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I. Brief History and Introduction

The Division of Public and Environmental Affairs (DPEA) was established at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) in October, 1974 as part of the Indiana University system-wide School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA). The division’s first complete academic year was 1975-76. In 2008, the SPEA system dissolved, and a Memorandum of Understanding was forged between the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University—Bloomington and the Division of Public and Environmental Affairs at IPFW. The division was granted an affiliate status by the SPEA and continues to offer SPEA degrees to undergraduate and graduate students alike. In 2010, the name of the DPEA officially changed to the Department of Public Policy with the creation of the College of Education and Public Policy (CEPP) at IPFW. At its inception, the CEPP housed three departments: Public Policy, Educational Studies, and Professional Studies.

II. Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Public Policy at IPFW is to improve the quality of public service through teaching current and prospective public servants, through research on public issues, and through service to organizations with public policy interests.

III. Leadership Structure and Duties

All voting faculty members in the Department of Public Policy (as defined by the Fort Wayne Senate) will elect a chair for a three-year term.

The chair will perform all tasks that are necessary and proper for the operation of the department and its academic programs in conformance with Office of Academic Affairs Memorandum No. 05-3.

IV. Faculty Committees

The Department of Public Policy has four standing committees staffed with faculty members charged with discussing and exploring policies that enhance the mission of the department. In
the fall of each academic year, the chair will poll the members of the full-time faculty to request preferences for assignment to one or more of the standing committees. The standing committees include the following:

Promotion and Tenure Committee (three tenured members)
Scholarship Committee (two members)
Student Assessment Committee (at least three members)
Student Organization Committee (two members)

The appointed members of all standing committees will elect a chair in the fall of each academic year.

In addition, the department chair, in consultation with the members of the full-time faculty, may create *ad hoc* committees as needed in order to pursue the mission of the department.

V. Faculty Review

A. **Promotion and Tenure Procedures**: The promotion and tenure procedures for the Department of Public Policy are as follows:

1. The department will follow standard IPFW procedures governing promotion and tenure cases (see Senate Document SD 14-35 and Senate Document SD 14-36).

   Dossiers must be submitted by candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure to the department chair by the date established by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

2. The department promotion and tenure committee members will make an assessment and take a formal vote on a candidate’s case in each of the three categories (research and/or creative endeavor, teaching, and service). Abstentions are not permissible. Committee members will either rate the candidate “excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory” in all three categories. Criteria for excellence, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory are delineated below. Promotion and/or tenure can result by achieving an “excellent” rating in one category and at least a “satisfactory” rating in the other two categories. Committee members will base their decision on an assessment of the vita, a narrative statement, the documentation of research, teaching, and service, as well as internal and external reviews. The recommendation of the committee members in the form of a letter will be forwarded by the chair of the promotion and tenure committee to the department chair within 21 days of the dossier due date.

3. At least three tenured members of the department will be appointed by the chair on an annual basis. The members will elect a chair. Where vacancies or absences may exist, tenured colleagues from other related disciplines at IPFW may serve at the discretion of
the chief academic officer of the College of Education and Public Policy upon receiving recommendations from the department chair.

B. **Promotion and Tenure Substantive Criteria**: The promotion and tenure standards for the Department of Public Policy for the assessment of teaching, research, and service are as follows:

**General Criteria**

For both tenure and promotion to either associate or full professor, a candidate must demonstrate excellence in at least one of the assessment categories (teaching, research, and service) and at least a satisfactory record in the remaining categories. An unsatisfactory record in any category results in the failure to secure tenure and/or promotion.

**Teaching**

**Evidence of Teaching Quality**

The primary evidence of instructional quality includes, *inter alia*, student evaluations of teaching, peer observations/evaluations of teaching, letters from students (particularly unsolicited ones), teaching publications, as well as teaching awards and other recognition of effective teaching. The evaluations of teaching, as well as the evaluation instruments, should always be sensitive to the context of the instruction and of what is being assessed. The limitations of student evaluations should always be heeded. It is common, for example, that even the most effective instructors may receive unfavorable commentary or evaluations from some students and instructors performing at an unsatisfactory level may receive some favorable commentary or evaluations from some students.

