

ITEM 1

Standard 1.3 – Program Evaluation

Standard 1.3 states, “The program will collect, apply, and report information about its performance and its operations to guide the evolution of the program’s mission and the program’s design and continuous improvement with respect to standards two through seven.”

The Commission noted that the MPA program at Cal State Fullerton has several deficiencies in and obstacles to meeting this standard. In general, the Commission noted the program has not fully formalized its approach to program evaluation. In particular, it is noted that student learning outcomes assessment is not fully incorporated in the program’s efforts at strategic program management, there is not a clear connection between the program’s mission, its goals, the methods by which to evaluate those goals and the ways in which they reflect the five NASPAA core competencies, how the competencies are connected to articulated student learning outcome goals, the ways in which those outcomes are measured for assessment purposes, and how the findings from that process are used for holistic programmatic improvement and evolution.

While the program believes that many of the above qualities of Standard 1.3 were included in its self-study report (SSR), its Response to the Interim Report, and discussed with the Site Visit Team (SVT), it acknowledges that its effort to meet this standard do not follow state-of-the-art assessment practices that provide direct and indirect evidence of student learning across the program, core competency achievement, nor a demonstrative process for continual programmatic improvement based on assessment findings over time.

In an effort to overcome the concerns of the Commission related to Standard 1.3, as well as additional concerns related to Standard 5.1, which states, “As the basis for its curriculum, the program will adopt a set of required competencies related to its mission and public service values...”, the program is redeveloping its Assessment Plan to formalize its approach for program evaluation and continual improvement. This process has begun by creating the role of a MPA Assessment Coordinator and by forming an MPA Assessment Committee, the members of which are the Program Coordinator, the Assistant Program Coordinator, and the Assessment Coordinator.

The first task of the committee is to examine and evolve the program’s mission statement, articulate specific goals related to this mission statement and connected to the five core competencies, formulate measurable student learning outcomes to assess achievement of these competency-related goals, and develop and implement a process to directly and indirectly measure outcomes achievement. This process will allow holistic program evaluation that reflects current assessment scholarship, as well as provide the Commission with “evidence that the assessment process is producing evidence that enables the program to focus improvement on program-wide student learning ... as well as progress toward programmatic

goals,” as guided by Laura Bloomberg in her July 20, 2017 memorandum to the program regarding NASPAA Accreditation Review. Evolving the program in these ways will allow the program to better meet the standards desired by the Commission.

Standard 1.3: Program Evaluation

As described in Section 1.2 of our SSR and in supporting documentation, our program is guided by five overarching goals that are central to and reflective of our mission, our institution, and the community we serve. As identified in our logic model, we collect information about the program, our students, our students’ learning, and our faculty to inform programmatic evaluation.

The five goals articulated in Section 1.2 are:

1. Prepare students to enter the dynamic field of public administration.
2. Increase the professional competence of those already pursuing public administration careers.
3. Provide theory-rich training to our students.
4. Provide specialized training and competency in the areas of public finance, human resources, urban management, and criminal justice.
5. Retain our reputation as the leading theory-rigorous MPA program in the region.

- **1.3.1: Link goals from Section 1.2 to program evaluation efforts**

Following our logic model we evaluate these goals with a focus on performance output and outcome measures. This will allow us to assess—in the short- and long-terms—how well our MPA program is achieving these goals. Our approach is described below.

- Goal 1: “Prepare students to enter the dynamic field of public administration.”
 - To evaluate whether our pre-service students are ready and prepared to enter public service careers, we rely on both direct and indirect measures of programmatic outputs and outcomes.
 - Output measures:
 - Courses taught focus on training for public service careers, preparing students to serve the broader public interest, and reflect the five NASPAA core competencies.
 - To evaluate this measure, we focus on the courses taught, when they are taught, and components that contribute to student achievement of specified learning outcome goals that are mapped to core competency and skill development.
 - In addition, we focus on student engagement in the classroom, at MPA extra-curricular events, and our students who are involved with the Pi Alpha Alpha honor society.

