San Francisco State University - Master of Public Administration - Annual Report

Entered: 9/14/2011 by Genie Stowers
Updated: 9/15/2011 by Genie Stowers

1. Mission and Goals
If this is the first time in the system, please enter your program's mission. In the future your mission will be self populated. If there have been any changes to your program's mission since your last review or annual report, please enter the revised mission statement. Please describe the changes and the mission revision process in Question 2.1 regarding substantive change.

Mission and Goals

NOTE: The Department is actively working on strategic planning right now and revising its mission statement. We have already met with our Advisory Board to seek their input and are readying plans to seek the input of our students.

The mission of the Department of Public Administration is to enhance individual, organizational, social and governmental capacity in the public and nonprofit sectors through innovative teaching, research and service.

Pedagogical Goals
Goal 1: Ensure all students leave the program with an understanding of the mechanics and values of contemporary public services.

Goal 2: Ensure the Program emphasizes real, hands-on learning through long-term joint learning team projects, applied projects in the community and other learning opportunities.

Goal 3: Work to enhance and increase connections for students with other students, other departments, and other academic institutions (through technology or other means).

Goal 4: Work to balance practice and theory in instruction.

Goal 5: Emphasize innovative thinking in administration, instruction, pedagogy, advising, service and research by encouraging innovation as a value and by emphasizing cutting edge ideas/concepts in the classroom.

Student Learning Goals
Goal 6: Provide students with substantive knowledge about the depth and breadth of public affairs today.

Goal 7: Provide students with the skills necessary to be leaders in today's and tomorrow's organizations.

Goal 8: Provide students with the ability to be sensitive and knowledgeable about ethical, diversity and international issues in the public and nonprofit sectors.

Goal 9: Provide students with the substantive knowledge about a specialized area of public affairs.

Programmatic Goals
Goal 10: Continue to be an effective and high quality Program.

Goal 11: Research: Contribute to the body of applied and theoretical research in public and nonprofit administration and policy, gaining recognition as faculty experts in our fields.

Goal 12: Community Engagement: Emphasize value and service to the community.

Goal 13: Create a reliable “pathway” to graduation for all students.

2.1 Substantive Change (if applicable)

2.1

Has your program made any substantive changes since the most recent review or annual report? If so, please elaborate. [A substantive change is defined as a significant departure from the last accreditation review regarding a program's operation, including but not limited to: mission, goals, objectives, assessment practices, delivery modalities and locations, targeted student population, governance structures, and required and elective competencies.]

Substantive Changes

The biggest substance change for our Department is the shift we have undergone within the University's organizational chart. Through the University's re-organization process (which sought and incorporated faculty input), the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS) (in which we had resided since our founding in 1980) was eliminated. An early proposal put our Department in the College of Business, which we successfully resisted. Along with other units from BSS, we were moved to the now College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). We believe that the name of this college will ultimately be changed to be the College of Social and Health Sciences. It includes other professional, applied graduate programs like the MSW, MPH, MS in Nursing and MA in Gerontology so we believe it is a good fit for us.

Also as part of this reorganization plan, we lobbied for and were successful in, the creation of a new School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (SPACE). To begin officially in January 2012, this unit will include us, Urban Studies and Planning, Criminal Justice, and Environmental Studies. We also hope that Gerontology will be joining us. We have a School Director but for now, chairs of all the units are continuing to act as Chairs of their units.

We wish to note that input was actively sought and received from our Advisory Board and from students and alumni in moving in this direction in the reorganization. We conducted a scenario planning process that allowed us to examine each of our possible options with input from our stakeholders.

We have now implemented what we hope is a final version of our pre- and post- MPA assessment process and have two years of data available. We had worked through several drafts of rubrics over the past five years but were not happy with any of them. The current one is working out very well, however, and so we will continue to utilize that as part of our assessment practices. (NOTE: to date, the analysis from this research indicates our students are making statistically significant gains in their knowledge of public administration and critical thinking / writing skills.

Iin Spring 2011 we implemented our assessment of student oral presentation skills, utilizing a scoring rubric completed by all students in the capstone class of each student giving a final presentation on a public administration topic of their choice. As we review these results, we will be looking for ways in which we can alter our program to improve instruction in this area.

Finally, we eliminated the microeconomics prerequisite to for Fall 2011 admissions and added the requirement for the submission of GRE Analytical Writing scores as an admission requirement.

3. Program Evaluation

3.1 Program Evaluation:

Please briefly discuss how the program has collected, applied, and reported information about its performance and its operations to guide the evolution of the program's mission and the program's design and continuous improvement in the past year. Please comment on the extent of your program's implementation of student competency assessment as it relates to the transition to outcomes-based accreditation standards (adopted in 2009). If you wish to upload any supplements, you may do so at the bottom of the form.

