Program Name: Masters in Public Policy and Administration   **Year: 17-18**

Graduate Learning Goals Report

The Graduate Learning Goals policy can be found at: http://www.csus.edu/acaf/academic%20resources/policies%20and%20procedures/15-16fs-115%20graduate%20learning%20goals.pdf

Coursework	Disciplinary Knowledge	Communication	Critical Thinking/Analysis	Information Literacy	Professionalism	Intercultural/Global Perspective
PPA 200, Introduction to Public Policy and Administration	X	X	X		X	X
PPA 205, Research in Public Policy and Administration	X	X	X	X	X	
PPA 207, Quantitative Methods	X	X		X		
PPA 210, Political Environment of Policy Making	X	X		X	X	X
PPA 220A and PPA 220B, Applied Economic Analysis	X	X	X	X	X	
PPA 230, Public Budgeting and Finance			X	X	X	
PPA 240A and PPA 240B, Public Management and Administration	X		X	X	X	X

Institutional Graduate Learning Goal	Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Assessment Plan Lines of Evidence			Action Plan
		Direct	**Indirect**	**Evaluation Parameters**	
Disciplinary Knowledge	Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand and address policy and administrative problems; Work effectively in groups; Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector				
Communication	Frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding; Write clearly and succinctly as appropriate to	Spring 2018 PPA Students in PPA 220B make 20-minute public	Students fill out end of semester evaluation of how well core-learning	Direct Evidence: Outside experts assign a grade based upon rubric;	Results of Direct and Indirect Evidence compiled in early summer 2018 and discussed at first fall 2018 PPA faculty

1

	various audiences; Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation; Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions	policy-based presentations evaluated by outside experts using attached rubric, scores compiled and discussed	objectives achieved in spring 2018 PPA core courses and the scores relating to communication noted.	advanced achievement if average grade A or better. Indirect Evidence: Students evaluate communication-based core learning objectives using Likert Scale of 5 = excellent to 1 =not accomplished; advanced achievement if average score between 4 and 5.	meeting. If advanced achievement achieved, then will try to identify the elements that led to it. If less than this, then will try to identify reasons why and discuss ways to improve.
Critical Thinking / Analysis	Construct clear definition of problems; Identify reasonable alternatives to address problems; Analyze and evaluate alternatives and offer solutions				
Information Literacy	Use relevant data; Effectively review a literature to help address a problem; Use different analytical skills and tools strategically				
Professionalism	Understand your obligation to advance public value; Consider the ethical dimensions of choices in public policy and administration; Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy				
Intercultural / Global Perspectives	Understand the significance of diversity in effective public governance in California				
Research*					

*Required for Doctoral Programs

Program Learning Outcomes Evaluation

The four areas below focus more on the process of your evaluation that is directly related to information you would report for program review. For each of the following sections, areas of focus (italicized) and questions are designed as a guide to assist you. You may not have a response for each one if it is not relevant to what you did. Some questions relate to information you offered in the template on the previous page. The key for the first three areas (Sample, Process, Results): Be as detailed as possible so you have information needed about department assessment activities for your program review.

a. Sample: Describe the sample of students you used to evaluate the outcome(s)
Describe the Sample: Number of students, from where they were located (thesis defense/thesis completion/core course/capstone, concentration representation, level of students: beginning, advanced, finished, etc.); how you sampled them (if not using the entire group); explanation of why the sample is a representation of program: Ex. Oral Communication: Thesis Defense: Evaluate all students in a given semester/year defending theses.

Direct Evidence gathered from 20 PPA master's students enrolled in PPA 220B (Applied Economic Analysis) in spring 2018 based upon evaluations from three to five outside experts that came to their presentations and evaluated them in terms of:
(1) Clarity/organization in presenting material through PowerPoint (no more than 20 slides used)
Ability to engage the audience in discussion, (2) Ability to engage the audience in discussion, (3) Handling of questions; (3) Ability to stay within the allotted time frame and cover material effectively (20 minutes for PowerPoint, 10 minutes for discussion), (4) "Comfort" level displayed in public speaking, and (5) Command of the material / appropriate knowledge of the subject (Five times other values).

