



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	Public Affairs and Administration
Program Unit	Master of Public Administration (MPA)
Reporting for Academic Year	2015-2016
Department Chair	Professor O. Jay Umeh
Date Submitted	6/20/2015

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

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. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

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 quarters (our admission quarters). We have developed new degree completion roadmaps a new annual course listing, which was necessary due to the curriculum revision. In addition, on the quarterly schedule, we clearly indicate in which courses students should enroll, based on their admission quarter.

In regards to new course delivery options, PUAD is now offering the majority of its courses in hybrid mode. Two courses – PUAD 5000 and PUAD 6811 were not approved by the faculty to be offered in hybrid mode, but the rest of the courses were approved.

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.

In regards to the admission requirements, we continue to follow the application evaluation process adopted in 2011-12, and update quarterly the specific instructions on the PUAD website regarding the content and format of letters of recommendation and the statements of purpose, as well as application deadlines.

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.

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 will join the department in Fall 2015 as an Assistant Professor.

C. Program Changes and Needs

The primary change in 2011-12 was the change in the number of faculty who primarily taught in the MPA program. Professor Frank Scott ended his participation in the FERP program in Fall 2014. The level of administrative support remains low – there is administrative position, and that is a 75% 10/12 position.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Within public administration education, there has been a movement towards competency-based education. The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), which is the membership association of graduate programs in public administration, public policy, and public affairs, has identified five competency domains that graduates from public administration programs should be able to demonstrate. This year, we significantly revised the PLOs and adopted the five NASPAA-identified domains with modification for the MPA PLOs.

PLO 1. Students who graduate with a MPA will be able to lead and manage in public governance while demonstrating an understanding of the role of theory in public governance and the application of these theories toward administrative inquiry.

PLO 1 supports the CSUEB ILOs of “act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels” and “demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.”

PLO 2. Students who graduate with a MPA will be able to participate in and contribute to the policy process.

PLO 2 supports the CSUEB ILOs of “apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities” and “work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities” and “demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.”

PLO 3. Students who graduate with a MPA will be able to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve

problems, and demonstrate an understanding of interpretive and quantitative research methodologies.

PLO 3 supports the CSUEB ILOs of “think critically and creatively and apply analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems” and “demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.”

PLO 4. Students who graduate with a MPA will be able to articulate and apply a public service perspective.

PLO 4 supports the CSUEB ILOs of “communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others” and “act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels.”

PLO5. Students who graduate with a MPA will be able to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry.

PLO 5 supports the CSUEB ILOs of “communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others” and “work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities.”

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

We assess all five of the PLOs annually.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

We assess PLOs annually. Per our 5-year review and previous annual reports, we continue to administer the MPA Exit Survey, a 21-item survey that indirectly measures our graduates’ perception of success with the MPA PLOs. PUAD 6901 (Graduate Synthesis) is the MPA capstone course and requires the completion of an essay exam, which is designed to directly assess the students’ level of competency.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Each PLO/ILO is assessed with the MPA Comprehensive Exam during the final weeks of PUAD 6901 (Graduate Synthesis course) using grading/assessment rubrics that the program faculty developed for each PLO.

All 26 students’ Comp Exams were submitted and assessed in Blackboard in Spring Quarter, 2016. Overall student performance on the learning outcomes was excellent. Average scores received on the essays ranged from a low of 84% on PLO 4 (“articulate and apply a public service perspective”) to a high of 91% on PLO 3 (“analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and demonstrate an understanding of interpretive and quantitative research methodologies”). The average total score was 53.5 out of 60 total points (88% correct) with a standard deviation of 7.7 points. Despite the fact that students were informed that their lowest scoring essay out of the 5 essay questions in the Comp Exam would automatically be omitted from their final grade, 15 students achieved total scores in the 90-100% range, which means they performed well

across the five areas. (Scores reported here include all the essay scores prior to throwing out each student's lowest scoring essay. The average adjusted final score, with lowest essay score thrown out, was 96.7% correct with a standard deviation of 4.7 points.) The percent distribution of scores received for each of the 5 essays corresponding to the 5 PLOs is presented in the attached "Appendix A – Score Distributions by Essay Question/PLO."

