I. **SELF-STUDY** *(suggested length of 1-3 pages)*

A. The last five-year review was completed in 2014-15. The planning goals outlined in the five-year review included: curriculum revision, implementing new course delivery options, admission requirement revision, improved advising, increased assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), monitoring of the student evaluation process, and improved enrollment management, and faculty resources.

B. **Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

Curriculum: In regards to curriculum revision, PUAD completed a major revision in 2012-13, revising options and discontinuing one option as part of the results of program and enrollment assessment. PUAD significantly revised the Health Care Administration option and the Public Management and Policy Analysis options, respectively. The Human Resources and Organizational Change option was discontinued. The option revisions and the discontinuance were approved by the required CSUEB entities.

In regard to advising, we continue to offer a student orientation in the Fall and Spring semesters (our admission semesters). We have developed new degree completion roadmaps and a new annual course listing, which was necessary due to the curriculum revision. In addition, on the semester schedule, we clearly indicate in which courses students should enroll, based on their admission semester.

New Course Delivery options: In regards to new course delivery options, PUAD is now offering the majority of its courses in a hybrid mode.

Regarding accreditation, a number of UC and CSU MPA programs are not NASPAA-accredited and many are not even institutional members of NASPAA. The resources needed to re-establish NASPAA accreditation lead us to question whether the value of accreditation is sufficient to merit the necessary investments, which would include increasing the MPA faculty by three tenure-track faculty, increasing administrative support, and decreasing class sizes. It seems unlikely that this level of increase in programmatic cost will be possible in the foreseeable future.

Admission Requirement Revision: In regards to the admission requirements, we continue to follow the application evaluation process adopted in 2011-12, and update in every semester the specific instructions on the PUAD website regarding the content and format of letters of recommendation and the statements...
Program Assessment/Improvement: In regards to assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs), we are continuing to develop SLOs for each of the courses, are participating in the CLASS FACT with specific assessment targets. In 2012-13, the MPA Graduate Coordinator examined all of the syllabi from Fall 11 and later in order to capture the SLOs. These SLOs were reviewed at our Department retreat in Summer 13. The PLOs were specified and tied to the University’s ILOs.

In regard to monitoring student evaluations, in Winter 13 and Spring 13 PUAD participated in the pilot study where all of the student evaluations were completed online. We will continue to be in the study for its duration.

Faculty Resources: During the 2014-15 AY, the MPA program was granted two tenure-track faculty lines. At the end of that search, we were able to hire one faculty member who joined the department in Fall 2015 as an Assistant Professor. Then, during the 2015-16 AY, the MPA program was granted one faculty line, and at the end of that search we were able to hire one faculty member who joined the department in Fall 2016 as Assistant Professor (However, during this Fall semester 2018, this particular faculty member unexpectedly passed away)

C. Program Changes and Needs
Overview: The primary changes in the MPA program were the result of the quarter-to-semester conversion, the addition of two faculty hires and constant maintenance of the lecture pool. For now, the primary program need is for increased administrative support our two graduate programs. For instance, rather than a .75, a 1.0 administrative support staff would have been adequate for our two graduate programs.

Curriculum: As was discussed earlier, the MPA curriculum has been completely transformed, with new Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). The curriculum now consists of 8 4-unit courses, for a total of 32 units.

Students: We are currently approved to admit in the Fall semester only in the MPA program. In Fall 17, we received 90 applications and admitted 62 applicants (68% admission). In Spring 18, we received 104 applications and admitted 77 applicants (74% admission).

Faculty: As discussed earlier on, PUAD was recently awarded two tenure-track faculty lines - one hire in 2015-16 (Nicole Diggs) and the second in 2016-17 (Joyce Keyes Williams, who recently passed away during Fall Semester 2018). We have sufficient number of lecturers in our part-time lecturer pool to draw from when they are needed.

Staff: PUAD runs two full-time graduate programs (MS-HCA and MPA) with roughly 350 students and a number of part-time adjunct faculty, but we continue to have inadequate administrative support. We have one 75% 12/12 ASC I position, which means that each program has a 37.5% 12/12 ASC I position. We have repeatedly requested that the 75% position be converted to a 100% position, but these requests have unfortunately been denied by CLASS.

Resources: The primary need continues to be for increased administrative support.
Assessment: We currently have the PLO Synthesis Examination which provides direct assessment. Also, the presentation of the assessment data is reported for each individual PLO.

II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (suggested length of 1-2 pages)

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)
List all your PLO in this box. Indicate for each PLO its alignment with one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). For example: “PLO 1. Apply advanced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & 6).”

B. Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed
List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background on your program’s history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g., annually, first time, part of other assessments, etc.)

C. Summary of Assessment Process
Summarize your assessment process briefly using the following sub-headings.

   Instrument(s): (include if new or old instrument, how developed, description of content)
   Sampling Procedure:
   Sample Characteristics:
   Data Collection: (include when, who, and how collected)
   Data Analysis:

D. Summary of Assessment Results
Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.

   Main Findings:
   Recommendations for Program Improvement: (changes in course content, course sequence, student advising)
   Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop: (recommendations to address findings, how & when)
   Other Reflections:

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year
Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.
III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

Each program should provide a one-page discussion of the program data available through CAPR. This discussion should include an analysis of trends and areas of concern. Programs should also include in this discussion requests for additional resources including space and tenure-track hires. Resource requests must be supported by reference to CAPR data only. Requests for tenure-track hires should indicate the area and rank that the program is requesting to hire. If a program is not requesting resources in that year, indicate that no resources are requested.

A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

Notable Trends:
Summarize and discuss any notable trends occurring in your program over the past 3-5 years based on program statistics (1-2 paragraphs). You may include 1-2 pages of supplemental information as appendices to this report (e.g., graphs and tables).

Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics:
Provide your reflections on the trends discussed above and statistics and supplemental information presented in this report.

B. Request for Resources (suggested length of 1 page)

1. Request for Tenure-Track Hires

PUAD is requesting for two (2) tenure-track faculty lines. The rationale for these requests are explained below.

Two senior faculty in the department have indicated their firm intention to retire - one at the end of Spring 19 and the other at the end of Spring 20. In addition, one junior faculty member has just recently passed away this Fall Semester. The MPA program is thus requesting a position for a faculty member who can teach in the MPA program, specifically in the finance and budgeting areas.

The faculty member who is planning to retire at the end of Spring 20 has been the primary faculty in the MS-HCA program for many years and serves as the MS-HCA Graduate Coordinator. The MS-HCA program is thus requesting a position for a faculty who can teach in both the MS-HCA program and the MPA program with Health Care Administration Concentration.

2. Request for Other Resources

PUAD runs two full-time graduate programs (MS-HCA and MPA) with roughly 350 students and a number of part-time adjunct faculty, but we continue to have inadequate administrative support. We have one 75% 12/12 ASC I position, which means that each program has a 37.5% 12/12 ASC I position. We have repeatedly requested that the 75% position be converted to a 100% position, but this request has unfortunately been repeatedly denied by CLASS. This is somewhat surprising, given that other departments in CLASS who appear to have a significantly lower number of students have a 100% 12/12 administrative support position.