

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

DESIGNATION CODE: **2009-10 CAPR 18**

DATE SUBMITTED: May 17, 2010

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)
SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for the MPA (revised from 2008-09 CAPR 45)
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION

REQUESTED: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Masters in Public Administration and Approval of the Continuation of the Program without modification. In light of the MPA Program being denied re-accreditation in August 2008, in order to ensure that it is making progress toward re-establishing its accreditation, CAPR will pay particular attention to the MPA annual reports. The CAPR Chair will review the annual reports submitted by the Public Affairs and Administration department for the MPA program and report to CAPR and to Excom on the observed progress each year until the next Five-Year review. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2013-2014 due to the shifting by one year of all program reviews following review postponement in 2009-10 (depending on acceptance of re-accreditation which would potentially result in a shift in this date to match accreditation requirements). CAPR requests a copy of all documents submitted to an accrediting body when the program applies for re-accreditation.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on November 5, 2009, CAPR voted unanimously to return the Public Administration MPA five-year review (08-09 CAPR 45) to the department faculty for revision and resubmission. CAPR did so because it was asked by the Excom of the Academic Senate to revisit this document since it was noted by Excom that there were several errors and omissions that needed to be addressed in 08-09 CAPR 45, that there was an allegation of grade trading for reviews referred to in CAPR's report that was inadequately addressed, and that there had been complaints that the Public Administration MPA program faculty had not been given sufficient opportunity to participate in and comment on the five-year review document preparation and submission. CAPR invited faculty and the Interim Chair of the program to discuss this issue at its November 5 meeting. Following representation by three of the Public Affairs and Administration program faculty, Toni Fogarty, Jennifer Eagan and Ken Kyle, who requested that they be given the opportunity to revisit, revise as necessary, and resubmit their self-study, five-year plan and program response to the Outside Reviewer's Report, CAPR voted unanimously to grant this request. The revised MPA Program Review was submitted electronically to the CAPR Chair on March 30, 2010 and printed copies were sent to the Academic Senate as required. This document represents CAPR's review of the revised document. Note that as requested in the referral back to the Department of Public Affairs and Administration (2009-10 CAPR 8), a signature page was included in which the seven faculty associated with the program attested that they had been given the chance to study the original document and to make recommendations for revision and also that they approve of the document in its present form.

Summary of the Program

(This section was prepared by Public Affairs and Administration Chair Toni Fogarty as specified in CAPR's referral of the Five-Year Review back to her department for revision; 2009-10 CAPR 8)

The Department of Public Affairs and Administration offers a Master in Public Administration (MPA) and Master of Science in Health Care Administration (MS-HCA). The five-year review of the MS-HCA program was submitted to CAPR in February 2006. Thus this report mainly addresses the five-year review of the MPA program. During the past five years, the Department has experienced a number of significant changes. There has been a general turnover in faculty, with senior faculty retiring and junior faculty replacing them. At present, only one faculty member has the rank of full Professor. Three have the rank of Associate Professor and three have the rank of Assistant Professor

(note added by CAPR - since writing this summary, one of these, Prof. Ken Kyle, resigned his position Spring 2010). The Department has also experienced some unexpected turnover in the Department Chair position. Since 2003, there have been three individuals in the position of Chair or Interim Chair. In Summer 2008, Chair Umeh was forced to resign from his Chair position, and an external Interim Chair was appointed without consultation with the Department faculty, which destabilized the Department and demoralized several of the faculty.

The Department has also experienced rapid turnover in two critical administration positions - the CLASS Dean and the Provost position. Since 2003 there have been four individuals in the position of Dean or Interim Dean. Dean Diedre Badejo, the current CLASS Dean, joined CLASS in 2008. There have also been four individuals in the position of Provost or Interim Provost.

In spite of these changes and the challenges they presented, the faculty members in the Department have achieved significant professional accomplishments. Selected accomplishments include: Assistant Professor Michael Moon published two peer reviewed articles; Assistant Professor Ken Kyle published two peer-reviewed articles, one book chapter, and his first book; Assistant Professor Lisa Faulkner published two peer reviewed articles; Associate Professor Frank Scott published three peer-reviewed articles and two book reviews; Associate Professor Toni Fogarty published one peer reviewed article and three books; and Professor Jay Umeh published two peer-reviewed articles, two book chapters, and one book review.

