School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA)
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

PLANNING FOR LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT
2011-2012 Academic Year Review

Overview of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs

SPEA is an Indiana University Core School, operating on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The school on the Indianapolis campus offers certificates and degrees at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in to programs: Public Affairs (PA), and Criminal Justice and Public Safety Management (CJ/PSM).

During the 2011-2012 academic year, SPEA served approximately 530 undergraduate majors (about 77 percent of whom were enrolled in Criminal Justice and Public Safety Management) and about 325 graduate students (about 85 percent of whom were enrolled in Public Affairs). In the 2011-12 academic year, SPEA faculty provided more than 18,000 credit-hours of classroom instruction. About 40 percent of those credit hours were taught by adjunct faculty. SPEA employed 24 full-time and more than two dozen partial-appointment and adjunct faculty during the academic year under review.

SPEA's student body is marked by a substantial fraction of part-time (about 27 percent of undergraduate and almost 78 percent of graduate) and non-traditional students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Many of these students have family responsibilities (spouses or significant others, children, and in some cases, are caregivers for parents or other relatives), and may also be employed part- or full-time. A significant fraction (33 percent) of undergraduates were 25 years of age or older, and almost 12 percent were 33 or older, considerably outside the "traditional" undergraduate age range of 18 to 24. Consequently, individual (and therefore overall) student performance in SPEA may be significantly impacted by events in student's employment or family lives, and by their overall life experiences, which will be substantially different than those of the traditional students. A substantial number of the undergraduate students are also the first in their families to attend an institution of higher education.

For many undergraduate students, SPEA is not a first-entry school, and the majority of undergraduate students transfer into SPEA during or after their sophomore year, most transferring from University College at IUPUI, but others coming from other schools on campus, or from other colleges and universities around Indiana and from outside the state. For example, during the fall semester 2011, only 32 (6.1 percent) of SPEA's reported 527 undergraduate students were freshman, and just over 22 percent were sophomores.

Almost 42 percent of SPEA's undergrads were seniors. During 2010-2011 academic year, 131 undergraduates completed degrees or certificates from SPEA, about a quarter of undergraduate students and about 60 percent of the school's seniors that year.

SPEA's Programs

The Criminal Justice and Public Safety Management undergraduate program includes majors and minors in Criminal Justice and in Public Safety Management, as well as several certificates. Majors earn a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice, or a BS in Public Safety Management. At the master's level, the program includes a Master of Science in Criminal Justice degree and an MS in Public Safety Management. Non-masters graduate students can also enroll to earn certificates. The Criminal Justice/Public Safety Management program conducted a campus self-study during 2009, and has been implementing changes and evaluating the results, based on the conclusions of that study for the past several years.

In the Public Affairs program, undergraduates pursue a BS in Public Affairs in one of four majors—Civic Leadership, Public Policy, Management, or Media and Public Policy (2011-2012 was the first year for this major). The Civic Leadership and Public Policy majors each have several emphasis areas, allowing students to specialize their studies according to their interests. Minors in these four categories are also available, as are several certificates. The undergraduate public affairs program was the subject of a campus self-study during 2008.

At the graduate level, students pursue one of three concentrations (Public Management, Nonprofit Management, or Policy Analysis) in the Masters of Public Affairs degree program. In addition, some graduate students pursue a dual MPA in Nonprofit Management/Master of Arts in Philanthropic Studies, offered jointly with the IUPUI School of Liberal Arts and its Center on Philanthropy. Non-degree graduate students can earn certificates in several specialties; in 2011, 98 did. Many of those who earn graduate certificates segue into the master's programs.

The MPA program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). Faculty and staff devoted considerable time and effort during the 2011-2012 academic year to preparing for NASPAA's reaccreditation process, which occurs during the 2012-2013 academic year. The program's self-study will be submitted to NASPAA in the fall of 2012, and the accreditation site visit will take place in the spring of 2013. The final report will be issued in the summer of 2013. NASPAA reaccreditation occurs approximately every 5 years. The last campus self-study was conducted in conjunction with the NASPAA accreditation in 2006.

SPEA's programs, especially the undergraduate criminal justice and public safety management program, and the graduate Master of Public Affairs program, have been undergoing considerable growth over the past several years. Between the fall of 2007 and 2011, the number of undergraduate students increased by almost 29 percent, and the number of credit hours taught increased by more than 30 percent. At the graduate level, the number of enrolled students increased by more than 48 percent, while the number of credit hours increased by 35 percent. For the school as a whole, enrollment was up by almost 36 percent, while credit hours increased by more than 31 percent.

Purpose and organization of this report

The purpose of this report is to meet the annual filing requirements of the university, while summarizing how SPEA collects, assesses and uses quantitative and qualitative data to improve student learning within the school. SPEA faculty and staff monitor program indicators to determine trends, and to make programmatic improvements to improve student learning outcomes.