- In addition, we direct our students who are preparing for a career in public service to an internship experience to develop practical knowledge and skills in this dynamic field.
 - Outcome measures:
 - Competencies introduced, reinforced, and mastered across the program through classroom artifact assessment and comprehensive exam evaluations.
 - Exit survey of students' self-evaluation of outcomes achieved.
 - Internship supervisor report and evaluation of student interns.
 - Post-graduate survey of programmatic satisfaction and job placement data.
- Goal 2: "Increase the professional competence of those already pursuing public administration careers."
 - To evaluate whether our in-service students have gained professional competencies in the field of public administration, we rely on both direct and indirect measures of programmatic outputs and outcomes.
 - Output measures:
 - Courses taught focus on training for public service careers, preparing students to serve the broader public interest, and reflect the five NASPAA core competencies.
 - To evaluate this measure, we focus on the courses taught, when they are taught, and components that contribute to student achievement of specified learning outcome goals that are mapped to core competency and skill development.
 - In addition, we focus on student engagement in the classroom, at MPA extra-curricular events, and our students who are involved with the Pi Alpha Alpha honor society.
 - Outcome measures:
 - Competencies introduced, reinforced, and mastered across the program through classroom artifact assessment and comprehensive exam evaluations.
 - Exit survey of students' self-evaluation of outcomes achieved.
 - Post-graduate survey of programmatic satisfaction and job placement data.
- Goal 3: "Provide theory-rich training to our students."
 - To evaluate whether our students are receiving a theory-rich training, we focus on our faculty recruitment, retention, tenure, and promotion process that reflects university standards, as well as division and programmatic priorities. In addition, we evaluate programmatic outputs, such as course content as evidenced by syllabi. In the evaluation of outcomes, we rely on indirect measures, such as our exit survey, and direct measures, such as comprehensive exams and student artifacts from course assignments or projects.

- Goal 4: “Provide specialized training and competency in the areas of public finance, human resources, urban management, and criminal justice.
 - For this goal we also rely on programmatic outputs and student outcomes for evaluation. The outputs include the courses taught, when they are taught, the content of the course, and scholarly specialization of the instructor. Outcome measurement focuses on responses to concentration-specific responses to comprehensive exam questions, as well as job placement data gathered through our post-graduate survey questionnaire.
- Goal 5: “Retain our reputation as the leading theory-rigorous MPA program in the region.”
 - To evaluate this goal, we focus on programmatic inputs, such as the knowledge, skills, and abilities of our faculty and the applicants to our program, as well as outcomes, such as responses to our exit and post-graduate surveys and through long-term examination of the professional impact of our graduates, i.e., their career paths. We also rely on feedback from our Advisory Board, from internship supervisors, and from the city managers involved in our City Management Fellowship Program.
- **1.3.2: Ongoing Assessment Processes**
 - The CSUF MPA program faculty use several assessment tools to determine whether and the extent to which we are meeting our programmatic goals and the student learning outputs and outcomes described in the previous section (Standard 1.3.1). The focus is on student learning, input and feedback from the MPA Advisory Board, faculty discussions, and a process that allows the program to improve and evolve.
 - Student Learning Assessment
 - Direct Measures
 - Comprehensive Exam
 - Artifacts from courses that can be used to assess learning mapped to the five core competencies, such as exams, projects, literature reviews, statistical analyses, and research papers, among other things.
 - Reports from internship supervisors
 - Indirect Measures
 - Exit survey
 - Post-graduate survey
 - Input and Feedback from the Advisory Board
 - Example 1: Between 2013 and 2016 the program assessed student learning outcomes related to quantitative methods skills, which we map as a learning outcome of universal competency three. Direct evidence of quantitative learning was collected from various artifacts from two sections of POSC 523, our research methods course. We also asked several questions related to this concept on the exit survey and discussed the importance of quantitative skills with our advisory board. On one hand, the direct measurement of classroom artifacts was inconclusive due to the evolution of the rubric used to assess this