Program Evaluation

The Department of Public Administration has a multi-faceted assessment process. It began with the development of our original strategic plan in 1998; this was updated in 1999, 2001 and 2003. A completely new strategic plan was developed in 2006. This plan included student learning goals based upon competencies identified by the faculty as well as program goals. To assess those learning goals, we set into motion a series of strategies which have changed over the years.

At the time, these began with what we believe was a first in the field of public administration--an electronically based portfolio (given to students on a CD). The portfolio contained examples of their work corresponding to the student learning outcomes. We received best practice recognition from NASPAA and from our University for that process. Since then, that portfolio has moved to an e-portfolio process, based on web site development. One big change this year is moving our eportfolio from a standard web site structure to the use of efolio, online software developed solely for the purpose of presenting student portfolios. We believe we are one of the first, if not the first, to do an online portfolio and now, to do the efolio process.

We have collected exit survey data from our graduates since 2002. We have assessed our culminating experience (the Strategic Assessment Memorandum, or written comprehensive examination). Also as discussed above, we are assessing overall program success, writing, and critical thinking skills through a pre- and post- degree assessment. We are assessing oral presentation skills and this year, are developing a rubric and process for evaluating team / group work skills.

Every year, we make substantive changes to our degree program, classes and general program based upon results from our exit survey, SAM results, pre and post test, and now, the oral presentation assessment. We have been conducting student competency assessments for practically ten years, identifying places within our curriculum at which these competencies can best be placed, evaluating students and their learning for achieving these competencies, and then making subsequent changes in our program.

This past year, we have worked on integrating more international coverage in our program. We had one student doing a study abroad program for the first time and actively pursued doing training with international visitors, developing a collaborative partnership with the University's Office of International Programs in order to accomplish that.

Since our exit survey indicated students wanted more emphasis on career development activities, we worked hard at developing additional career development workshops and activities. We welcomed a city manager in residence as part of a ICMA / Cal-ICMA program, welcomed back our alumni to take part in career workshops and talk about how to get jobs.

We drastically improved as processes and supports for our internship programs. We now have an extensive iLearn site with jobs, careers and internship resources, and supporting forms for our relatively new internship program.

Finally, we took advantage of technological innovations to help our students learn more about information technology and make their lives easier. The University developed "labspace", a tool allowing students and faculty to access numerous software products from anywhere in the world (a "cloud computing" innovation). We were one of the pilot programs on campus, one of the first departments to utilize this. Students taking our statistics classes have been able to access SPSS without having to buy the package, students in budgeting and financial management can access Excel anywhere, and students in our IT oriented classes (PA 755) can access desktop publishing, GIS (geographic information systems) and animation software from anywhere. This is allowing all of our students to better understand information technology and how it can be used in the public and nonprofit sectors.

In addition, the efolio system already mentioned is another innovation that is allowing our students to take fuller advantage of technology to more easily accomplish tasks-- in this case, their eportfolio.

4.1 Faculty Nucleus

Nucleus faculty information should be entered using the "Add/ View a Faculty Member" tab at the top of the page. You only have to enter information for nucleus faculty members. If you have previously entered faculty information in a Self-Study Report or Annual Report within this system the information will be auto-populated in the tab. You should check to verify none of the information has changed and edit as necessary.

4.2 Faculty

4.2 Please provide the percentage of courses in each category that are taught by full and part-time faculty in the annual report year. Programs with multiple campuses or modalities should upload a supplemental table that breaks this information down by campus or modality.

	% Taught by Full Time Faculty	**% Taught by Part Time Faculty**
All Courses	80	20
Required Courses	75	25

4.3 Data Explanations (optional)

The following blank field is offered in case the program would like to provide any narrative context or explanation for any of the faculty data in this form. (Optional for all programs)

Data Explanations

Dr. Kathy Naff is listed above as a full-time faculty member, as I understand the definitions here. She is a tenured full professor in our department. However, for the past year due to unfortunate health issues, she took part in an on campus program that allowed her to reduce her time base to .33. All of that time is spent in the Department of Public Administration.

Dr. Eric Zeemering resigned from the University as of August 2011 to take a post at another university. Therefore, he is no longer listed in our faculty nucleus.

5.1 Student Data

5.1 Admissions:

Please fill out this table describing your program's applicant pool for the annual report year. Combine applicants across the year into one pool.