This report provides a systematic overview of SPEA's planning for learning, and assessment of learning, from identification of the desired learning outcomes, through the assessment measures used, to the current findings using those assessment measures, and finally, to the actions SPEA has or is planning to take as a result of identifying those findings. The following tables and associated discussion identifies the general student learning outcomes identified, provides more-specific statements of those general learning outcomes, description of where, when, and how SPEA faculty and staff will help students demonstrate the outcomes, a description of how each of the outcomes will be measured or assessed, and a brief statement about the current findings. More detailed descriptions of some of the findings will be highlighted in the text sections following the tables. These are organized by undergraduate and graduate levels across both of the school's programs; thus, section 1 deals with student learning objectives and outcomes in undergraduate programs in both the Public Affairs and Criminal Justice/Public Safety Management programs, while section 2 addresses the graduate programs in these areas. This arrangement was chosen because while the content of the programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels are similar in many respects (e.g., that the topics covered in the undergraduate criminal justice program continue on into the graduate program), the structure and purposes of the degrees at the two levels are significantly different, thus making for example, the BSPA and BSCJ more similar to each other in many respects than to either the MPA or MSCJ.

Looked at from a systems approach, student learning outcomes depend on the inputs, and the processes those inputs are subjected to within SPEA to create measurable outputs that result in the desired learning outcomes. The inputs include faculty, staff, knowledge, the educational setting, and students. Among the processes are a well-designed, rigorous and properly structured curriculum, administered by faculty and staff within the educational setting. The outputs of the system include students with improved knowledge,

skills and abilities in their respective majors or concentrations. We are capable of measuring various aspects of the inputs and the processes, as well as the outputs of the system.

This leaves the desired outcomes of the program: students who will be able to find employment, and/or continue their education, and later make a difference in their lives and communities by using those KSAs acquired in the SPEA program. Some measures of these outcomes may not become evident for years. The most severe limitation to our assessment of learning outcomes is that we cannot reasonably follow students after they complete their education. Therefore, unless all our graduates choose to keep us informed of their activities in the future, our knowledge of our learning outcomes is limited to the later feedback we receive from a self-selecting sample of our graduates, and survey and anecdotal communication about our graduates received from outside employers and educators. We continue to study alternatives for collecting valid and reliable outcomes information.

In practice, therefore, our measurement of learning outcomes is primarily based on factors related to the inputs, processes and outputs of our system, and only to some small degree can it be based on actual outcomes among our alumni. We hope in the future to be able to improve our post-graduation data collection, and are considering a number of alternatives to that end.

Finally, our objective in measuring these input, process, output and outcome factors is to improve the results of our educational programs. Changes in the measured variables and the outcomes should tell us where improvements need to be made in our inputs and processes to achieve better outcomes. This connection of measured changes to outcomes will allow us to create a better, more effective learning environment for our students.

SPEA has identified three broad student learning outcomes for its programs, which apply at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A number of indicators—some related to our inputs, some related to our processes, some related to our outputs, and some attempting to measure the outcomes of our programs—are used to triangulate our progress in improving learning outcomes for our students on these desired learning outcomes. These broad learning outcomes include:

> **Outcome 1.** Students graduating with a SPEA degree or certificate will have the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to enter and advance in the professions relevant to their major, whether in the public, nonprofit or for-profit sector. Students will demonstrate the appropriate knowledge, skills and abilities for their degree and major, have appropriate and successful professional and other developmental experiences while enrolled in SPEA, and will find employment or voluntary service congruent with their degree upon completion of their program.

Outcome 2. Students graduating with a SPEA degree or certificate will have the knowledge, skills and abilities embodied in the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) or Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGLs), as appropriate, and will meet the requirements set forth by school faculty and outside accrediting bodies, such as NASPAA for the MPA program.

Outcome 3. Students graduating with a SPEA degree or certificate will be prepared for admission to an advanced degree program appropriate to their chosen field of study (for example, a graduate certificate or master degree program for undergraduate degree holders; a doctoral or other professional degree program for MPA degree recipients).

Section 1—SPEA Planning for Learning and Assessment: Undergraduate
2011-2012 Academic Year Review

The following table summarizes for the undergraduate programs 1) the general learning outcomes, 2) what those learning outcomes entail, in terms of student demonstration of knowledge, skills, and abilities, 3) the means by which faculty and staff will see students learn and demonstrate those outcomes, 4) the measures for the outcomes, and 5) the findings based on the measures. Some of these results will be expanded upon in text discussions referenced in column 5 that appear below the table.

