

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025

<i>PCAL</i>	<i>Political Science</i>
<i>MPA (051)</i>	
<i>Joel Turner</i>	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1

Program Student Learning Outcome	Identify and critically analyze decisions that would uphold the public trust with awareness and consideration of both intended and unintended consequences (Competency 3)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.
Results & Conclusion	As expected, students generally meet SLO targets with several exceeding standard requirements. This has been consistent for several years. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no

	decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above, switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate the capacity to make decisions conducive to improving institutional performance and sustainability (Competency 3)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.
Results & Conclusion	As expected, students generally meet SLO targets with several exceeding standard requirements. This has been consistent for several years. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above,

<u>Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.
-------------------------------	---

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Articulate and demonstrate responsiveness to the diverse viewpoints and cultural contexts among constituent groups (Competency 5)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.
Results & Conclusion	As expected, students generally meet SLO targets with several exceeding standard requirements. This has been consistent for several years. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above, switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.

Program Student Learning Outcome 4	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Identify and describe best practices for public governance. (Competency 1)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to

	be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.
Results & Conclusion	There is limited history for the assessment of this learning outcome as it had not been assessed on annual basis prior to AY24. Results from that year were as expected. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above, switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.

Program Student Learning Outcome 5	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Evaluate the effectiveness of the policymaking process in assuring the delivery of public goods and services that are appropriate for specific communities. (Competency 2)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.

Results & Conclusion	There is limited history for the assessment of this learning outcome as it had not been assessed on annual basis prior to AY24. Results from that year were as expected. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above, switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.

Program Student Learning Outcome 6	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate the ability to balance efficiency, effectiveness, and equity in making decisions involving the delivery of public services (Competency 4)
Evaluation	This SLO (and others) were initially developed through and to meet the requirements of the NASPAA accreditation process. They were reviewed during the the 2022-23 reaccreditation process. Based on their guidance, we believe that they continue to be relevant and meaningful.
Measurement Instruments	Responses from comprehensive examinations are used to evaluate students' performance in meeting the learning outcome. One major advantage of using the exams is that all graduates are evaluated as they complete the program. While we believe that the exams provide a meaningful and effective way to measure student learning, we have had conversations about moving from the comprehensive examinations as a culminating experience and moving to portfolio based requirement. There is interest in going this route but requires approval and coordination with NASPAA.
Criteria & Targets	The current criteria reflect and meet NASPAA requirements. Students who graduate with an MPA should meet learning outcomes so we expect that all (or at least almost all) students will meet the criteria and targets. Using a scale provides additional information on whether students exceed standard expectations.
Results & Conclusion	There is limited history for the assessment of this learning outcome as it had not been assessed on annual basis prior to AY24. Results from that year were as expected. Through review of previous ASL and the reaccreditation process, we have made made several changes and are considering others. We have made changes to the scheduling of courses (increased biterm) during AY25. It is too early to see the impact of changes through the ASL process but initial feedback from students has been more positive than negative. The move to biterm courses also lead to a hybrid format. We are looking at moving from synchronous to asynchronous as the primary modality but no decisions have yet been made. We are also considering the shift from comprehensive exams to a portfolio based capstone experience. Discussions are are taking place within the context of NASPAA requirements.

<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	We don't anticipate any significant changes for the AY26 process but are excited for the first round of full assessment following AY25 changes to course scheduling. AY26 will also mark the second time that all six SLOs are evaluated. As mentioned above, switching the culminating experience to a portfolio requirement would impact the artifact utilized in the assessment process.