Indirect Evidence gathered from survey on core learning objectives related to communication filled out at the end of PPA 207, 210, 220B, and 240B in spring 2018. Of the 87 students enrolled in these courses, 63 responded (72% participation).

b. Process: Describe the process in detail about how you collected and analyzed data
Data you collected: Assignment, paper, presentation, etc.; *Who collected data*: faculty member of record, assessment committee, thesis committee, etc.; *Describe process for evaluating* documents or activities (NOTE: this may be similar to the sampling procedure for papers/assignments; for others, like oral, may be whether you watched the oral presentations live, recorded, etc. Just a description of process.); *Instrument (measures) used*: Direct (rubric); Indirect (survey) (NOTE: this is also reflected in the Graduate Learning Goal Template when asked about Measures: Direct, Indirect); *Performance Levels*: Based on instrument (measures), what are the expected levels/scores for beginning/advanced students (NOTE: This is reflected in the Evaluation Parameters in the form); Data analysis: who analyzed (same/different as those who gathered the documents?); *Analysis procedures*: Each assignment/paper reviewed by two people, a third evaluates if conclusions are significantly different between first two reviewers, etc.; *Data analysis*: Calculate averages of reviewer scores/consensus scores among reviewers.

Direct Evidence collected by Professor Wassmer who taught 220B and handed out and collected evaluation rubric from each outside expert. He then used a spreadsheet to compile average responses.

Indirect Evidence collected in the form of each instructor of PPA Core Course in the spring of 2018 handing out an evaluation instrument to each student created by PPA Department. The forms then returned to student who returned to PPA Admin Asst (Suzi Byrd). She compiled scores without the instructor ever seeing them until done.

c. Results: Describe your results and conclusion in relation to your outcome.
All results will be about how well program/department is achieving learning outcome; not about individual students or faculty: Overall percentage of students who reach each standard; specific areas that students are achieving

4

expectations; specific areas students need improvement: e.g., rubric ratings that indicate students are more/less successful.

Indirect Evidence in the form of Communication-Based learning objective (course) and average score out of five achieved **(Overall Average Score of 3.97 – just below the acceptable level of between 4 and 5).**

Effectively review empirically-based literature to assist in the creation of a regression analysis (207) 4.32;

Practice writing a regression-based research study in a manner that is theoretically sound and also understandable to a non-statistical audience (207) 4.08;

Understand the key leadership role played by political entrepreneurs (210) 3.33;

Understand how to frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding (210) 3.58;

Gain a greater comfort in your ability to make a public presentation and engage in a public discussion on a public policy topic (220B) 3.91;

 Compose a white paper on a policy problem (220B) 3.91;

Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation (Yolo projects and class work) (240B) 4.67).

Direct Evidence in the form of overall score out of 100 achieved in PPA 220B public policy presentations based upon six different evaluation categories (average score in each category also reported:

Clarity/organization in presenting material through PowerPoint (no more than 20 slides used)

Ability to engage the audience in discussion (8.99/10)

Handling of Questions (9.02/10)

Ability to stay within the allotted time frame and cover material effectively (20 minutes for PowerPoint, 10 minutes for discussion) (9.35/10)

"Comfort" level displayed in public speaking (9.00/10)

Command of the material / appropriate knowledge of the subject (Five times other values) (45.73/50)

Overall Average: 91.12/100

d. Data: Attach the data you gathered (this is for possible campus-wide assessment, so not being used to evaluate your program at all. This could help the campus-wide assessment.)
    If collected using a standardized instrument (VALUE RUBRIC), please submit in an excel spread sheet that includes each student's scores on each area of the rubric (Use the Excel spread sheet that is located on the graduate studies website to include data: URL. You may have to modify the spreadsheet if you are using a different standardize rubric. If so, please provide the rubric used).

PPA 220B – APPLIED ECONOMIC ANALYSIS II

**GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
SPRING 2018**

<u>Grading Rubric for Student PowerPoint Presentations</u>

Excellent = 10, Good = 9, Acceptable = 8, Needs Improvement = 7, Poor = 6, Absent = 0

Required Content	10	9	8	7	6	0
Clarity/organization in presenting material through PowerPoint (no more than 20 slides used)						
Ability to engage the audience in discussion						
Handling of questions						
Ability to stay within the allotted time frame and cover material effectively (20 minutes for PowerPoint, 10 minutes for discussion)						
"Comfort" level displayed in public speaking						
Command of the material / appropriate knowledge of the subject (Five times other values)	<u>**50**</u>	<u>**45**</u>	<u>**40**</u>	<u>**35**</u>	<u>**30**</u>	<u>**0**</u>

Total score (100 possible)

Comments (Three Positive and One Area to Work On):

1.