Table 1. Undergraduate planning and assessment

1. What general outcome are we seeking?	2. What will the student know or be able to demonstrate?	3. How, when and/or where will we help students demonstrate this outcome? (For example, in class or out of class)	4. How can we measure each of the outcomes listed in column 2?	5. What are our assessment findings? (Further discussion in the associated text below the table)
Outcome 1. Students graduating with a SPEA undergraduate degree will have the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to enter and advance in the professions relevant to their major, whether in the public, nonprofit or for-profit sector.	We will see students demonstrate mastery of the competencies and learning outcomes defined for their major, minor or certification in their tests, projects, and other evaluative tools used in classes.	Faculty with the assistance of staff have the responsibility to establish the competencies and learning outcomes that students must demonstrate, and the manner in which they must demonstrate them. SPEA faculty has established competencies and learning outcomes for each of our majors. At the undergraduate level, these are linked to the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULS). Each SPEA course has a designated primary PUL, which is identified in the syllabus and which the instructor rates each student	**Program-level Measures** **Measure 1.** Establishment of competency areas and desired learning outcomes for each major, including distribution of primary PULs to individual courses. **Measure 2.** Review of course syllabi to ensure standard structure, statement of learning outcomes and PULs, and appropriate rigor in readings and assignments across courses in each major and program. **Measure 3.** Review of faculty performance, including use of student course evaluations, and peer evaluation of teaching, to	**Program-level Measures** **Measure 1.** Competency areas have been established for several years for each undergraduate program, major, and certificate. Faculty continually discuss the appropriateness of the curriculum and the degree to which students achieve these competencies based on informal observation and evaluation of student work in courses. Typically, these competencies are reviewed in depth and may be modified as result of program self-studies. **Measure 2.** Program directors

		on, based on performance on appropriate assessment activities. Courses are designed to develop student knowledge, skills and abilities related to these learning outcomes and the PULs through coursework, which provides students the opportunity to demonstrate their proficiency on tests, projects, and other activities. At the individual level, SPEA provides students with strong mentoring through an advising program that includes academic advisers and faculty mentoring to assure that we address academic and nonacademic issues that may hinder student performance, and to encourage students to maximize their potential. For undergraduates, we offer a career development and planning course to foster a broader and longer appreciation of the SPEA educational opportunity. We also offer a SPEA Success Seminar, to help students improve academic performance.	ensure substantially even educational quality of instructional staff. **Measure 4.** Program reviews, including periodic comprehensive formal reviews mandated by the university and/or by accrediting bodies, and occasional informal reviews conducted by faculty and staff of selected aspects of the program. **Measure 5.** Surveys of recent graduates and alumni will include selected questions to illuminate student outcomes, especially whether or not the student perceives that they have the knowledge, skills and abilities anticipated in the learning outcomes. **Measure 6.** Undergraduate retention rates **Measure 7.** Undergraduate probationary and DF rates. **Measure 8.** Grade-point averages over courses, majors, and programs. **Measure 9.** Completion rates. **Course-level Measures** **Measure 10.** Course-based evaluation of student performance (e.g., grades, PUL ratings). This can include exams, case-studies, presentations, papers, problem-solving, projects, etc.) for each	and staff review syllabi each semester, especially those submitted by part-time faculty, to ensure consistency and rigor in course offerings. There were no specific findings for this period. **Measure 3.** School administration, program directors, and the faculty's promotion and tenure committee periodically review teaching performance for full-time faculty. Program directors annually review performance for part-time faculty. **Measure 4**. The last formal reviews of the undergraduate programs took place in the 2006 (PA) and 2009 (CJ/PSM) academic years, and the next are scheduled in 2013-14 (PA) and 2014-15 (CJ). **Measure 5.** Students report high satisfaction with education in the major and overall academic experiences at IUPUI. **Measure 6.** IMIR reported in the fall 2011 census that SPEA's undergraduate retention rates had declined in 2011. See discussion below. **Measure 7.** SPEA's probation/dismissal rate continues to decrease; rates of probation, critical probation and dismissal continue to decline.

			individual course. For evaluation purposes, can be assessed individually or collectively. **Measure 11.** Student mid-term and end-of-term course evaluations. **Measure 12.** Curriculum assessments, such as pre-and-post tests for students entering and completing a program, or other evaluative tools. **Individual-level Measures** **Measure 13.** Successful completion of career planning courses. **Measure 14.** Faculty mentoring and staff academic advising. In dealing with numbers of students, faculty and staff may identify issues and trends that are not apparent in other data.	**Measure 8.** Undergraduate student performance continues to improve overall and in each major. An analysis of grades conducted during the year revealed little evidence of systematic grade inflation, with most evidence of inflation or other problems occurring among adjunct faculty. **Measure 9.** SPEA's completion rates continue along the positive trend. **Course-level Measures** **Measure 10.** PUL results are discussed in more detail below. **Measure 11.** Faculty, courses, and the program overall generally receive good ratings from students in the course evaluations. In a few cases, associated faculty were not brought back to teach other sections, based in part on poor student evaluations, student complaints, and other evidence of poor teaching quality. **Measure 12.** The CJ/PSM faculty continue to develop a pre/post-test for students entering and completing these majors. The PA program has begun using a directed reflective essay in the capstone course as an evaluative tool, and plans to implement an exit survey in the capstone beginning in the fall of 2012.

