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.94

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2010

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked										average
			5		4		3		2		1		
7. (7) Gain a better understanding of how California arrived at its current fiscal crisis and be able to offer an educated assessment of the options offered to solve it (Wassmer and Leach)	20	17	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>5</u>	29.4%	<u>12</u>	70.6%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.29
8. (8) Improve written and verbal communication skills, including the presentation of budgetary information (All)	20	17	<u>6</u>	35.3%	<u>4</u>	23.5%	<u>7</u>	41.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.94
Overall Averages for section			<u>4</u>	25.0%	<u>6</u>	36.8%	<u>6</u>	38.2%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>0</u>	0%	3.87
PPA 240B													
section 1													
1. (1) Create a more integrated sense of the form(s) and functioning of organizations.	31	19	<u>11</u>	57.9%	<u>5</u>	26.3%	<u>1</u>	5.3%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.32
2. (2) Understand the variety of ways to undertake strategic planning and benefits and drawbacks of different tools.	31	19	<u>6</u>	31.6%	<u>10</u>	52.6%	<u>1</u>	5.3%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.05
3. (3) Understand the way performance measurements are used and misused.	31	19	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>10</u>	52.6%	<u>6</u>	31.6%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>1</u>	5.3%	3.32
4. (4) Understand the circumstances under which organizations change and how change can be managed and directed.	31	19	<u>8</u>	42.1%	<u>9</u>	47.4%	<u>0</u>	0%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21
5. (5) Learn how to assess organizations at a macro-level -- especially your comfort and competence using written documentation (web sites, budgets, strategic plans, annual reports etc.) to learn about organizations.	31	19	<u>10</u>	52.6%	<u>5</u>	26.3%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.21
Overall Averages for section			<u>7</u>	36.8%	<u>8</u>	41.1%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>2</u>	10.5%	<u>0</u>	0%	4.02

Results of Course Assessments by course Spring 2010

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

Overall Totals and Averages

Spring 2010

Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
944	651	240	211	163	28	9	3.99
100%	68.96%	25.42%	22.35%	17.27%	2.97%	0.95%	