2.

3.

4.

White Paper Assignment

PPA 220B – Spring 2018 – Professor Rob Wassmer

Due May 17, 2018 in Word form

One Grade Deduction for Every Day Late

Submit an Electronic Copy to rwassme@csus.edu

Overview

You are to write no more than an eight-page (not counting cover page and references), typed, and double-spaced (11 Times New Roman Font, one-inch margins White Paper) on your chosen policy topic in a manner described below.

Within your policy topic, you will cover one chosen area that not duplicated by someone else in your group. When I meet with you, we will discuss what these will be.

I will use the rubric contained on the next page to score your assignment and assign it a grade. Pay careful attention to what this rubric is asking for and the further instructions offered below.

Instructions

You should structure your White Paper as an essay with an appropriate cover page, introductory section that describes what is in the essay, section headings that cover the requested material, and a concluding section. You will need a reference list at the end and **citations must be in APA style**. Include diagrams and references in body of paper. I will not read beyond eight pages. (Your cover page and reference list are not part of this eight-page limit.) Other than these constraints, including the mandatory components described below, the remaining form of the write up is up to you. Include diagrams and in body of paper.

Name: _____

Grading Rubric for Final Policy White Paper
PPA 220B, Spring 2017

Excellent = 10, Good = 9, Acceptable = 8, Needs Improvement = 7, Poor = 6, Absent = 0

Required Content	10	9	8	7	6	0
Development and organization: appropriate introduction and conclusion, organization clearly described in introduction and done as stated, appropriate headings for sections						
Writing mechanics: grammar, spelling, word choice, and sentence structure						
Presentation: appropriate and attractive format						
Citations: accurate citations and listing of references using APA style						
Figures/diagrams/charts: minimum of three						
Command of the material/knowledge of the subject (Five times other values): how well do you cover the approach assigned to your section (that is representing what others have written about it and in reaching your own conclusions)	50	45	40	35	30	0

Your Total Score (100 Possible)

GRADE

Oral Communication rubric scores

Student Tracking Number	Clarity/organization in presenting material through PowerPoint (no more than 20 slides used)	Ability to engage the audience in discussion	Handling of Questions
1	10	9	9
	9	9	9
	9	9	10
2	8	9	9
	9	8	9
	9	9	8
	8	7	9
3	9	9	9
	8	7	10
	9	9	9
	10	10	9
4	8	8	8
	8	9	9
	8	9	9
5	9	9	9
	8	10	9
	9	9	9
	10	10	10
	9	8	8
6	10	9	8
	10	7	7
	10	9	8
	9	10	9
	8	10	8
7	10	9	9
	10	9	9

	8	9	8
8	8	9	9
	10	10	10
	9	9	9
	9	9	10
	8	9	10
9	10	9	9
	10	9	9
	9	10	10
	10	9	10
10	10	10	10
	9	8	9
	9	9	10
	10	10	10
	10	10	10
11	9	9	8
	9	10	9
	8	9	10
	9	10	10
12	10	10	9
	9	8	8
	9	10	9
	10	9	9
13	8	9	9
	8	10	10
	7	8	9
14	9	9	9
	9	9	9
	10	7	8
	10	9	9
15	9	8	8
	9	9	8
	10	9	7
	10	9	9

	9	9	10
16	8	9	9
	8	8	9
	8	9	8
	8	8	8
	9	9	8
	9	10	10
17	10	10	10
	10	10	10
	10	10	10
	10	10	10
18	7	8	8
	8	8	8
	8	8	8
	9	8	8
19	10	9	9
	10	9	9
	10	10	10
	9	10	10
20	9	10	10
	7	7	10
	9	8	9
AVERAGES	**9.02**	**8.99**	**9.02**

Directions

Please enter the student ID number
and then enter a numerical score for
each VALUE rubric element (column).
Appropriate scores are as follows:
Excellent = 10, Good = 9, Acceptable
= 8, Needs Improvement = 7, Poor =
6, Absent = 0