			Individual-level Measures **Measure 13.** The career planning class was created several years ago in response to student requests for such a professional development course. Students report satisfaction with the course. In 2011-12, the Optimal Resume system was incorporated, as well as an online Personal Development Plan. **Measure 14.** Faculty and staff continue to hear about a wide variety of problems that individual students have that may impact individual performance and continuation in SPEA, especially problems involving family and employment. Faculty and staff often refer these students to other University services for assistance, but there is little SPEA can do about these barriers to student participation. We continue to discuss possible impacts and solutions, and encourage full and part-time faculty to work with students with these issues.
	Outcome 1b. Students are placed successfully in relevant, high-quality internships, and supervisor evaluations are supportive of student achievement in the	Internships are not conducted in a classroom setting, but rather in external workplaces in the public, nonprofit or for-profit sectors. Faculty and staff identify	**Measure 1.** Student feedback about internship quality. (Student evaluation form, journal of activity, and concluding reflection paper, evaluated by faculty and staff as appropriate.)	**Measure 1.** Overall, students report considerable satisfaction with internship opportunities. **Measure 2.** Internship supervisors continue to report high satisfaction with student

	internships.	potential internships, screen and consult with the organizations and supervisors to ensure quality positions and experiences. Students may also identify appropriate internship settings, which are reviewed and approved by faculty and staff as needed.	**Measure 2.** Internship supervisor evaluations of student performance. (Supervisor evaluation form, and followup interviews conducted by staff as appropriate).	interns. In the last year, several employers have hired our students as part- or full-time employees following their internships.
	Outcome 1c. Students are employed in the public, private, or nonprofit sectors in positions relevant to their majors after having earned their degree or certificate.	By providing job-placement and job counseling services for students approaching and after graduation. (Note: SPEA currently does not provide job-placement services, but does provide career and job counseling for students, as does the university.)	**Measure 1.** Recent undergraduate/alumni survey (selected questions concerning post-graduation employment). **Measure 2.** Tracking of former students via LinkedIn and other profession-related social media.	**Measure 1.** IMIR reported in February 2012 the results of the 2011 undergraduate alumni survey. The results as applied to SPEA are discussed below. **Measure 2.** Staff are looking into the reliability and usefulness of LinkedIn and other social media for tracking employment of alumni.
Outcome 2. Students graduating with a SPEA bachelor's degree will have the knowledge, skills and abilities embodied in the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs).	Undergraduate students demonstrate mastery of the PULs through coursework, including capstone experience and RISE experiences.		**Measure 1.** Faculty evaluation of student coursework, including that evaluated for the PULs (projects, tests, quizzes, papers, etc.) **Measure 2.** RISE and other experiences **Measure 3.** Capstone course performance, in which the students participate in a group project for a real-world client to produce a report or other summative and evaluative activities as a culmination of their undergraduate experience in their program.	**Measure 1.** Overall, the results of PUL ratings by faculty and reported by IMIR in June 2012 are encouraging, and suggest that overall, students are achieving mastery in most of the PULs. There is always room for improvement, and faculty will be discussing the IMIR report during the 2012-13 school year. **Measure 2.** See discussion below. **Measure 3.** Capstone course faculty reports that many students are encountering their

				first substantial "real-world" projects in the capstone course. Students with less group experience tend to have a more difficult time participating effectively in these projects. Many students have self-reported that culminating experience is the first in the program to consciously try to pull concepts and skills together from throughout the program.
Outcome 3. Students graduating with a SPEA bachelor's degree will be prepared for admission to an advanced degree program appropriate to their chosen field of study.	Students are qualified to be admitted to graduate programs appropriate to their chosen field of study, and do so.	In class, by providing a full and rigorous education. Outside of class by providing mentoring and other development services.	**Measure 1.** Students have sufficient GPA and other knowledge, skills and abilities to be admitted to graduate programs. **Measure 2.** Recent graduate/alumni survey (selected questions concerning post-graduation education). **Measure 3.** Tracking of former students via LinkedIn and other profession-related social media.	**Measure 1.** Entrance requirements (GPA, admissions testing, etc.) are highly variable at institutions of higher education. Our assessment of quality can only be approximate. We continue to investigate ways of measuring this outcome in a valid and reliable manner. **Measure 2.** See discussion below. **Measure 3.** Staff are looking into the reliability and usefulness of LinkedIn and other social media for tracking alumni pursuit of advanced education.

Expanded Narration

Outcome 1a, Measure 6. IMIR reported that the freshman-sophomore retention rate declined from 85 percent in 2009-10 to 80 percent in 2010-11, while the junior-senior rate declined from 88 to 84 percent, with the overall retention rate declining from 88 to 83 percent. This seems to reverse the trend of stable to improving rates since 2006-07. For all three categories (f-s, j-s, and overall), 2009-

10 represented the highest retention rates in the past five years, markedly better than the previous years' rates. SPEA's rates are compared to the campus rates in the following table.