There are a number of other contributions to teaching which should be included in the assessment process. Mentoring and advising of students may encompass such activities as supervision of internships, supervision of independent studies, as well as advising students who engage in scholarly research. It should be noted that the opportunities, as well as the demands, for faculty mentoring and advising are likely to vary considerably among academic fields and between different levels of students. In terms of assessment, letters from students as well as observations and/or evaluations from peers can be facilitative. Where products are formally created (e.g., papers, presentations, joint-publications, and reports) that arise out of the interaction with the faculty member, they should be duly noted and assessed.

Contributions to pedagogy are very important in the assessment process. Pedagogical contributions may include curriculum development, course development, as well as the development of teaching materials and techniques. Evidence of such contributions are likely to come from peer assessments, the receipt of grants to develop new courses or the revision of
old ones, teaching awards, articles in peer-reviewed outlets, and presentations at professional conferences. In assessing the development of teaching materials, evaluations should focus on quality; the nature and impact of textbooks, instructor's manuals, student guides, web sites, and other teaching media; articles in peer-reviewed outlets; and presentations at professional conferences.

Criteria for Assessment of Teaching

A. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Excellence: The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has maintained a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the classes, and the number of different preparations) and has established a strong performance in instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both quantitative and qualitative responses, support the contention that the instructor is well above average and students are consistently very positive about teaching effectiveness. Unsolicted student letters, as well as peer evaluations, attest to teaching effectiveness. The candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. The candidate also demonstrates exceptional contributions to curriculum and/or course development and to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus. In the case of pedagogical contributions, peer assessment confirms the excellence of the cumulative contributions.

2. Satisfactory: Student evaluations, in both quantitative and qualitative responses, confirm that the faculty member is performing instructional duties at a clearly acceptable level. Students are generally favorable about the organization of courses as well as the effectiveness of teaching. Teaching effectiveness has generally improved over time and, wherever particular problems have been identified, the faculty member has taken proactive measures to address them and assess the effectiveness of the adjustments. Peer evaluations also support a conclusion that the instructional effectiveness is at a clearly acceptable level. The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to develop new course preparations and to craft and deliver reasonably acceptable courses. The faculty member willingly contributes her/his share of advising duties and provides a reasonable contribution to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.

3. Unsatisfactory: The evidence does not demonstrate a reasonable contribution to the instructional mission. An unsatisfactory record typically is characterized by one or more of the following: student evaluations consistently indicate that the
faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or there are a number of student complaints about course organization, delivery, and/or teaching effectiveness; where problems have been formally identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft reasonable responses to address them and there is a discernible lack of improvement over time; peer evaluations do not confirm the faculty member is teaching at a clearly acceptable level; the faculty member does not make a reasonable contribution to student advising, mentoring, curriculum and course development, and/or pedagogy.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

1. Excellence: In addition to the criteria delineated above, the faculty member has a national reputation for pedagogical contributions, and peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions.

2. Satisfactory: Note the criteria delineated above.

3. Unsatisfactory: Note the criteria delineated above.

Research and/or Creative Endeavor

Evidence of Research Quality

The primary evidence of research performance is quality which includes, *inter alia*, the faculty member’s published work and the peer assessment of that work. Research published in peer-reviewed journal articles and books are typically, but not always, the most appropriate outlets for the presentation of a faculty member’s scholarship. Other suitable outlets may include chapters in books, papers in conference proceedings, technical reports, abstracts, as well as digital/electronic media where a peer-reviewed process similar to the one utilized in the publication of journal articles or books is part of the decision to publish work in one of these media.