Ability to stay within the allotted time frame and cover material effectively (20 minutes for PowerPoint, 10 minutes for discussion)	"Comfort" level displayed in public speaking	Command of the material / appropriate knowledge of the subject (Five times other values)	Total Points
10	10	50	98
10	10	44	91
10	10	45	93
8	8	45	87
8	8	45	87
10	10	45	91
9	8	35	76
8	9	42	86
9	7	42	83
9	9	45	90
10	10	45	94
8	9	45	86
8	8	47	89
10	9	40	85
9	9	45	90
10	9	45	91
9	9	45	90
10	10	50	100
9	9	40	83
10	10	45	92
10	10	40	84
9	10	45	91
10	9	45	92
10	10	42	88
10	8	50	96
9	8	45	90

9	9	40	83
10	8	45	89
10	9	45	94
9	10	45	91
10	10	50	98
9	7	40	83
8	8	45	89
9	8	45	90
10	10	50	99
10	9	45	93
10	10	50	100
8	10	45	89
9	9	37	83
10	10	45	95
10	10	50	100
10	9	45	90
10	10	50	98
8	8	45	88
10	10	45	94
10	10	50	99
9	8	42	84
10	10	50	98
10	10	45	93
10	8	50	94
9	9	45	91
9	9	45	87
9	10	50	96
9	8	50	94
10	8	50	93
9	9	45	91
9	10	50	94
9	9	45	89
9	7	45	87
10	10	50	98

10	10	45	93
9	9	45	89
9	9	45	88
9	8	45	87
9	9	45	87
10	8	50	94
9	10	50	98
10	10	50	100
10	10	50	100
10	10	50	100
10	10	50	100
8	7	45	83
10	7	45	86
8	8	40	80
8	7	45	85
10	8	50	96
10	8	45	91
9	9	50	98
10	9	46	94
10	9	45	93
9	9	45	87
8	9	43	86
9.35	**9.00**	**45.73**	**91.12**

Outside Experts: Lizette Mata (Deputy Treasurer CA Sec of State), Dan Walters (Sac Bee Columnist), Joe Mathews (CA Policy Author), Geoffrey Neill (Policy Analyst CSAC), Alex Vassar (Comm Manager CA State Library), Barbara O'Connor (Retired Sac State Comm Professor), Lloyd Levine (Former CA Assembly Member), Rob Osborne (CA Public Utilities Comm), Tammy Cronin(Project Leader Valley Vision), Ryan Anderson (LAO Policy Analyst), Rick Pratt (Consultant CA Assembly Educ Committee), Roxanne Purdue (Consultant CA Commission on Teacher Credentialling), Edgar Zazueta (Director Gov Relations CA Assoc of School Admin), Binu Abraham (Program Manager SACog), Ryan Ong (Economist CA Dept Transportation), Susan Handy (Env Science Professor, UC Davis), Manny Leon (Consultant Senate Transp Comm)

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

PPA 207 Quantitative Analysis

section 1

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		3		2		1		average
■ 01. Learn to apply the analytic tool of regression analysis to offer insights into a particular policy or administration concern. (1d)	30	25	10	40.0%	8	32.0%	5	20.0%	2	8.0%	0	0%	**4.04**
■ 02. Learn how the knowledge and skills necessary to produce and interpret a credible regression analysis. (1e)	30	25	11	44.0%	6	24.0%	6	24.0%	2	8.0%	0	0%	**4.04**
■ 03. Learn how to access relevant data and literature to complete a credible regression analysis. (2d)	30	25	15	60.0%	3	12.0%	6	24.0%	1	4.0%	0	0%	**4.28**
■ 04. Effectively review empirically-based literature to assist in the creation of a regression analysis. (1f)	30	25	13	52.0%	7	28.0%	5	20.0%	0	0%	0	0%	**4.32**
■ 05. Practice writing a regression-based research study in a manner that is theoretically sound and also understandable to a non-statistical audience. (2e)	30	24	11	45.8%	5	20.8%	7	29.2%	1	4.2%	0	0%	**4.08**
Overall Averages for section	30	25	12	48.4%	6	23.4%	6	23.4%	1	4.8%	0	0%	**4.15**