	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
F-S (IUPUI/SPEA)	67/76	70/76	74/76	75/85	74/80
J-S	83/78	83/86	85/86	86/88	85/84
All Undergrads	75/78	77/83	80/84	81/88	80/83

SPEA faculty and staff have considered the magnitude and relative importance of the retention rate statistic. For example, SPEA typically has very few freshmen enrolled; in 2009-10, for example, IMIR reported just 27, and over the last five years it has varied between 25 and 38. A retention rate of 80 percent in the 2010-11 census suggests that 5 of those freshmen did not continue in SPEA their sophomore year—yet SPEA enrolled 117 sophomores in the fall of 2011. Those five may have failed, withdrawn, transferred to other schools or other universities, or may have continued as SPEA freshman, if they were part-time students who had not yet completed 30 semester hours of credit. The population is too small to determine any trends.

On the other hand, SPEA had 128 juniors in 2009-10, and a retention rate of 84 percent at the beginning of the 2011-12 year. Therefore, 108 juniors were retained into their senior year—when SPEA enrolled a total of 222 seniors. Therefore, 20 students did not continue in SPEA, or continued as juniors until they achieved the necessary number of credit hours. The usefulness of any statistics or other data as to why those students left the program is questionable. Students leave for a number of reasons, not all of which have to do with the school or program in which they are enrolled. Overall, of 461 SPEA undergraduates in 2010, some 383 were retained in 2011—while overall enrollment grew to 527. SPEA staff have not yet completed an analysis of why those 78 students were not retained last year. However, data has been collected, along with that from other years, and will be analyzed in the future.

Clearly, SPEA has experienced more improvement overall than the campus as a whole over the past several years, and has rates comparable to or better than the campus rates. Just as clearly, there is remains room for improvement, as ideally the retention rates would be 100 percent. In addition, SPEA is apparently benefitting from students transferring into its programs after their freshman, sophomore, and sometimes junior, years.

SPEA faculty and staff have been investigating the cause of the change in retention rates. SPEA's retention rates may be attributable in part to the fact that SPEA has a significant (although declining) fraction of part-time students. In 2011, almost 27 percent of SPEA's students were part-time, compared to more than 46 percent of the campus' students. Part-time students often take longer than two

semesters to transition from one grade level to another, which could significantly impact not only the retention rates, but also the 4 and 6 year completion rates for the school.

Outcome 1a, Measure 10. In SPEA, each course has a designated primary PUL, which is evaluated and reported for each student when the course is offered, although that has only recently moved from a pilot-scale program with a few courses reporting, to full-scale with instructors for all courses reporting their assessment of student mastery of the primary PUL for the course. In addition to instructor assessment of individual student mastery, students are asked to rate their own mastery of the PULs.

In June 2012, IMIR completed a report on SPEA faculty PUL ratings. Faculty have not yet had time to receive, analyze, and discuss the implications of this report; this discussion is expected during the fall 2012 semester.

The report combines ratings at course level over the five semesters from the Spring of 2010 to the Spring of 2012. Thus, for example, all 100-level courses taught in SPEA are grouped together, and the ratings on each of the PULs determined. SPEA only has a handful of 100-level courses, so not all of the PULs are represented in the report. Similarly, all of the 200-level courses are grouped together, and so on. Most of SPEA's courses are at the 300 and 400 levels, a fact that reflects SPEA's upper-division bias in enrollment.

One finding of note echoes an observation that many faculty have reported in the majority of courses at all levels: student writing is not up to faculty expectations, and generally is considered to be inadequate for a professional setting. The faculty ratings of student performance on PUL 1a, *Written, Oral and Visual Communications Skills*, suggest that very few students demonstrate mastery of skills in this area. The mean evaluation score for 376 students in 100-level courses was 2.2 (on a 4-point scale), while the mean for 224 students in 200-level courses where PUL 1a was the primary was 2.76. Only 38 percent of students at the 100-level and 69 percent of students at the 200-level were rated Effective or Very Effective on this PUL. Of the 69 percent at the 200-level, only 19 percent were rated Very Effective. Unfortunately, no courses at the 300 or 400 levels in this time period had PUL 1a as the primary, so no overall trends could be observed over the full range of course levels.

Faculty will consider the implications of these findings, which could suggest a need for greater emphasis on communication skills in more courses. How faculty will respond to this finding will impact how courses are delivered for years to come.

Outcome 2, Measure 1. In February 2011, IMIR released the results of the 2011 Undergraduate Alumni Survey, comparing SPEA's respondents to the survey to those of the university as a whole. IMIR attempted to contact 5,674 IUPUI graduates who completed between Spring 2008 and Summer 2010. Of SPEA's approximately 450 graduates during that period, 24 responded to the survey: 5 graduating in 07-08, 12 in 08-09, and 7 in 09-10. This included graduates not only of the CJ/PSM and PA programs, but also the

Public Health program, which separated from SPEA at the end of the 2009-10 academic year. The respondents were predominantly female, 25 years old or older, with more than 71 percent Caucasian and 21 percent African-American. Fifty-two percent reported a final GPA of 3.0 or higher, compared to more than 70 percent for the overall university respondents.