In assessing the quality of the published work, considerations could include, but not be limited to, the rigor of the peer review process involved in publication; the appropriateness and status or reputation of the journal or publisher; the commentary from outside reviewers on the importance and impact of the published work; the reputation of the external reviewers; and indications that the work is cited by others and/or has had a discernible impact on the field in question.

Another indicator of research performance is quantity, in conjunction with prevailing campus standards at IPFW. Depending upon the discipline and its norms, the nature of the work, as well as the rank of aspiration, the volume of research productivity will be ascertained.
While the quality of the work is more important than quantity, the amount of the research product is to be considered in the context with the quality and value of the work.

The independence of the research output is also a consideration in the assessment of research performance. Some considerations may include whether the faculty member has moved beyond the simple extension of her/his doctoral dissertation and established an independent research agenda; whether the faculty member has authored publications with her/his doctoral dissertation supervisor, or a single senior colleague, as a co-author. Co-authorship with collaborators should follow the norms of the field, but in each case the assessment should be made of the faculty member’s independent contribution to the published research.

The professional reputation of the faculty member is another consideration in the assessment process. The extent to which the individual faculty member has obtained a regional, national, or international reputation may include presentations at professional meetings; invitations to lecture at other universities and at professional meetings; invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings; grants or contracts; awards by regional, national, or international organizations; memberships on journal editorial boards; editorships of journals or books; and leadership positions in scholarly societies. In assessing these indicators, the reputation of the organizations, journals, scholarly societies, and grant making/contracting agencies, as well as the nature of the peer review process involved, are relevant factors.

Criteria for Assessment of Research

A. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Excellence: The evidence establishes that the faculty member is beginning to establish a national reputation as an original contributor through research and shows high promise of continued development as a research scholar. The faculty member’s work should establish the existence of an independent research agenda and a discernible domain of inquiry being established with continuity and connection between individual projects. There should be evidence that the faculty member is contributing to an area in at least one of the following ways: methodological originality (developing research methods that are original or offer new solutions to policy problems); substantive illumination (adding new critical insights to a subject that provide for more clarity or new perspectives to those working in the field); integration and synthesis (placing information or empirical data in a new framework so as to enhance knowledge); or conceptual and theoretical innovation (generating new ways of pondering existing topics or problems). The faculty member should have established a record of high quality work with a number of published works in high quality journals and/or high
quality publishers. External reviewers are generally very positive about the quality of the research.

2. Satisfactory: The evidence establishes that the faculty member is developing a program of research in a specific field and is contributing to that field in a discernible manner. Progress beyond the doctoral dissertation should be evident. The faculty member should have established a record of quality work in good quality journals and/or with good quality publishers, and should have an established independent research agenda and show promise of continued development as a scholar.

3. Unsatisfactory: The evidence provided fails to establish that the faculty member has established an independent research agenda and shows promise of continued development as a scholar. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by one, or more, of the following: little or insufficient indication of an independent research agenda; research work that in the judgment of external reviewers is of poor quality; research work that is published in poor quality journals or by poor quality book publishers; an insufficient amount of published research; and a failure to demonstrate promise of continued development as a research scholar.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

1. Excellence: The evidence clearly demonstrates that the faculty member has established a national, or international, reputation as an excellent scholar and can be expected to maintain that reputation. The faculty member has created a body of research beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. External reviewers are very positive about the quality and quantity of the research and the impact it has had on the field, and they confirm the national or international reputation of the faculty member.

2. Satisfactory: The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to associate professor and has established a national reputation for making legitimate research contributions through the publication on a sustained basis of good quality research beyond the level expected for promotion to associate professor. External reviewers are generally positive about the quality and quantity of the research.

3. Unsatisfactory: The evidence is insufficient to establish that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to associate professor and/or that the faculty member has established a national reputation for making sound research contributions through the publication of good quality research beyond
the level expected for promotion to associate professor. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: little indication of an independent research agenda; little indication of growth as a scholar since promotion to associate professor; work that in the judgment of external reviewers is of poor quality; and an insufficient amount of published research.