Since the Department was undergoing review for re-accreditation between 2007 and 2008, Department Chair Umeh planned to submit the accreditation self-study report to CAPR, assuming that the MPA would be reaccredited by the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). In 2007, however, the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA) at NASPAA reviewed the CSU-East Bay Self Study Report and asked the Department to resolve within one academic year specific non-conformities with the NASPAA Standards for accreditation. The major nonconformities raised by the Commission included 1) the lack of a more formalized system of assessment linked to the mission statement and objectives; 2) insufficient attention in the curriculum to information management; 3) low admission standards; 4) the lack of student advising; and 5) the lack of evidence of faculty efforts to improve the instructional program (including teaching methods, course content, and innovative curricula development). Most of the non-conformities stemmed from the Department's focus on increasing admissions, which was compelled by the perceived University-wide pressure to increase admissions as part of the University's strategy to "grow itself" out of its budget shortfall. The program was accorded one year to provide evidence that these concerns were being addressed.

During 2007 and 2008, the Department began to work on an action plan to address the issues raised by COPRA. However, the release time for the Graduate Coordinators in the Department was unexpectedly cut, which affected work on the action plan and worsened the availability of student advising. After a series of joint meetings with the Associate Dean Okutsu, Interim Dean Bowser, AVP APGS Bellone, and Provost Mahoney, the Department developed an extensive action plan that was based on the Department's understanding that requested resources would be shortly forthcoming. The action plan was submitted to COPRA and it was well-received. Before that plan could be fully implemented, however, the Department was unexpectedly informed that the requested resources would not be forthcoming. The Department submitted its progress report to COPRA in Spring 2008, and COPRA deemed the response insufficient for obtaining re-accreditation.

CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM

CAPR recommends: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Masters in Public Administration and Approval of the Continuation of the Program without modification. In light of the MPA Program being denied re-accreditation in August 2008, in order to ensure that it is making progress toward re-establishing its accreditation, CAPR will pay particular attention to the MPA annual reports. The CAPR Chair will review the annual reports submitted by the Public Affairs and Administration department for the MPA program and report to CAPR and to Excom on the observed progress each year until the next Five-Year review. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2013-2014 due to the shifting by one year of all program reviews following review postponement in 2009-10 (depending on acceptance of re-accreditation which would potentially result in a shift in this date to match accreditation requirements).

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Overview description of program

The Masters in Public Administration (MPA) has experienced significant challenges since its last five-year review. In 2007, the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), the accrediting body for the MPA, asked the Public Affairs and Administration Department to address major non-conformities in the program and in August 2008 denied re-accreditation on the grounds that these issues had not been sufficiently addressed. The issues included:

- Lack of a more formalized system of assessment linked to the mission statement and objectives
- Insufficient attention in the curriculum to information management
- Low admission standards
- Lack of student advising
- Lack of evidence of faculty efforts to improve the instructional program

Since being denied re-accreditation in August 2008, the program has continued to address the issues raised by NASPAA and CAPR has approved some modifications to the curriculum since the discussion of the five-year review documents at the CAPR meeting of April 16, 2009 including approving MPA options in Public Human Resources Management and Public Management and Policy and discontinuing MPA options in Public Policy Development, Public Management, and Organization Change. While it appears progress has been made and the program intends to apply for accreditation, the program is not yet ready to do so. Rather it is in the process of re-examination of its mission and goals and has not yet developed a plan and timeline for applying for re-accreditation according to Chair Fogarty's Five-Year Review Summary. The program faculty was recently reduced to six tenure-track and tenured members with the resignation of Prof. Ken Kyle from the university.

