**2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to james.solomon@csun.edu, Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 28, 2018. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please identify your department/program in the file name for your report.**

**College: S and BS**

**Department: MPA**

**Assessment liaison: Henrik Minassians**

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_\_ \_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Natural Sciences learning outcomes**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:
* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**Option C:**

**Even though the CSUN MPA program is not a new program, its last assessment report was generated in the 2013-14 academic year. Since that time the program has gone through changes by shifting the academic oversight from the self-support side to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Also, in 2016 the program hired a new director, Dr. Mylon Winn, in order to insure academic integrity and continuity. One of the major changes that the program adopted was a shift from culminating experience MPA 697S - Comprehensive Exam to MPA 698S - Graduate Project. For the first time, in summer of 2018, MPA 698S - graduate project was implemented across six cohorts. After consultation with 3 core faculty the MPA program assessed a sample of graduate projects in order to identify whether student teaching and learning meet programmatic objectives.**

**Part of the assessment plan the program has identified six new SLOs in line with the NASPAA competencies. These competencies are as followings:**

1. **Articulate and Apply Public Service Perspective**
2. **Lead and Manage in Public Governance**
3. **Participate in and Contribute to the Public Policy Process**
4. **Analyze, Synthesize, Think Creatively, Solve Problems, and Make decisions**
5. **Communicate and Interact Productively with Diverse and Changing Workforce and Citizenry**
6. **To Rely on Professional Ethics While Making Policy, Managerial and Program Decisions**

**The main SLO that was utilized for assessment was SLO number 2, Lead and Manage in Public Governance. The faculty has prepared the following rubric for identifying student competency in the program. The graduate project as a final culminating experience encompasses all theoretical and analytical skills that a student should have acquired throughout program, thus the assessment becomes the ideal mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of faculty teaching and student learning.**

**We sampled 35 out of 117 graduate projects using the rubric provided above. The report will utilize summative format indicating the frequency that students in each area of the rubric.**

**After the consultation with faculty, we will continue with the same assessment process for 2018-2019 academic year with results to be reported in Fall of 2019 to the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review.**

1. **Preview of planned assessment activities for 2017-18.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

**MPA program will focus on SLO number 2, as determined by our assessment planning for this program in transition. The program utilized NASPAA’s competency #2 as the overarching measurements of teaching and learning in the MPA program. For the 2017-18 academic year assessment, the program committee adopted 4 MPA 698S classes offered during the summer of 2018. MPA 698S – Graduate Project is culminating experience course where students undertake writing a major work (15-25 pages) examining a specific issue in the area of field of study. This course requires from the students to identify a problem/researchable topic, identify a body if peer reviewed literature examining the issue at hand, identify an appropriate methodology, if the case was going to be implemented what methods would be utilized and finally overall organization and writing style. Table below shows the percentage of students across 4 classes MPA 698S. The numbers of students were approximately 117 students. Random sample of 30 percent (n= 35) was utilized in order to reach the assessment of teaching and learning for the MPA program. Random sampling of the 117 students across four MPA 698S courses suggests that student ability to identify a researchable question (after working with faculty closely) stands at 60 percent satisfactory and 30 percent unsatisfactory. The main challenge with unsatisfactory research question and objective is related to the type of topics that students choose. This is reflective of lack of coordination within the program with student class projects and students are allowed to write on topic not directly related to the field of study. Another major finding is that majority of students are incapable of identifying appropriate literature relevant to the field of study. Use of academic resources remained limited and command of literature limited. This is direct reflection of the limitations to what occurs in classes or the depth of coverage and student learning. Considering that MPA program does not have full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty (only 3 faculty with the subject matter expertise with appointments in 2 different departments) suggests that coverage and exposure to the latest literature and research remains limited. The MPA program offers 16-20 courses per semester, and majority of classes are taught by faculty from various field of studies or by adjunct faculty. Successful teaching and student learning requires more faculty with subject matter expertise.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Graduate Project COMPETENCIES** **Assessment** | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Exemplary |
| 1. Research objectives/ research question(s)  | 30% | 60% | 10% |
| 2. Organization  | 40% | 50% | 10% |
| 3. Command of literature  | 70% | 25% | 5% |
| 4. Methodology and research design  | 70% | 30% |  |
| 5. Use of sources  | 50% | 40% | 10% |
| 6. Formatting, mechanics of writing (e.g., grammar, spelling, documentation  | 65% | 35% |  |
| 7. Quality of writing  | 50% | 50% |  |