outcome. On the other hand, an indirect measure in our exit survey asking how much did you learn from the MPA program related to quantitative and statistical techniques, students responded with an average of 3.5 out of 5 (1 indicating nothing and 5 indicating a great deal) for the years 2014 and 2016. This is slightly lower than self-assessments of other curricular areas. Feedback from our advisory board reinforced this finding, indicating that our graduates need additional training in quantitative methods and statistical analysis. In response, the program has asked faculty teaching courses related to these skills to place a greater emphasis on methodological training. In addition, faculty are discussing a two-day “stats camp” for students struggling with this learning outcome that could be held during winter and summer breaks.

- Example 2: Between 2014 and 2016 the program assessed learning outcomes related to the articulation of a public service perspective, with the goal that students in our program would be able to articulate a public service perspective. Direct evidence to evaluate learning outcomes for this goal include evaluation of a paper written in the capstone seminar (POSC 521) and an internship supervisor evaluation (POSC 497) that asks how well the student intern understands and is motivated by public service. The goal for both of these measures is that 80% of our students meet or exceed expectations for this learning outcome. An indirect measure of this learning outcome is included in our exit survey of graduates, asking how much they learned or gained knowledge about public service values. On a scale of 1 to 5, with five being “a great deal,” our students responded with an average of 4.4 across the years. While we are pleased with these results, we discovered in the evaluation of papers from POSC 521 that 20% of our students scored below our expectations in their ability to “identify the difference between public versus private interest and between public versus private goods.” This led program faculty to believe that we can improve student learning in this area by clearly introducing and discussing aspects of a public service perspective in the program’s introductory and foundations course (POSC 509) through the use of examples, case studies, and additional readings. In an effort to evolve and improve the program, nucleus faculty are in the process of completing paperwork to make POSC 509 a program requirement for all students. Artifacts from POSC 509 and 521 are being identified to measure student achievement of this learning goal at the end of their first and penultimate semesters in the program.
- Student Training for PA Careers
 - In discussions with our Advisory Board, alumni, local and regional stakeholders and public officials, and city managers who have participated in our City Management Fellowship Program, program

faculty rely on feedback about student learning, job placement and advancement, and information about whether our students possess the knowledge areas, skills, and expertise needed to enter and/or advance in the field of public administration. This feedback is used to refine our operations, learning outcome goals, and to make programmatic improvements where needed, i.e., to evolve the program to ensure our students have the required competencies to engage in this dynamic field.

- Note on programmatic evolution of Standard 1.3.
 - Following the Self-Study Report, our Site Team Visit, and the COPRA response, MPA faculty are considering several changes to the ways in which they conduct the evaluation of the program. These changes include evaluating the program’s mission statement, reexamining programmatic goals, rearticulating our student learning outcome goals and the methods by which to measure them, exploring how to better use the evidence from our findings to improve the program. Additional information related to this is provided in below in the program’s response to standard 5.1.

ITEM 2

Standard 3.2 – Faculty Diversity/Standard 4.4 – Student Diversity

Standard 3.2 states, “The program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment and retention of faculty members.” Standard 4.4 states, “The program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment, admissions practices, and student support services.”

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review requests additional information regarding how it operationalizes its diversity plan to intentionally promote a climate of inclusiveness across the program.

As described in Standards 1 and 4 and our diversity plan, the program and its faculty are deeply committed to incorporating diversity into the program and curriculum. Consequently, we are taking a number of steps to ensure diversity issues are part of, or will be incorporated into the curriculum by faculty. Our efforts support the program’s mission statement insofar as incorporating diversity helps our graduates become leaders and managers who excel in public service within government and across sectors.

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review asks: How does the program emphasize diversity and inclusion across the program, including in its student body and curriculum?