1.2 Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR

The report to CAPR included:

- A summary of the five-year review
- A self-study
- A five-year plan
- Report of the Outside Reviewer
- Program response to the Outside Reviewer's Report
- Annual reports to CAPR (2006-7 and 2007-8)
- Appendices: Statistics from Institutional Research; entry assessment document; foundation course completion assessment; graduate synthesis assessment; exit survey results 2005-06; MPA survival tips document; Chair position announcement; course-specific SLOs; HCA pre-test and post-test scores; faculty resumes.

2. FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW/SELF-STUDY

2.1. Summary of Specific areas of the Self-Study

Curriculum and Student Learning

The self-study states that there was no serious attempt to revise the curriculum in the five years between the last review and this one. The accreditation team expressed the need for evidence of ongoing efforts to improve the instructional program in order to meet its basic standards. The program thinks, however, that its curriculum is diverse in its academic content and very innovative as compared to other MPA programs, and that faculty attempts to integrate theory and practice.

In February 2009, the program submitted new course requests and course modifications which were considered by CAPR and CIC. The goal of these changes was to reduce the number of options from five to three, strengthen the

requirements of information management (one of NASPAA's concerns), and change the required courses for the current option in health care administration. In 2009, CAPR and CIC approved new MPA options in Public Human Resources Management and Public Management and Policy and also the discontinuance of the MPA options in Public Policy Development, Public Management, and Organization Change.

Students, Advising, and Retention

The self-study reports that there are 16 MPA programs among the 23 CSU campuses and 12 of these are accredited. Of the three CSU campuses used for comparison in the self-study (San Diego, Long Beach and Los Angeles), the CSUEB MPA admission standards are equivalent to two of them. The number of total units required for graduation is higher than at other CSU programs. Forty-eight (48) units are required for graduation, of which four (4) units are for the graduate synthesis and comprehensive examination. In addition, there are sixteen (16) units of foundational courses. Program faculty are currently developing student learning outcomes related to the mission statement (revised in 2008), specifying assessment measures, planning for collection and analysis of assessment data, and developing a process for using the evidence for program improvement. The self-study indicates that faculty is approaching the process one learning outcome at a time. There is a curriculum map that outlines which learning objectives are addressed by each course. The program conducts an exit survey, which asks students to evaluate the program's effectiveness in terms of their learning outcomes. Students are also given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments. While dialog and feedback are sought in every course, there is a more formal set of open discussions held during the capstone course. In addition, the self-study states that the program consults its MPA Advisory Board that includes local city managers, department headings, and alumni. These are in addition to assessment of student performance in terms of content and writing, the formal course evaluations completed by students at the end of each class, and the results of the comprehensive exam taken in the final quarter of the program.

In Fall 2008, a three-step assessment was implemented. On entry, students' admission materials were assessed; after completing the foundation courses, the students' progress is monitored through their grades; and after the capstone course, there are four evaluations—evaluation of the comprehensive exam, the students' exit essays, an exit survey questionnaire, and the students' evaluations of the instructors. Data from this assessment should presumably become available when the cohorts of students admitted in 2008 and beyond graduate from 2010 onwards.

Enrollments have been sustained for the past twenty (20) years. In spite of losing accreditation, subsequent applications suggest that the impact on enrollments was minor. The number of MPA majors increased over the five years of the review from 201 students in 2004 to 236 students in 2008. The number of MPA degrees awarded also increased, from 72 in 2003-4 to consistently more than 80 degrees in each of the succeeding years (2004-5 through 2007-8).

The accreditation team expressed concerns about increasing course enrollments; however, the average section sizes are constant.

The accreditation team expressed a need to improve student advising. As the program had over 230 majors and only eight (8) faculty and most students work full- or part-time, addressing this need remains a challenge, especially now faculty has fallen to six (6) in Spring 2010. The department chair and graduate coordinator handle most program advising and faculty provides additional course, thesis, and option advising. A main source of student dissatisfaction appears to result when students find they have not planned their course schedule sufficiently and have difficulty meeting requirements. To resolve this, the self-study indicated that in Fall 2008, faculty would start to provide advising and self-help tools in brief one-hour sessions in a couple of required courses to ensure that all students are informed. In addition, general advising was to be given by the department chair and graduate coordinator in order to ensure consistency of information. The department provides general orientation meetings to new students, and has developed a FAQ for its web site. An MPA Survival Tips list was developed. The self-study expressed the hope that the consolidation of five options into three would help alleviate some advising issues.