Of the 24 SPEA respondents, 100 percent reported being employed, with only four working outside of Indiana. One-third reported being employed in a job not at all related to their degree (compared to just 21 percent for respondents overall), while 46 percent reported their job was directly related, and 21 percent somewhat related. The following table compares SPEA's responding graduates to the university's respondents, by which kind of organization they report working for. While an interesting comparison, which highlights SPEA's focus on the government and nonprofit sectors, we note the small group of respondents and the selection method make generalizations difficult.

Employment Category	SPEA	IUPUI
Federal, State or Local Government	42%	11%
Small Business or corporation	21	23
Education (Public or private)	17	27
Other nonprofit organization	13	9
Large corporation	8	27
Self-employed	0	2

The survey included a number of other items in three categories, including related to further education (discussed under Outcome 3, below); related to the impact of IUPUI on learning and satisfaction with IUPUI; and related to specific education-related experiences. Responses for several of the items were significantly above or below the IUPUI figures. SPEA faculty and staff are reviewing the findings and determining what changes might be appropriate.

Outcome 2, Measure 2. RISE experiences are built into a number of courses. On course evaluations and through other channels, students report satisfaction with the experiences, and instructors find the students generally capable and that they learn better with applied projects.

In addition, faculty and staff developed a second Bridge/TLC for incoming freshmen, implemented in the fall of 2011. The effort to expand the opportunities for our students in SPEA and the university as a whole was a success, and will be repeated in the 2012 fall semester.

Also, SPEA continues to implement the World of Work series, with speakers and presentations held throughout the year. Events are well-attended and students are enthusiastic about the opportunity to meet and talk with insightful practitioners. SPEA staff and students also participate in existing professional development trips to Washington, D.C., and Chicago, which are organized by SPEA-Bloomington.

Outcome 3, Measure 2. The IMIR report discussed in Outcome 2, above, found that 33 percent of the responding SPEA graduates reported being enrolled in further education, with about 17 percent being enrolled full-time in another degree program, and 13 percent enrolled part-time in such a program. About 4 percent were enrolled in coursework not leading to a degree. Another 50 percent reported planning to pursue more education later. Of those actively pursuing a degree, almost 29 percent reported that their IUPUI undergraduate education had "somewhat" prepared them for their current degree program, while more than 71 percent said that it had prepared them "very well."

Section 2—SPEA Planning for Learning and Assessment: Graduate
2011-2012 Academic Year Review

The following table summarizes for the graduate programs 1) the general learning outcomes, 2) what those learning outcomes entail, in terms of student demonstration of knowledge, skills, and abilities, 3) the means by which faculty and staff will see students demonstrate those outcomes, 4) the measures for the outcomes, and 5) the findings based on the measures. Some of these results will be expanded upon in text discussions referenced in column 5 that appear below the table.

Table 2. Graduate planning and assessment

1. What general outcome are we seeking?	2. What will the student know or be able to demonstrate?	3. How, when and/or where will we help students demonstrate this outcome? (For example, in class or out of class)	4. How can we measure each of the outcomes listed in column 2?	5. What are our assessment findings? (Further discussion in the associated text below the table as noted)
Outcome 1. Students earning a SPEA graduate degree will have the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to enter and advance in the professions relevant to their degree and concentration or certification.	**Outcome 1a.** We will see students demonstrate mastery of the competencies and learning outcomes defined for the degree and concentration, or certification, in their tests, projects, and other evaluative tools used in classes.	Faculty with the assistance of staff have the responsibility to establish the competencies and learning outcomes that students must demonstrate, and the manner in which they must demonstrate them.

The SPEA faculty has established competencies and learning outcomes for each degrees and associated concentrations, and for the graduate certificates. These are linked to the IUPUI Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning at the programmatic level. The competencies and learning outcomes of the PA program | **Program-level Measures**

Measure 1. Establishment of competency areas and desired learning outcomes for each degree, concentration, and certificate, as a result of formal self-study of programs and degrees.

Measure 2. Review of course syllabi to ensure standard structure, statement of learning outcomes, and appropriate rigor in readings and assignments across courses in each degree, concentration, and program.

Measure 3. Review of faculty performance, including use of | **Program-level Measures**

Measure 1. Last formal self-study for the CJ/PSM program was in 2009. Last formal self-study for the PA graduate program was in 2006. Faculty continually discusses the appropriateness and the degree to which students achieve these outcomes based on informal observation and evaluation of course performance. No specific findings for this period.