Service

Evidence of Service Quality

The overall functioning and self-governance of the university is dependent upon the academic citizenship of the faculty, and institutional service involves a number of activities that help to promote the academic mission of the university. Every faculty member is expected to contribute a reasonable amount of service to the department such as regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in committee assignments. Institutional service may include committee service (e.g., committees central to the mission of the institution, including curricular issues, accreditation, teaching/learning evaluation, personnel searches, and promotion and tenure) and/or administrative service (e.g., directing programs, directing committees, and serving in faculty governance). Service to the profession, however, is essential to the development of the evolving scholar, and may include such activities as reviewing manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals or grant proposals, moderating sessions at professional conferences, serving on committees related to one’s discipline, and participation in accreditation or establishing professional or academic standards. Serving one’s profession can also occur through editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, organizing symposia, participating in conferences or workshops, editing proceedings, and serving as an officer in a professional association. Public service is also an important component in this assessment category. Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the academic mission. Consistent with the department’s public affairs orientation, service activities may be in the public, non-profit, and/or private sectors and may be paid or unpaid in nature. It is expected that faculty members will engage in some public service activities within their areas of expertise as time warrants. Engagement in public service may ensue through consulting; providing public policy analysis or technical expertise; writing technical reports; serving as an expert witness or providing expert testimony; serving on boards, commissions, or review panels; evaluating public policies; assisting agencies with development activities; and communicating in popular, non-academic publications and other media such as television or radio.

Service records will be assessed utilizing a number of indicators. The quantity of service must be ascertained, including such considerations as the number and range of activities, the nature of the faculty member’s involvement in each activity, and the time commitment required. As is the case with the research category, it is particularly important to assess the
quality and impact of the service. Evaluations by other colleagues, committee chairs, and other administrators will assist in this endeavor. Another important indicator in assessing service activities is tangible evidence of the significance of the service and its impact, as well as demonstration of leadership, particularly in cases where faculty members are claiming excellence in the service category.

Criteria for Assessment of Service

A. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor (While faculty members will be evaluated in this category, they are not permitted to pursue promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure based on excellence in service under Senate Document SD 14-35)

1. Excellence: The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the department through her/his service activities to the profession, to the public, as well as to the department and the university. Colleagues and external reviewers assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact. The faculty member has typically received external awards, honors, or other recognition for some of the service.

2. Satisfactory: The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes constructively to the mission of the department through her/his service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, fulfills her/his responsibilities, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for her/his contributions. The faculty member is also an active participant in professional activities and has demonstrated a willingness to contribute to the public service mission of the department.

3. Unsatisfactory: The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes constructively to the mission of the department through her/his service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the department or university; failure to demonstrate more than minimal contributions to the public service mission of the department; irresponsible service; failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings; and generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for her/his contributions or collegiality.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

1. Excellence: In addition to the criteria delineated above, the faculty member’s
service contributes well beyond the norm to the reputation of the department and university. Typically, service excellence must be premised on more than outstanding service to the department, university, and profession but must include significant public service.

2. Satisfactory: Note the criteria delineated above.

3. Unsatisfactory: Note the criteria delineated above.

C. Annual Review and Salary Increment Process: Each faculty member will submit her or his annual Faculty Summary Report to the chair on February 1 by 5 p.m. Based on that report, teaching evaluations, and other materials the faculty member and chair deem relevant, the chair will provide each faculty member with a written Annual Review by April 1. The review will be based on the chair’s assessment of each faculty member in teaching, research, and service. Based on the department’s promotion and tenure standards, each faculty member will be ranked as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each area. Each faculty member will have the right to meet with the chair to discuss the evaluation before the evaluation is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education and Public Policy.