Faculty

In the five years from 2004 through 2008, one faculty completed his five-year FERP in 2006 and was reinstated from retirement in September 2008 to take the position of interim chair of the department (he retired again in August

2009). Another faculty retired in September 2008. The department shared a faculty member one-third time with the Philosophy Department. The department attempted to recruit a department chair in -2008-09 and is currently led by an Interim Chair. One of the junior faculty members resigned from the University at the beginning of the Spring quarter 2010 reducing the tenure-track and tenured faculty to six.

2.2. Summary of Supporting Data

Ethnicity of MPA Majors

Ethnicity	Fall 2004	%	Fall 2005	%	Fall 2006	%	Fall 2007	%	Fall 2008	%
Black	57	28.36	48	27.27	53	28.65	57	27.67	59	25.00
Asian / Pacific	26	12.94	16	9.09	25	13.51	41	19.90	52	22.03
Hispanic	27	13.43	23	13.07	26	14.05	23	11.17	28	11.86
White	59	29.35	47	26.70	39	21.08	38	18.45	44	18.64
American Indian	3	1.49	2	1.14	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Other	24	11.94	34	19.32	37	20.00	42	20.39	45	19.07
International	5	2.49	6	3.41	5	2.70	5	2.43	8	3.39
Total	201	100.00	176	100.00	185	100.00	206	100.00	236	100.00

Number of courses, sections taught, and average section size

Quarter	Number of Courses	Sections Taught	Average Section Size
2003 4	17	20	23
2004 1	18	22	21
2004 2	17	18	24
2004 3	11	11	26
2004 4	18	20	26
2005 1	22	25	21
2005 2	23	23	20
2005 3	13	14	20
2005 4	20	24	21
2006 1	19	24	21
2006 2	19	23	20
2006 3	15	16	19
2006 4	18	25	22
2007 1	21	25	21
2007 2	20	25	22
2007 3	15	16	23
2007 4	20	27	24
2008 1	21	31	20
2008 2	21	28	20
2008 3	11	15	18

Key: 1=Winter 2=Spring 3=Summer 4=Fall

FTES, FTEF, and SFR

	Term FTES					Term FTEF					Term SFR				
	Fall 03	Fall 04	Fall 05	Fall 06	Fall 07	Fall 03	Fall 04	Fall 05	Fall 06	Fall 07	Fall 03	Fall 04	Fall 05	Fall 06	Fall 07
Lowe	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Uppe	30.93	36.00	33.87	47.20	44.27	1.10	0.83	1.14	1.83	2.95	29.22	45.14	30.18	25.85	16.66
UG	30.93	36.00	33.87	47.20	44.27	1.10	0.83	1.14	1.83	2.95	29.22	45.14	30.18	25.85	16.66
Grad	75.07	89.07	77.87	73.60	95.47	4.79	4.97	5.84	5.17	11.19	14.99	18.46	13.20	15.12	10.29
Lec-turer	33.33	59.73	52.00	55.47	60.53	1.62	1.85	2.16	2.67	8.50	19.07	30.00	24.11	20.81	7.79
T/TT	72.67	65.33	59.73	65.33	79.20	4.27	3.96	4.83	4.34	5.83	16.00	17.34	11.71	15.7	14.66
Total	106.0	125.0	111.7	120.8	139.7	5.89	5.81	6.98	7.00	14.13	17.02	22.67	16.43	17.92	11.67

Ethnicity of Faculty

Ethnicity	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008
Black	1	1	1	1	1
Asian/Pacific	0	1	1	1	2
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0
White	6	6	6	6	6
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
International	0	0	0	0	0

Ethnicity of lecturers

Ethnicity	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008
Black	1	2	3	3	2
Asian/Pacific	0	1	1	1	2
Hispanic	1	1	0	0	1
White	2	5	6	5	5
American Indian	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
International	0	0	0	0	0