The program currently uses a multi-pronged approach to emphasize diversity and inclusion across the program. We advertise to and attempt to recruit women and minority applicants for faculty positions. We advertise and recruit women and minority applicants to apply for admission to the program. Diverse authors and literature about diversity are included

in the curriculum. Diverse guest speakers are invited to talk, deliver lectures to and mentor our students. Faculty create an inclusive and welcoming environment for all students by promoting frequent interactions among students. This is done through group projects and social networking events that bring together students from diverse backgrounds

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review requests additional information about its strategies to promote a climate of inclusiveness, including its efforts to refine the exit survey, incorporate guest speakers, and the results of its work reviewing diversity in the curriculum.

In order to refine our Exit Survey, we are undertaking a complete review of the document. We have contracted with our University's own Social Science Research Center (SSRC). This unit has extensive expertise in survey design and research. At present, the SSRC is reviewing the survey and will provide us with feedback, including rewritten questions that will better capture our students' full range of experiences with respect to diversity and a supportive educational climate. The improvement in data comprehensiveness will allow us to perform more accurate analysis of the student experience and follow that with programmatic improvement in any deficient areas.

The program has always invited numerous guest speakers to classes and events throughout the academic year. The program also began collecting and maintaining information on our guest speakers including along relevant dimensions of race, ethnicity and gender and these data were presented in our report as evidence of balance and inclusiveness with respect to diversity. We would describe this as a passive approach to promoting diversity and supportive educational climate. What we believe is also needed is an active approach to promote a supportive educational climate. The next step the program plans to take is to invite guest speakers to directly address topics related to diversity and inclusion. We have an extensive network of PA professionals working in specialties like human resources who can share their experience and expertise with respect to diversity and inclusion with our students. Many of these professionals are themselves, alumni of the program.

In order to review diversity in the curriculum, we are convening faculty groups for each course. These faculty groups will be composed of the faculty members who regularly teach that course and any other faculty members that have specific expertise in that area. The faculty groups will review syllabi and examine how diversity and diverse viewpoints are currently represented in syllabi and to how these might be augmented. Faculty groups will report on their findings and recommendations in the spring in time for curricular changes to be implemented by fall.

We plan to conduct face to face meetings and workshops with student support services across to campus to learn about their resources and to tailor strategies and best practices to our students. Finally, we are exploring the idea of hosting a series of focus groups with different stakeholder groups (current students, alumni, and our PA Advisory Board) in which we could develop strategies to promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness in our program.

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review requests evidence that the program provides a supportive educational climate for students.

By the time of the next report, we will provide evidence that the program provides a supportive educational climate for students.

ITEM 3

Standard 4.3 – Support for Students

Standard 4.3 states, “The program will ensure the availability of support services, such as curriculum advising, internship placement and supervision, career counseling, and job placement assistance to enable students to progress in careers in public affairs, administration, and policy.”

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review asks “if the program finds students are poorly prepared for the rigor of the program, are the admissions requirements appropriate to gauge future student success in the program?”

In previous COPRA reaccreditation documents the program noted its concern that pre-service students are often less well-prepared for the MPA program than students working in-service in the public and nonprofit sectors. Data from the 2016/17 school year confirm faculty concerns. While only 28% of students were enrolled full-time during the school year, these students accounted for 41% of probationers. Further, students not employed and/or employed in the private sector were only 29% of our student body, however, they were nearly half of the students on probation in 2016/17. The program will continue to collect and analyze this data to ensure our admission process selects applicants that are best prepared to succeed.

Our programmatic response to this issue has been greater emphasis on recruiting and admitting in-service students who are more likely to be successful in our program. To that end we have made numerous programmatic changes over the past few years. For example, our admissions policy, which guides faculty members doing admissions, includes the following statement, “We are more likely to admit students if they are already in the public or nonprofit workforce and we take the written statement of purpose as an indicator of the ability to do graduate level writing. Our goal is to admit students whose university record demonstrates their capability and desire to succeed in both their coursework and the public workplace.” Second, after consultation with the PA Advisory Board in January 2016, the MPA program faculty discussed how to more actively recruit in-service students. As part of program efforts to more evenly distribute MPA workload duties across the faculty, it was agreed that a new position of Admissions Coordinator would be created and that one of the duties associated with this position would be conducting on-campus program information sessions. This system became institutionalized in fall 2016 and while too soon to indicate a trend, fewer than 10% of the incoming group of MPA students for fall 2017 is pre-service or not working in the public or nonprofit sector.