At the same time, the chair will also make salary increment recommendations for each faculty member to the Dean of the College of Education and Public Policy. Increment recommendations will be based on the annual review. The chair is allotted a certain percentage of the total university increment to disburse. This increment is to be awarded on the basis of merit. To receive the full increment from the department, a faculty member would have to be ranked excellent in all three areas. The chair will recommend to the Dean of the College of Education and Public Policy, however, that a faculty member whose work is highly satisfactory in at least one area, while satisfactory in the other two, receive a merit increase. Further merit recommendations will also be made to recognize additional highly satisfactory or excellent rankings achieved. The chair will notify faculty members about their salary increment recommendation by May 1.

D. Annual Review and Salary Increment Process: A template for the annual Faculty Summary Report is provided.

FACULTY SUMMARY REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY
From January 1, 2xxx to December 31, 2xxx

NAME: __________________________________________________________

Full Time: _________ Part Time: _________ Percent (If P/T): _________
I. TEACHING RELATED ACTIVITIES

A. Courses Taught (please complete relevant columns for all courses taught)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Lect.</th>
<th>Lab.</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Student mentoring and advising

C. Contributions to pedagogy
   1. Curriculum/course development
   2. Teaching related grants or awards (title, source, start/end dates, amount)
   3. Teaching-related publications (note type, publication status, whether refereed)
   4. Other

II. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

A. Public
   1. Consulting or advising
   2. Boards, commissions, review panels
   3. Technical or service-related reports and publications (note type, publication status, whether refereed)
   4. Media communication or consultation
   5. Other

B. Department and University
   1. Committees, Department
   2. Committees, University
   3. Other (incl. administrative positions, faculty mentoring)

C. Professional
1. Editorial board
2. Professional reviews (manuscripts, books, grants, accreditation)
3. Professional conference participation (specify activity)
4. Professional affiliations
5. Other (including awards, honors)

III. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES
A. Research-related publications, manuscripts, and papers (note if refereed)
   1. Books published
   2. Articles or book chapters published
   3. Manuscripts accepted for publication
   4. Manuscripts under review for publication
   5. Papers presented at professional meetings
   6. Other

B. Research in progress

C. Research grants (title, agency/source, start/end dates, amounts)
   1. Grants received or in progress
   2. Proposals submitted

D. Other

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR COMING YEAR
(one paragraph is sufficient)

REMUNERATED OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES (NON-UNIVERSITY) (Including activities listed above)

NARRATIVE SUMMARY (optional)

E. Third-Year Review and Procedures: The members of the department’s promotion and
tenure committee will conduct a formal review of all tenure-track colleagues in their third
year of service in the following procedural manner:

1. Tenure-track faculty members will submit their dossiers for review to the department’s
   promotion and tenure committee members for feedback by February 1 of their third
   year of service at IPFW.

2. The promotion and tenure committee members will provide an assessment of the
candidate’s record to date in each of the three categories (research, teaching, and
service). Abstentions are not permissible. Committee members will base their decision
on an assessment of the vita, a narrative statement, and documentation of research, teaching, and service. A recommendation, including whether or not to reappoint, will be forwarded to the chair via the elected chair of the committee.

3. The department chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the assessment of the promotion and tenure committee and provide other recommendations that the department chair deems relevant.

F. **Sabbatical Policy:** A sabbatical leave affords faculty members with the opportunity for professional growth and renewal. Sabbatical activities normally should include any or all of the following: study, research, and writing. These are activities that can benefit the faculty member and the public from the focused attention that a sabbatical leave provides.

A faculty member who is eligible for a sabbatical should review IPFW’s policy on Sabbatical Leaves, described in Senate Document SD 06-14, and the Application for Sabbatical Leave, which is available at [http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/academic-affairs/sabbaticalleave/](http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/academic-affairs/sabbaticalleave/).

The following should be included in the sabbatical leave application:

1. A statement of goals for the sabbatical leave.
2. A statement of the activities that will be pursued to meet those goals.
3. A statement of the outcomes that the applicant expects to achieve during the sabbatical period.