Percentage of Courses Taught by Regular Faculty vs. Lecturers

Year	Total Courses	Regular Faculty Courses	Faculty Percentage of Total Courses Taught	Lecturers Courses	Lecturer Percentage of Total Courses Taught
Fall 03 - Sum 04	72	38	52.78%	34	47.22%
Fall 04 - Sum 05	73	39	53.42%	34	46.58%
Fall 05 - Sum 06	82	43	52.44%	39	47.56%
Fall 06 - Sum 07	91	40	43.96%	51	56.04%
Fall 07 - Sum 08	101	50	49.50%	51	50.50%

3. OUTSIDE REVIEWER'S REPORT AND THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE

3.1. Outside Reviewer's Report

Dr. Michelle A. Saint-Germain, Professor of Public Policy and Administration, and Director, Program Review and Assessment, California State University, Long Beach visited the campus in March, 2009. Her overall conclusion was that although the MPA program reached a low point, "the current faculty, staff, and students are working hard to improve the MPA and restore it to its former solid reputation for producing quality graduates." This involves "adopting new curricula, new practices in teaching learning, new approaches to assessment of student learning, and a new [and] sustained dedication to continuous quality improvement."

Concerns:

From a reading of the most recent self-study prepared for NASPAA as well as of the new self-study prepared for CAPR, it was the Outside Reviewer's opinion that the MPA program has not been following any previous plan that refers to directions being taken by the field of public affairs, administration, and policy as a whole. It is not clear to CAPR exactly what she meant by this although in earlier commentary, the Outside Reviewer states the following: "*One item of information I can provide, since I am on the NASPAA Standards Revision Committee, is that the standards for accreditation have been completely revised. The new standards are based almost entirely on an outcomes model. That is, while the program must demonstrate the sufficiency of some input measures, such as the number of faculty, access to technology, and adequate resources, the majority of the standards look for evidence of continuous program improvement in areas such as definition of the mission, specification of student learning outcomes, measures and processes of assessment of student learning, and the use of evidence for program change.*" Thus, the Outside Reviewer recommended that CAPR ensure that the MPA five-year review be followed up by periodic progress reports. She did not seem to be aware that current CAPR policies and procedures require each program to submit an annual report which can be monitored for progress. Nevertheless, her recommendation appears to be that a careful assessment of annual progress reports for this program be carried out by CAPR with an emphasis on assessing progress in the key areas now required for re-accreditation.

The Outside Reviewer noted that the self-study requested a new faculty member to teach in the area of information management and provide support to students at the Concord campus; however, she suggested this request be deferred in favor of first addressing areas of non-compliance. This is complicated by the fact that NASPAA will adopt new standards shortly, standards that do not include the specification regarding information management, technology, and policy.

Regarding outcomes assessment and the lack of a plan, the Outside Reviewer noted the significant turnover in university administration and faculty as a potential contributing factor. In 2008-2009, the faculty had identified six student learning outcomes that are distinct and can be assessed. There are also a curriculum map, assessment measures, and a timetable for assessment, including analysis of evidence and use of evidence for program improvement. The Outside Reviewer suggested that the specification of assessment measures still needed improvement as the majority of approaches are indirect and direct assessment is required.

The Outside Reviewer noted some problems with the data, e.g., the number of faculty which doesn't take into account faculty on leave or half-time or working on reduced loads for administrative assignment. Also noted was the NASPAA concern about large class sizes when the figures suggest that class sizes have remained stable. It is suggested that CSUEB consult with other CSUs to research what useful information is made available to academic programs, e.g., pushing data to department that is crucial for effective course scheduling, making program data available on demand, and displaying electronic 'dashboards' that monitor program performance.

In terms of program requirements, the Outside Reviewer suggested considering increasing the admissions requirements, increasing the number of required courses, and offering additional culminating experiences beyond the comprehensive examination. The program has addressed these issues already. In terms of the planned curricular changes, the Outside Reviewer saw no need to rush through the revision of the options from five to three and advised the faculty to delay other changes until the new chair is on board and the planning is complete. The Outside

Reviewer also cautioned that Academic Affairs and CLASS would need to provide technical and resource assistance to ensure the success of the plan.