	Number Of Students
Applicants	225
Admitted Students	48
Enrolled Students	43

5.3 Employment of Graduates

Report the job placement statistics (number) for the year PRIOR TO the annual report year, of students who were employed in the "profession" within six months of graduation, by employment sector, using the table below.

	Total Number of Graduates
National or central government in the same country as the program	3
State, provincial, or regional government in the same country as the program	3
City, County, or other local government in the same country as the program	5
Foreign government (all levels) or international quasi-governmental	1
Nonprofit domestic-oriented	13
Nonprofit/NGOs internationally-oriented	1
Private Sector - Research/Consulting	3
Private Sector but not research/consulting	2
Status Unknown	1

5.3 Data explanations (optional)

The following blank field is offered in case the program would like to provide any narrative context or explanation for any of the student data in this form. (Optional for all programs)

Data Explanations

Fully 40.6% of 2009-2010 graduates either worked for, or went to work for, nonprofit organizations. The remainder are a mixture of public sector workers (37%) along with several consultants and then several students working in the health management industry. One additional category that would be helpful here is University employment. Due to the number of universities in the San Francisco Bay Area, many students work for either SF State, University of California-Berkeley or University of California-San Francisco. We have coded those under state employment as those are public state institutions.

6. Resource Sufficiency (if applicable)

6.1 If there have been any significant changes in resource trends and the sufficiency of resources available to the program to pursue its mission, objectives, and continuous improvement. (If there are no changes, the program may leave this field blank.)

Resource Sufficiency

We are very pleased that there have been significant changes in resource trends. While the University and the CSU system have been facing numerous cutbacks, our own operating revenues have grown enormously due to the entrepreneurial efforts of our faculty and staff (last year, to over $80,000).

These funds have come from an off-campus MPA cohort (now completed), running and teaching a nonprofit administration certificate program (non-academic courses), summer class sessions, and individuals taking limited courses as non-matriculated students. (NOTE: It is important to realize that departments do not receive and / or manage the funds for salaries and benefits, we only manage funds for operating expenses.) We invested these funds in faculty travel to conferences, research assistants for faculty, replacing computers for our student spaces, student assistants, and staff (faculty all received new computer upgrades from the University "refresh"), buying supplies ahead, and buying needed furniture. In other words, we treated much of these funds as if they were one-time only funds; the amount left unspent is considered reserves.

We do not believe this year's operating expenses will reach this same level but we will have enough for faculty travel and research assistants plus any needed supplies-- and a reserve.

For the most part, the severe budget cuts hitting the system and the University have not hurt us-- except in the number of courses we can offer during the optional summer sessions for students; we used to offer 4 and now can only offer two. But we continue to offer the highest level of sections we ever have during the regular academic year. Faculty bringing in grants and release time help to ensure that their course load is mixed and that also allows us to add in outside practitioners as lecturers.

However, the faculty have not received raises in the past two years and have been without a contract, also for two years. Currently, bargaining is ongoing.

7. Standards Being Monitored (if applicable)

If your program is being monitored on a specific Standard, you are required to provide updated information on the issue raised by COPRA in your decision letter each year until which you are notified that COPRA has removed the monitoring. Your program is being monitored on the following standards listed below. Note that if you'd like more details on the specific request from COPRA regarding any of your monitoring standards, you can view your most recent decision letter in the documents tab. **If you are being monitored under Pre-2009 standards, check your Decision Letter to see which Standards you need to provide additional information for.**

Standard 1.1

Standard 1.2

Standard 1.3

Standard 2.1

Standard 2.2

Standard 3.1

Standard 3.2

Standard 3.3

Standard 4.1

Standard 4.2

Standard 4.3

Standard 4.4

Standard 5.1

Standard 5.2

Standard 5.3

Standard 5.4

Standard 7.1

Monitored under old Standards

Submit and Lock Application

Submit and Lock Annual Report

Definitions

1. Part Time Instructional Faculty: Adjuncts and other instructors being paid solely for part-time classroom instruction. Also includes full-time faculty teaching less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions. Employees who are not considered full-time instruction faculty but who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses may be counted as part-time faculty.

2. "All Courses" includes all required courses for students in the program, as well as all required courses for elective specializations. It does not include courses outside of these categories that are not primarily for students of the program, and does not include elective options in other departments, unless they are regular substitutes for required courses.

3. ARY-5 cohort is the group of students who entered the program in the academic year that began 5 years before the annual report year. Programs unable to use this cohort as a basis for calculating completion rates should expalin their approach for calculating a completion rate in the optional text box.

4. Part Time Student: A student enrolled in the program who does not meet the institutional definition of a "full-time" graduate student. Typically, on a semester credit hour basis, this is defined as fewer than 9 credit hours per semester.

Definitions