Measure 2. Program directors and staff review syllabi each semester, especially those submitted by part-time faculty. |

		are directly linked to the accreditation requirements of NASPAA. Courses are designed to develop student knowledge, skills and abilities related to the course-level learning outcomes through coursework, which provides students the opportunity to demonstrate their proficiency on tests, projects, and other activities. At the individual level, SPEA provides students with strong mentoring through an advising program that includes academic advisers and faculty mentoring to assure that we address academic and nonacademic issues that may hinder student performance, and to encourage students to maximize their potential.	student course evaluations, and peer evaluation of teaching, to ensure substantially even educational quality of instructional staff. **Measure 4.** Program reviews, including periodic comprehensive formal reviews mandated by the university and/or by accrediting bodies, and occasional informal reviews conducted by faculty and staff of selected aspects of the program. **Measure 5.** Surveys of recent graduates and alumni will include selected questions to illuminate student outcomes, especially whether or not the student perceives that they have the knowledge, skills and abilities anticipated in the learning outcomes. **Measure 6.** Retention rates **Measure 7.** Probationary and DF rates. **Measure 8.** Grade-point averages over courses, majors, and programs. **Measure 9.** Graduation rates. **Course-level Measures** **Measure 10.** Course-based evaluation of student performance, for example, grades. This can include exams, case-studies, presentations,	There were no specific findings for this period. **Measure 3.** School administration, program directors, and the faculty's promotion and tenure committee annually review teaching performance for full-time faculty. Program directors annually review performance for part-time faculty. **Measure 5.** Students report high satisfaction with education in the major and overall academic experiences at IUPUI. **Measure 6.** Although we can track this, its value as a measure of performance in a 2-year graduate program with a significant portion of part-time students is doubtful. Staff attempt to contact and help resolve issues for students who do not register each semester, although students may choose to sit out a semester or withdraw from the program for family, employment, or other reasons outside of SPEA's knowledge or ability to influence. **Measure 7.** SPEA's probation/dismissal rate continues to decrease; rates of probation, critical probation and dismissal continue to decline.

			papers, problem-solving, projects, etc.) for each individual course. For evaluation purposes, can be assessed individually or collectively. **Measure 11.** Student mid-term and end-of-term course evaluations. **Measure 12.** Curriculum assessments, such as pre/post-program exams, comprehensive exams, and culmination projects. **Individual-level Measures** **Measure 13.** Faculty mentoring and staff academic advising. In dealing with numbers of students, faculty and staff may qualitatively identify issues and trends that are not apparent in other data. **Measure 14.** Individual grades in courses, and grade point average overall.	**Measure 8.** An informal analysis for grade inflation was conducted during the 2011-2012 year; no significant evidence of grade inflation was identified. GPA for graduate students continues to improve; we continue to assess means of further improvement. **Measure 9.** SPEA's graduate completion rates again increased. **Course-level Measures** **Measure 10.** See discussion below. **Measure 11.** The SPEA faculty identified topics that need remediation or additional instruction. However, this is primarily done on a course-by-course basis and is not the subject of faculty discussion or programmatic response unless significant issues requiring additional response is found, such as the issues discussed under Measures 10 and 12. **Measure 12.** The SPEA faculty identified greater need for quantitative assessment skills. The faculty has made a change in the statistical software package used in the statistics course for the program. **Individual-level Measures**

				Measure 13. Some students avoid taking recommended undergraduate courses (suggested to improve basic skills and knowledge) while in the graduate program due to the cost. Faculty and staff identified additional options for adequate preparation and now communicate them to students when recommending additional basic coursework. **Measure 14.** The SPEA faculty conducted an analysis of grading to identify any possible negative patterns. Some inconsistencies in the grade distribution between full time and adjunct faculty were identified. In some cases, decisions on retaining adjunct faculty are made based on concerns regarding rigor.
	Outcome 1b. Students are placed successfully in relevant, high-quality internships, and supervisor evaluations are supportive of student achievement in the internships.	Internships are not conducted in a classroom setting, but rather in external workplaces in the public, nonprofit or for-profit sectors. Faculty and staff identify potential internships, screen and consult with the organizations and supervisors to ensure quality positions and experiences. Students may also identify appropriate internship settings, which are reviewed and approved by faculty and staff	**Measure 1.** Student feedback about internship quality. (Student evaluation form, journal of activity, and concluding reflection paper, evaluated by faculty and staff as appropriate.) **Measure 2.** Internship supervisor evaluations of student performance. (Supervisor evaluation form, and followup interviews conducted by staff as appropriate).	**Measure 1.** Overall, students report considerable satisfaction with internship opportunities. **Measure 2.** Internship supervisors continue to report high satisfaction with student interns.