The curriculum posed serious concerns for the Outside Reviewer. In addition to the issue of the minimum GPA for admissions, cited by NASPAA, the Outside Reviewer's visit to campus revealed concerns about low standards overall and the ability of students admitted provisionally with low GPAs to gain access to the program by scoring high grades in 4000 level pre-requisite classes. Note that the Outside Reviewer made reference to instructors who "appear to trade high grades for high student evaluations of teaching." This remark was addressed strongly by faculty in the program's response to the Outside Reviewer's Report; the Chair consulted with faculty members and a cross-section of 30 students and could not substantiate this claim. Moreover, the Outside Reviewer, when contacted to explain this comment, could not remember its origins or the specifics of the claim. It was suggested by faculty that, since the Outside Review took place at the time the program lost its accreditation, students were feeling aggrieved and made negative comments that were likely baseless.

There were also concerns that students could not get needed courses each quarter, that the department did not track how many students pursue each option, that faculty did not receive unit load reduction for thesis and comprehensive exam duties so tended to discourage students from the thesis option, and that students could not secure a supervisor for a departmental or university thesis.

The Outside Reviewer discussed the issue of gathering, analyzing, and using information for improvement, along with the need for more input from stakeholders, and assistance from Planning & Institutional Research.

Finally, the Outside Reviewer suggested developing an internship program.

3.2. Response to the Outside Reviewer's report

The program faculty incorporated the Outside Reviewer's suggestions into their self-study and addressed some specific concerns. The request for a new faculty position remained, particularly in light of the need to cover teaching at Hayward, Concord, and the Oakland Center. The faculty believed that their outcomes assessment was fairly well developed. In Winter quarter 2009, the department began to collect data related to the first of their student learning objectives and planned to explore different ways of improving teaching methods and means of assessing learning outcomes. The faculty expressed concern about data not being available through Planning and Institutional Research, and recognized the need to collect alumni data actively. As indicated previously, a large portion of the response addressed the negative comments compiled by the Outside Reviewer concerning the quality of the program and the issue of grade trading, a claim which was investigated and which lacked substantiation. The program faculty indicated that they intend to improve the quality of the MPA program by further examining curriculum content and developing implementable outcome assessment.

4. PROGRAM'S FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

From 2009-2011, the faculty plans to redesign the requirement of core courses to meet NASPAA requirements, including improving the process by inviting more input from stakeholders. The department intends to continue assessing student learning on the major program objectives, as well as exploring ways to improve teaching, advising, and the quality of the program, based on empirical evidence. A matrix is provided that indicates that the six main learning objectives for the program will be fully implemented by 2014, including developing methods for analysis and use of findings to improve the curriculum.

A specific list of progress made in addressing NASPAA concerns from its 2007 Accreditation Review Memorandum is provided in the areas of formalizing its feedback loop (assessment cycle), developing admissions standards (i.e. how to raise them up to a 3.0 GPA), offering strong and continuous student advisement, and dealing with the numerous course preparations and the large class sizes observed in the program. Major obstacles identified in implementing the necessary steps that will permit re-accreditation include the loss of release time for the graduate coordinator, cancellation policies affecting courses with enrollments below cap levels and cancellation of student admissions for 2010. Admissions are likely to fall by due to budget and enrollment limitations and the plan

expresses the concern that it is possible that the MPA program could become a target for suspension or discontinuance.

The strategic plan refers to faculty consideration, enrollment and budget restraints permitting, of instituting an accelerated MPA program to enable students to achieve a BA and a MPA in five years, based on NASPAA standards. This could prove attractive to undergraduates seeking public service careers and provide a competitive advantage over other MPA programs in the region.

The plan reports that the department has lacked resources to develop an active internship program for pre-service students. It will seek opportunities for more community partnerships to build up the MPA internship program.