By September 15 of the year in which a sabbatical application is to be submitted, faculty members should notify the department chair of their intention to submit an application. The chair will ask the members of the department’s promotion and tenure committee to review the sabbatical application and then submit a recommendation to her or him. The chair will then forward the Committee’s recommendation, along with her or his recommendation, to the Dean of the College of Education and Public Policy for her or his signature. The entire application will then be forwarded to the IPFW Professional Development Subcommittee. The Professional Development Subcommittee members are responsible for making recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs regarding sabbatical leave applications.

At the end of the sabbatical leave, and not later than six months after returning to campus, the faculty member must submit a report about the sabbatical leave to the chair of the department. The chair will forward the report to the Dean of the College of Education and Public Policy, who will then forward the report to the Office of Academic Affairs. The report should include the following:

1. How the sabbatical leave period was used.
2. What outcomes were achieved, and what further outcomes are expected as a result of the sabbatical project.
All such reports must be included with subsequent sabbatical applications. Information about the outcome of previous sabbaticals will be used to evaluate subsequent sabbatical applications.

G. **Assessment Plan of Student Learning**: In order to assess student learning in both the undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the department, the following plan was implemented in 2008 and will resume at appropriate intervals thereafter.

**Bachelor of Science in Public Affairs**

The Bachelor of Science in Public Affairs degree exists within a liberal arts context and prepares students to begin a career in either the public or private sector. The program introduces students to the concepts of the economic, political, and social contexts in which public servants work and provides students with information about administration in a changing public sector. The program also strives to prepare students to enter graduate programs in law, planning, public affairs and policy, criminal justice, environmental sciences, health administration, or business administration.

**GOALS**

Based on the Pedagogical Framework for the IPFW Baccalaureate Degree (http://ipfw.edu/academics/programs/baccalaureate-framework.html), the Department’s goals are:

I. Acquisition of Knowledge: Students will demonstrate breadth of knowledge across the disciplines integral to public and environmental affairs. They will also demonstrate the skills needed to gather information relevant to public and environmental affairs.

II. Application of Knowledge: Students will demonstrate the ability to integrate, analyze, and apply knowledge necessary for public and environmental affairs.

III. Personal and Professional Values: Students will learn about the centrality of professional ethics and personal integrity in public and environmental affairs.

IV. A Sense of Community: Students will acquire the knowledge and skills needed to be productive and responsible citizens, leaders, administrators, and analysts in local, regional, national, and international communities and organizations. This includes a commitment to free and open inquiry and respect for diverse cultures and perspectives.

V. Critical Thinking and Problem Solving: Students will demonstrate facility and adaptability in their approach to problem solving, acquiring critical thinking, and quantitative and qualitative
reasoning skills.

VI. Communication: Students will acquire the written, oral, and multimedia skills needed to communicate effectively in diverse settings.

DATA GATHERING PROCEDURES

The following target courses were identified, by the faculty, for assessment. They comprise the four introductory courses for the BSPA and the courses that are generally the last (advanced) or near the last taken for the five majors (Criminal Justice, Environmental Policy, Health Services Administration, Legal Studies, and Public Management):

Introductory Courses: PPOL E162 (Environment and People); PPOL H120 (Contemporary Health Issues); PPOL J101 (The American Criminal Justice System); and PPOL V170 (Introduction to Public Affairs).

Advanced Courses: PPOL H320 (Health Systems Administration); PPOL J439 (Crime and Public Policy); and PPOL V376 (Law and Public Policy).

For the introductory courses: Full-time faculty members teaching any of the target courses will be asked to keep the course syllabus and all materials that are used to evaluate students in the class. All materials will be submitted to the chair during and/or at the end of each semester. The assessment committee members will review and assess the files for the fall semester in January and for the spring semester and summer sessions in August.

For the advanced courses: Full-time faculty members teaching any of the target courses will be asked to keep all materials that are used to evaluate students in the class. All materials will be submitted to the chair during and/or at the end of each semester. The assessment committee members will review and assess the files for the fall semester in January and for the spring semester and summer sessions in August.