Third, another programmatic change that is designed to recruit in-service students was creation of an informational brochure that faculty can share with practitioners. Most systematically, the

director of the Center for Public Policy (located within our Division of Politics, Administration, & Justice) has taken these brochures to local cities, agencies, special districts, and professional organizations to market the program to working professionals. In 2016/17, the director’s visits included ten cities, two water districts, two county Chambers of Commerce, and the Association of California Cities--Orange County at which he was able to discuss and disseminate information about the program. These efforts are on-going for 2017/18. Further, these brochures are given to students who attend the MPA information sessions.

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review asks “Are there identifiable trends for those students who begin the program and ultimately succeed (or dropout)?”

The program has not tracked student departures in a systematic way however, we have information on forty-four students that enrolled in at least one class between fall 2007 and fall 2015, who subsequently left the program. The following table indicates that nearly one-third of these students failed to maintain adequate grades; twenty-five percent left for work or family reasons; and twenty percent transferred to another degree program.

Low grades/ Failed out	Transfer to other degree program	Left for work reasons	Left for family reasons	Dropped in first semester
12	9	6	5	2
27%	20%	14%	11%	4.5%

Of students about whom we have information, the largest number left due to poor academic performance, therefore, several years ago the MPA Coordinator began a programmatic change to support students as soon as their grades slip below a 3.0. This includes sending a letter and Academic Success Sheet to students who are placed on academic probation. The Success Sheet requires students to reflect on the reasons for their probationary status, devise a personal plan of improvement, and meet with the MPA Coordinator to discuss strategies for academic success. At these meetings students are encouraged to take advantage of university resources at the Graduate Student Success Center including graduate tutoring and writing workshops.

The memorandum regarding reaccreditation review asks “Has waiting until a student is placed on academic probation proven to be a successful strategy for intervention?”

The program has several levels of support for students before academic probation. First is the MPA New Student Orientation (NSO) which has been a staple of the program for ten years. During orientation, new students meet program faculty, including the MPA Advisor, learn about program concentrations, appropriate order of the curriculum, and the “milestones” to completion of their degree. The NSO is always co-hosted with students from Pi Alpha Alpha, who are on-site to answer questions from new students and serve as program experts. On-campus support resources including Disability Support Services, the Student Wellness Center, and the Graduate Student Success Center are highlighted during these sessions. In the past

several years the on-line MPA Student Handbook has been printed and distributed to each new student.

The university requires that students complete a Study Plan after completion of 12 program units (four classes, thus typically at the end of our students' first year). This requires that students meet with the MPA Advisor who works with the student to help decide upon a concentration area, courses to take over the next several semesters, and appropriate course load. During these advising sessions the advisor has the student's transcripts so the two can discuss issues of low grades and/or GPAs below a 3.0, and appropriate corrections to ensure future success including taking fewer classes, joining study groups, and making use of on-campus tutoring.

Completing the Academic Success Sheet and meeting with the MPA Coordinator appears to be a successful intervention for some of our students; while eleven were placed on academic probation after the fall 2016 semester, only seven were still on probation at the end of the spring semester. Unfortunately, students do not always heed the advice of the coordinator, for example at least two of our probationers who are employed full-time disregarded the advice of the coordinator and enrolled in three classes in spring (full-time student status); they both ended up on probation again at the end of that semester. The program has begun discussions with the Office of Graduate Studies about possibly limiting probationers to no more than two courses in subsequent semesters until the student can earn his/her way off of probation. Concerns about how this change might impact financial aid and how we might best support the academic and financial needs of our students has impeded a final program change on this matter.