The department plan states that it seeks another faculty member to teach courses in information management in the public sector and other courses in the public management option. The new faculty would also be more involved in the Concord MPA program and boosting the cohort enrollment there to 70-80 students annually. Failing that, the department will need to rely on more part-time lecturers. Note, the need for a new hire has been made even more acute by the reduction in faculty to six (6) with the resignation of one Assistant Professor in Spring 2010. Additionally, on the subject of resources, the strategic plan laments the loss of course release for its Graduate Coordinator and loss of student work-study to manage the large number of students.

5. CAPR ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM'S FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

The program has clearly had difficulties in recent years, as evidenced by its loss of accreditation, the need to ask a retired faculty member to return to be interim department chair, and the overall concerns expressed by NASPAA and the Outside Reviewer.

In reviewing the many challenges facing the program, CAPR is pleased to see the work that the faculty is investing in reconsidering the program and curriculum, and in working on assessment; however, there are some key issues that CAPR would like to see addressed:

1. Now that leadership of the program has been stabilized with the appointment of Prof. Toni Fogarty as Chair, significant progress can be made on assessment and advisement; however, this will be difficult without sufficient faculty and staff support. The program currently has only six (6) tenure-track and tenured members plus part-allocation of FTES from a Philosophy program faculty member, although this has not been available due to budget cuts and loss of lecturer resources. The program lacks administrative support and there are currently no resources allocated to free-up faculty time for Graduate Coordinator duties. Without sufficient resources the ability to achieve reaccreditation and to revive the MPA cohort program at Concord are in doubt (no new cohorts were admitted in Fall 2009 or Fall 2010). Efforts need to be made to secure additional faculty and restore administrative support if this program is to remain viable.
2. There are many "intentions" in the response to the Outside Reviewer's report and the accreditation denial criteria. While these are no doubt sincere, CAPR is concerned about the ability to turn these intentions into concrete results. As a result, the CAPR Chair should look for evidence that progress is being made in these areas through careful assessment of program annual reports and report back to the committee and to Excom his/her findings each year through the next five-year review.
3. Both assessment and curriculum revision are underway, which is good, but have not progressed far enough as yet. It appears that the student learning outcomes assessment will be fully implemented by 2014 and evidence will be looked for with respect to this goal in the annual reports and in the next five-year review self-study.
4. The Outside Reviewer's report had disturbing comments concerning low academic standards as well as the relatively high proportion of students expressing reservations concerning advising quality, the quality of education received concerning quantitative research, and the appropriate mix of practical and theoretical courses. It appears that efforts are being made to address these concerns and CAPR recommends that continued effort to improving performance in raising academic standards (through an assessment of application GPA requirements), offering more frequent and timely advising, increasing research

opportunities, and addressing the perceived imbalance between theoretical and practical instruction. CAPR recognizes, in particular, that the issue of advising will be difficult to address without more resources.

5. Although the comment allegedly made in regard to grade trading and student evaluations cited in the Outside Reviewer's report could not be substantiated by the MPA program, CAPR recommends that nevertheless, faculty should make every effort to address this issue seriously. While CAPR appreciates that it appears to have constituted little more than hearsay, it is in the best interests of the program to have the faculty evaluate their collective grading standards and course evaluation procedures to make sure they are robust and of the highest integrity.

CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM

CAPR recommends the continuation of the Masters in Public Administration without modification partly because it is difficult to suggest specific modifications when the program is a work in progress, seeking to make the necessary modifications to meet NASPAA requirements for re-accreditation. Rather, in light of the MPA Program being denied re-accreditation in August 2008 and in order to ensure that it is making progress toward re-establishing its accreditation, CAPR will pay attention to the MPA annual reports as suggested by the Outside Reviewer, particularly to the areas which she indicated will be key for re-accreditation. The CAPR Chair will review the annual reports submitted by the Public Affairs and Administration department for the MPA program and report to CAPR and to Excom on the observed progress each year until the next Five-Year review. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2013-2014 due to the shifting by one year of all program reviews following review postponement in 2009-10 (depending on acceptance of re-accreditation which would potentially result in a shift in this date to match accreditation requirements). CAPR requests a copy of all documents submitted to an accrediting body when the program applies for re-accreditation.