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	5		4		Ranked 3		2		1		average
PPA 210 Political Env. of Policy Making													
section 1													
■ 01. - Understand the multiple streams model of how and why policies are chosen. - Understand how to recognize when to advance policies based on whether windows of opportunity are open or closed. - Understand how the way a policy choice is framed affects its potential for support. - Learn a variety of analytical tools that are helpful in the political arena (e.g., tools to address collective action problems, skill at convey information to policy makers effectively, negotiation skills) (2a)	19	12	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	3.58
■ 02. - Understand the key leadership role played by political entrepreneurs. (2c)	19	12	2	16.7%	3	25.0%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	3.33
■ 03. - Understand how to frame and present problems to different audiences to optimize understanding. - Understand the particular importance of framing in terms of gains versus losses. (2d)	19	12	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	3.58
■ 04. - Consider how public policy choices may be viewed from different ethical frameworks (e.g., utilitarianism, Rawlsian justice). - Consider the ethical nature and limits of role responsibilities. (3b)	19	12	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	0	0%	3.67
■ 05. - Understand the difference between analysis and advocacy (3c)	19	11	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.18
■ 06. - Understood how the diversity of political actors affects the type of policy choices that are made.(3d)	19	12	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	4
Overall Averages for section	19	12	4	35.2%	2	21.1%	4	29.6%	1	8.5%	1	5.6%	3.72

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2018

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	5		4		3		2		1		average
PPA 220B Economic Analysis II													
section 1													
■ 01. Understand the basic process of how to conduct a benefit cost assessment (BCA) and have a working knowledge of some of the specific techniques necessary to do it. (2a)	21	11	2	18.2%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	0	0%	**3.64**
■ 02. Learn to apply the concepts of benefit-cost assessment (BCA) to a particular California public policy (for example High Speed Rail) and to appreciate this policy tool's relevance to gaining a better understanding of how to structure a policy intervention. (2d)	21	11	3	27.3%	5	45.5%	1	9.1%	2	18.2%	0	0%	**3.82**
■ 03. Be able to apply a specific public policy "tool" (Government Failure, Comparative Institutional Analysis, Microeconomic Based Market Analysis, Market Failure Approach, BCA, etc.) to a California relevant public policy concern in order to gain a better understanding of how "best" to deal with it. (1d)	21	11	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0%	**4**
■ 04. Gain a greater comfort in your ability to make a public presentation and engage in a public discussion on a public policy topic. (2f)	21	11	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	0	0%	**3.91**
■ 05. Explore further how the framing of a policy problem in terms of "what is fair" or "what is efficient" results in the choice of different "best" solutions. (1c)	21	11	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	2	18.2%	0	0%	**4**
■ 06. Compose a white paper on a policy problem. (2e)	21	11	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0%	**3.91**
Overall Averages for section	21	11	4	36.4%	3	30.3%	2	18.2%	2	15.2%	0	0%	**3.88**

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

Course Learning Objective	Enrolled	Polled	Ranked 5		4		3		2		1		average
PPA 240B Management II													
section 1													
■ 01. Understand the critical role of effective leadership in the public sector (leadership paper). (2c)	17	15	10	66.7%	4	26.7%	1	6.7%	0	0%	0	0%	4.6
■ 02. Draw upon multiple disciplines to understand address policy and administrative problems (evaluation and leadership papers and Yolo projects). (1e)	17	15	10	66.7%	5	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.67
■ 03. Use different analytical skills and tools strategically (leadership paper and Yolo projects). (2a)	17	15	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.6
■ 04. Work effectively in groups (Yolo projects and class work). (2b)	17	15	12	80.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.67
■ 05. Use an articulate and confident style of oral presentation (Yolo projects and class work). (2f)	17	15	12	80.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4.67
■ 06. Understand your obligation to advance public value (Yolo projects and class work). (3a)	17	14	12	85.7%	0	0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	0	0%	4.64
Overall Averages for section	17	15	11	75.3%	2	0%	1	9.0%	0	1.1%	0	0%	4.64

Results of Course Assessments by course   Spring 2018

Department of Public Policy and Administration
California State University, Sacramento

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

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

Overall Totals and Averages   Spring 2018

	Number Enrolled	Number Polled	ranked5	ranked4	ranked3	ranked2	ranked1	Overall Average
totals	492	350	176	77	70	23	4	
averages	21.39	15.22	7.65	3.35	3.04	1	0.17	4.14
	100%	71.14%	35.77%	15.65%	14.23%	4.67%	0.81%	

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