Finally, program faculty and the PA Advisory Board have voiced concerns about student writing ability for a number of years. Poor writing has been identified as an impediment for many of our probationers, for example. To further support our students for whom writing is a barrier to success, at their August 2017 meeting the MPA faculty voted to fund an MPA Writing Workshop in mid-October. This timeframe was chosen to give faculty ample opportunity to evaluate writing assignments for our new students; those identified as needing some assistance will be encouraged by their faculty to attend the Workshop. In addition, all students on probation will be asked to attend and every student in the program will be invited to this pilot program. If student writing improves and student feedback is positive, the program intends to make this an on-going form of student support.

ITEM 4

Standard 5.1: Universal Required Competencies

As noted above, program faculty are in the process of redesigning the approach to assess student achievement of the five universal competencies. This section elaborates on how our evolving approach to assessment will provide direct measures of student competencies and

evidence with which to identify opportunities for improvement. This process involves evaluating our mission statement and its related goals to ensure it reflects our particular program and the universal competencies. In addition, and as described below, we are working to better articulate measureable student learning outcomes that map to the universal competencies, determining in which core courses student artifacts can be used to measure those learning outcomes, and creating the methods by which to evaluate those artifacts across the program and over time.

The current mission statement of the program states, “The mission of the MPA program at Cal State Fullerton is to prepare our students for a career in public service by providing a core set of competencies anchored on the foundation of scholarly research and professional practice. Our students develop knowledge, skills, and public service values that equip them to be ethical and exceptional leaders in their communities who act with a commitment to public service, democratic values, accountability, social equity, and diversity.”

The program’s nucleus faculty is considering evolving the mission statement in ways that better reflect our students, the communities we serve, programmatic goals, and NASPAA competencies. This new mission states:

The Cal State Fullerton MPA program develops leaders and managers who excel in public service within government and across sectors. We provide students with a comprehensive core curriculum in public administration and a diverse selection of electives and concentrations by providing outstanding academic and practical instruction anchored on the foundations of scholarly research and professional practice in public administration. We train and prepare our students to think critically and to solve difficult administrative and policy problems in local, state, regional, and national communities with an emphasis on a public service perspective in the development of technical and managerial skills to address the needs of diverse and changing communities.

The program is also considering several programmatic goals that reflect this refined mission statement:

1. Prepare students to enter the dynamic field of public administration or increase the professional competence of those already in public service careers.
2. Provide students with academic instruction based on theoretically-rich public administration scholarship and practical training.
3. Develop the abilities of our students to address significant issues in public administration and policy related to curricular concentrations in the areas of public finance, human resources, urban management, and criminal justice.
4. Retain our reputation as the leading theory-based MPA program in the region to allow the program to fulfill its mission.

The above mission statement and programmatic goals reflect the emphasis of the program and its commitment and aspiration to meet the standards and core competencies set out by the

Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA). The program is developing student learning outcomes (SLOs) statements aligned with the NASPAA required competencies and designed to evaluate the program's effectiveness meeting its goals. These SLOs and core competencies to which they are aligned are enumerated below. Table 1 displays how these SLOs are mapped to the five competencies required by NASPAA.

Programmatic Student Learning Outcome Goals:

Upon completion of the program, students will be able to:

1. Synthesize relevant information to address public problems using the major theories underlying the field of public administration, including those related to governance structures, federalism and intergovernmental relations, and intersectoral relations;
2. Articulate and apply a public service perspective in the demonstration of knowledge related to the structures, components, goals, and objectives of the public sector;
3. Describe the policy process through the application of appropriate theories, including those related to the role of stakeholders, administrators, bureaucracies, and the challenges of implementation;
4. Participate in the policy process by demonstrating the ability to find and use a variety of appropriate resources to research policy issues;
5. Participate in the policy process through analysis and application of quantitative and qualitative empirical evidence to determine the effectiveness of a public policy or program;
6. Identify and assess ethical problems in public administration, and create appropriate solutions based on moral reasoning and public service values;
7. Demonstrate the ability to use graphical and tabular methods to summarize and interpret data, analyze and interpret basic univariate and bivariate statistics;
8. Conduct and evaluate survey research, identify strengths and weaknesses in research design, and articulate an understanding of both substantive and statistical significance;
9. Demonstrate an understanding of the major components of a personnel system within an organization, including the nuances of effective motivation, behavior, and management;
10. Effectively communicate and productively interact with diverse teams and diverse communities;
11. Articulate and appreciate the value of diversity in the public sector the communities it serves;
12. Weigh the value of different ways of achieving goals and conserve resources to maximize goal achievement.