It should be noted that scores for PLO 5, "communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry," show a somewhat bimodal distribution with 77% receiving a score of 10-12 of 12 possible points and 14% receiving zero points. Additionally, scores for PLO 4, "articulate and apply a public service perspective," also show a bimodal distribution, albeit a more modest one, with 73% receiving a score of 10-12 of 12 possible points and 9% receiving zero. This *could* be the result of ordering effects whereby students completed the first few essays and, knowing that the lowest score received on an essay would be thrown out, decided to skip one of the last questions (all students received these essay questions in the same numerical order as the PLOs). Alternatively, the low scores *could* indicate some students' trouble with demonstrating competency on PLOs 4 and 5. These lines of reasoning are only conjecture and the students' reasoning behind these bimodal distributions is an area that the department will need to investigate.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

a. Student Demographics - Headcount Enrollment by Major Profile: Fall 2010-Fall 2014 (Fall 2015 Not Available)

Source:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ir/files/html/apr/enrollment%20by%20major%20and%20ethnicity%20014.html>

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

		Fall 2010		Fall 2011		Fall 2012		Fall 2013		Fall 2014	
Public Administration		TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	
			Master	Master	Master	Master	Master	Master	Master		
Female	Black, non-Hispanic	33	18	18	18	18	23	23	23	23	30
	Asian	28	19	19	20	20	21	21	19	19	23
	Pacific Islander	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
	Hispanic	13	12	12	17	17	19	19	25	25	33
	White	24	23	23	21	21	26	26	19	19	22
	Multiple ethnicity	2	3	3	6	6	6	6	7	7	5
	Race/ethnicity unknown	24	12	12	10	10	6	6	7	7	2
	Nonresident aliens	7	4	4	3	3	5	5	6	6	10

Male	Black, non-Hispanic	11	5	5	7	7	8	8	13	13	13
	Asian	13	12	12	9	9	12	12	14	14	10
	Pacific Islander	3									
	Hispanic	3	4	4	8	8	14	14	14	14	14
	White	17	11	11	11	11	9	9	16	16	16
	Multiple ethnicity	1	2	2	3	3	5	5	2	2	
	Race/ethnicity unknown	11	7	7	9	9	2	2	2	2	3
	Nonresident aliens	6	5	5	1	1	3	3	1	1	3
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	44	23	23	25	25	31	31	36	36	43
	Asian	41	31	31	29	29	33	33	33	33	33
	Pacific Islander	5	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
	Hispanic	16	16	16	25	25	33	33	39	39	47
	White	41	34	34	32	32	35	35	35	35	38
	Multiple ethnicity	3	5	5	9	9	11	11	9	9	5
	Race/ethnicity unknown	35	19	19	19	19	8	8	9	9	5
	Nonresident aliens	13	9	9	4	4	8	8	7	7	13

b. Degrees Conferred

Source: <http://www.csueastbay.edu/ir/Academic%20Program%20Review.html>

Degrees Awarded	College Years				
	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
Public Administration					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	77	54	105	68	75
3. Total Number of Majors	77	54	105	68	75

Source: Degrees Awarded By Department and Major

https://public.tableau.com/views/DegreesAwarded1/DegreeAwardedDashboard?:embed=y&:display_count=yes&:showTabs=y&:showVizHome=no#5#!/vizhome/DegreesAwarded_10/DegreeAwardedDashboard#!/vizhome/DegreesAwardedupdated/PlotDegreesAwarded#!/vizhome/DegreesAwarded_10/DegreeAwarded

By Department		
Department	College Year	
	2014-15	2015-YTD
Public Administration	88	21
Grand Total	88	21

By Major		
Major	College Year	
	2014-15	2015-YTD
Health Care Administration	88	21
Grand Total	88	21

c. SFR's by Discipline

Source: Academic Program Review SFR Table - Subject

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ir/files/html/apr/APR%20SFR%20by%20Subject.html>

	Fall 11	Fall 12	Fall 13	Fall 14	Fall 15
Tenure-track	16.40	19.00	20.04	23.99	10.56
Lecturer	28.96	30.57	29.49	25.86	21.81
Lower Division	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Division	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate	15.05	25.20	29.53	23.38	15.88
Total	19.05	26.49	27.29	25.51	16.11

d. Course History Data

Source: Course History Table 10.1b

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ir/files/pdf/fact-book/Course.History.10-1b.pdf>

	Summer 13	Fall 14	Winter 15	Spring 15
#	9.0	15	9.0	14
Enrollment	238	342	240	317
Average Size	26.4	26.0	26.7	22.6

E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future

N/A

Appendix A – Score Distributions by Essay Question/PLO

Question/PLO	Points	0 pts	1 pt	2 pts	3 pts	4 pts	5 pts	6 pts	7 pts	8 pts	9 pts	10 pts	11 pts	12 pts	Average	Median
and Manage	Points	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00		
		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	0%	5%	0%	0%	86%	11.36	12.00
y Process	Points	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00		
		0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	0%	5%	0%	5%	5%	18%	59%	10.68	12.00
ze, size, Solve ms	Points	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00		
		5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	0%	77%	11.09	12.00
c Service ctive	Points	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00		
		9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%	59%	9.95	12.00
municate and Productively	Points	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	10.00	11.00	12.00		
		14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	5%	0%	9%	0%	68%	9.73	12.00