The evaluators (assessment committee) will use the following criteria for assessing the individual student files:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA-BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS (BSPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSPA Goals Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking/ Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Master of Public Management**

The Master of Public Management (MPM) is an integrated course of study designed to enhance the administrative and evaluative skills of managerial practitioners with substantial professional experience in our service area and to advance the department’s commitment to public service and regional responsiveness. The MPM is designed to produce graduates who are committed to public service and have the theoretical foundations and skill sets that will enhance contributions to their organizations and agencies. The MPM will provide students with critical managerial, analytic, and leadership skills.

**GOALS**

In the core competency areas students should be able to demonstrate a diverse knowledge and skills base in the areas of leadership, policy process involvement, strategic analysis and action, applied organizational management, and professionalism.

**DATA GATHERING PROCEDURES**

**Graduate Courses: MPM Core Requirements**

PPOL V502 (Public Management); PPOL V506 (Statistical Analysis for Effective Decision Making); PPOL V509 (Administrative Ethics in the Public Sector); PPOL V560 (Public Finance and Budgeting); PPOL V562 (Public Program Evaluation); PPOL V566 (Executive Leadership); and PPOL V600 (Capstone in Public and Environmental Affairs).

Graduate courses: Full-time faculty members teaching any of the target courses will be asked to keep the course syllabus and all materials that were used to evaluate students in the course. All materials will be submitted to the chair during and/or at the end of each semester. The assessment committee members will review and assess all files for the fall semester in January and for the spring semester and summer sessions in August.

The evaluators (assessment committee) will use the following criteria for assessing the individual student files:

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA-MASTER OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT (MPM)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPM Core Competencies Goals Met</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Process Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Analysis and Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Organizational Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership**: to develop the necessary skills to take on leadership roles in public management

**Policy Process Involvement**: to effectively participate in and contribute to the policy process with the highest ethical standards

**Strategic Analysis and Action**: to develop strong problem-solving and decision making skills within an interdisciplinary context

**Applied Organizational Management**: to develop a deep understanding of public organizational behaviors and apply the knowledge for effective management

**Professionalism**: to communicate effectively and interact productively with a diverse workforce and dynamic citizenry

**Reporting**

An assessment report will be assembled by the assessment committee members in September of each year based on the data collected from previous fall and spring semesters and summer sessions. The assessment committee report will consist primarily of descriptive statistics and will be reported to the faculty.

**H. Annual Faculty Awards**: Two awards will be given each year and they will be determined by the department chair. The first award is for full-time faculty members only, and the chair will utilize the annual Faculty Summary Report as the basis of selection. The chair will select one faculty member as the recipient of the faculty excellence award. The recipient will be that faculty member who has excelled more than any other during the academic year in question in all three faculty areas (research, teaching, and service).

The second award will be given annually to a limited-term lecturer. The chair will utilize course syllabi, course materials, and student evaluations to determine the most effective limited term-lecturer during the academic year in question. Limited-term lecturers will be assessed in teaching only.

**I. Review of the Department Chair**: In conformance with Senate Document SD 97-23 (approved April 13, 1998), the faculty members of the department will provide an evaluation of the department chair each year.
VI. Student Matters

A. Codes of Conduct and Regulations: The members of the department adhere strictly to the university regulations, policies, rights, and responsibilities of IPFW undergraduate and graduate students, currently available at http://bulletin.ipfw.edu.

B. Outstanding Undergraduate and Graduate Student Awards: Each spring semester the faculty members will be provided with a list of undergraduate and graduate students who will be completing their degree programs at the end of the academic year in question with grade point averages of at least 3.5. Full-time faculty members may also wish to nominate other students who are believed to fulfill the criteria for these awards. Faculty recommendations are forwarded to the chair who will select the outstanding undergraduate and graduate student award winners.

VII. Amendments

The policy document may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the department’s full-time, tenure-track members.