		as needed.		
	Outcome 1c. Students are employed in the public, private, or nonprofit sectors in positions relevant to their majors.	Students who earn a graduate degree from SPEA are prepared to enter the workforce in their chosen field with the skills to be successful. The program ensures that students have the appropriate quantitative and qualitative skills as well as the professional behavior to become leaders in their field. The curriculum not only reflects the best academic practices from around the country but also reflects the input and suggestions from established professionals in the field.	**Measure 1.** Recent graduate/alumni survey (selected questions concerning post-graduation employment). **Measure 2.** Tracking of former students via LinkedIn and other profession-related social media.	**Measure 1.** Survey evidence suggests that about two-thirds of students attain jobs in their majors, and about 80 percent report that their education prepared them well for the positions they hold. **Measure 2.** Staff are looking into the reliability and usefulness of LinkedIn and other social media for tracking alumni employment.
Outcome 2. Graduating students will have the knowledge, skills and abilities embodied in the competencies specified by the accrediting body for each degree program, if applicable, or established by the SPEA faculty if there is no accrediting body.	Graduate students demonstrate mastery of the degree competencies through coursework, internships and other experiential learning opportunities, and capstone experience.	The SPEA faculty have created and regularly revisit the individual course competencies to ensure they reflect current best practices and the universal competencies of our accrediting body.	**Measure 1.** Coursework and faculty evaluation of student work (projects, tests, quizzes, papers, etc. **Measure 2.** Internship supervisor evaluations of student performance. **Measure 3.** Other experiential learning, such as service learning projects. **Measure 4.** Capstone performance, where students work in groups to produce analyses and reports for real-world clients in the public, nonprofit and business sectors.	**Measure 1.** See discussion below. **Measure 2.** Internship supervisors continue to have high satisfaction with graduate-level student interns. In the past year, three organizations hired our interns as full-time employees at the end of their internships, despite the students still having coursework to complete before graduation. **Measure 3.** The SPEA faculty have found value in service learning projects that help students gain a deeper understanding of the course content, and often design

				courses around service learning projects, especially at the graduate level. **Measure 4.** Faculty for the graduate capstone has identified increased professional preparedness among students in recent semesters.
Outcome 3. Students graduating with a SPEA Master's degree will be prepared for admission to an advanced degree program appropriate to their chosen field of study. Students graduating with a graduate-level certification are prepared for admission to a master's program.	Students are admitted to graduate programs appropriate to their chosen field of study.		**Measure 1.** Students exit our programs with sufficient knowledge, skills and abilities, as evidenced by their cumulative GPA, to enter a graduate program. **Measure 2.** Recent graduate/alumni survey (selected questions concerning post-graduation education). **Measure 3.** Tracking of former students via LinkedIn and other social media.	**Measure 1.** See discussion below. **Measure 2.** See discussion below. **Measure 3.** Staff are looking into the reliability and usefulness of LinkedIn and other social media for tracking alumni pursuit of advanced education.

Expanded Narration

Outcome 1, Measure 10. Student academic performance in graduate level work is closely linked to most recent semesters of undergraduate work in courses within their major. The correlation weakens over time for students who do not attend graduate school immediately after undergraduate completion, and often students with modest undergraduate performance will, with several years of life experience, including family and employment, will become much higher performing students upon entry to the SPEA graduate program.

During the 2011-12 academic year, faculty informally identified negative trends in overall student performance related to student writing ability and quantitative analysis. This has resulted in a discussion of the need for more rigorous instruction in these areas earlier in the program. Faculty have taken steps to identify specific solutions, such as development of a standard grading rubric for all faculty in grading papers and quantitative analysis in all graduate courses. These solutions will be implemented beginning in the 2012-13 academic year.

Outcome 2, Measure 1. In developing course competencies, faculty explicitly works to develop competencies that reflect the needs of the industries in which graduates will be employed. In the case of the MPA program, faculty connect course competencies to those established by NASPAA, the program's outside accrediting agency. The 2011-12 academic year was a self-study year for the MPA program, and the NASPAA site visit and review will take place during the coming year. Program faculty will then consider the results of the re-accreditation process in course and program design and implementation.

Outcome 3, Measure 1. Admission requirements for further graduate education are highly variable, and are often school and program specific. Graduate education schools typically require students to take the GRE or other appropriate assessment, but not all. For example, while direct-admit students applying to the SPEA-I MPA program are required to successfully complete the GRE for admission; students seeking admission to one of the graduate certificate programs do not. Students who have successfully completed a SPEA certificate may choose to enroll in the full MPA program without taking the GRE, and a significant number do. Another exception to this at SPEA-I is undergraduate students who enroll in the accelerated MPA program, who are admitted as undergraduates based on their undergraduate performance and earn their bachelor and master degrees at the same time.

We can make a judgment as to whether our graduates are well-enough prepared to enter other graduate programs, such as based on their GPA, but such a judgment must be in the general sense, because of the differing entrance requirements of different programs at different schools and universities.

Outcome 3, Measure 2. While SPEA receives some data through surveys and other indirect sources, much of it is voluntary, self-selected reporting, and therefore of questionable reliability. Faculty and staff continue to investigate means of measuring this outcome in a more comprehensive and reliable manner. However, informal feedback from students suggests that a significant portion of our MPA graduates would be interested in pursuing a doctorate through SPEA-Indianapolis, and some have applied to and enrolled in the doctoral program through SPEA-Bloomington. A significant number seek advanced education by going to law school, either here at IUPUI, in Bloomington, or at other law schools.