Table 1: Mapping SLOs to NASPAA Core Competencies

NASPAA Required Competency	SLO Goal
The ability to lead and manage in public governance	6, 7, 9
To participate in and contribute to the policy process	1, 3, 4, 5
To analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12
To articulate and apply a public service perspective	2, 6
To communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry	10, 11

Artifacts from course assignments, exams, projects, papers, annotated bibliographies from core curriculum courses, as well as the comprehensive exam are used to measure the achievement of the programmatic student learning outcome goals. The curriculum map below (table 2) identifies specific core courses within the MPA curriculum from which a sampling of artifacts of student work can be gathered to assess student learning outcome achievement.

Table 2: Curriculum Map

SLO	509	521	523	526	571	572	519	525	528	497
1	x	x					x			
2	x	x								x
3	x						x	x	x	
4							x		x	
5			x		x					
6	x	x								
7			x		x			x		
8			x							
9	x			x		x				
10	x	x				x		x		x
11	x	x				x				x
12					x	x				

The following course names are associated with the course numbers indicated in Table 2:

- 509: Foundations of Public Administration
- 521: Capstone Seminar: Public Administration Theory
- 523: Administrative Research and Analysis
- 526: Public Organizational Theory and Behavior
- 571: Public Budgeting and Finance
- 572: Human Resources Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations

- 519: State and Local Government
- 525: Local Government Management
- 528: Seminar in Public Policy
- 497: Internship in Public Administration

As the Commission expects to see evidence of the completion of one full assessment cycle for at least one universal competency and substantial progress toward the completion of a complete assessment cycle for at least two additional competencies by May 2018, the program has developed an assessment plan for the next several years. This plan, as indicated in table 3, shows that the program will complete a full assessment cycle for universal competency four, determining the extent to which our students articulate and apply a public service perspective, analyzing our findings, and demonstrating the use of those findings for programmatic improvement and evolution. The program will also show substantial progress in the demonstration of the extent to which our students have achieved universal competencies one and two.

Table 3: Assessment Plan Cycle

Assessment Cycle (Academic Year)	Competencies Assessed
2017–2018	4, 1, 2
2018–2019	1, 3, 5
2019–2020	2, 4, 3
2020–2021	1, 2, 5

The Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Committee are responsible for ensuring this plan is implemented and that these competencies are assessed. In consultation with core faculty, the committee is developing rubrics to assess each student learning outcome that is mapped to each of the five universal competencies. An example of one of these rubrics that can be used for different types of student across the courses to which the outcomes are mapped (table 2) is provided in table 4, demonstrating our expectations to measure the extent to which students have achieved this outcome.

Table 4: EXAMPLE OF LEARNING OUTCOME RUBRIC

Learning Outcome # 2	Developing (1)	Milestone (2)	Capstone (3)
----------------------	----------------	---------------	--------------

<p>Articulate and apply a public service perspective in the demonstration of knowledge related to the structures, components, goals, and objectives of the public sector.</p>	<p>Student is unable to fully articulate and apply a public service perspective through demonstrated knowledge of the structure, components, goals and objectives of the public sector.</p>	<p>Student is able to differentiate between varying organizational structures present in the public sector and articulate and apply a public service perspective based on the goals and objectives of this sectors.</p>	<p>Student is able to differentiate between varying organizational structures present in the public sector, and compare and contrast to private sector organizations in terms of both structure and goals and objectives.</p>
---	---	---	---