### PERFORMANCE: ARE WE SERVING STUDENTS?

Enrollment:  If increasing applications and retention are measures of the program’s overall health, then the program is meeting those challenges. The Evergreen State College MPA is a high-demand, regional MPA program.  We closed admissions for the PNAPP cohort (DATE) and, for the first time, also closed enrollment for the TG cohort in early spring as well (DATE). After experiencing the difficulty in administering “too much growth” within the 2014 PNAPP cohort pilot of 65 students and a 4-faculty teaching team, (instead of the typical 51-student, 3-faculty teaching team), we have decided to approach growing the MPA Program with a different model.ent of 65 students for a pilot study on student increase. This is in tandem with the largest number, in our history, of tribal concentration students; 35. The recent economic recessionary years may have been a contributing factor as individuals look for new educational opportunities for re-training. We have increased our marketing efforts, to ensure that we are relevant and modern; we will continue to take extra recruiting measures to maintain a strong demand for the program.

Student Satisfaction: In May 2005, we began regularly surveying students (we have some limited data from 2003).  For the most part, our annual surveys are a census of all students registered in the spring quarter and our response rates are usually over 90%.  In AY09-10 we began using an online data gathering method and response rate dipped only a bit.  Consequently, we returned to hand collected paper surveys in order to improve our response rate, though second year, general, core completed the survey online. Next year we are looking at offering the option of completing the survey online during a set aside time in class, as most people have access to a device during class time.

**Table1.  Student Satisfaction Indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2008-09****All cohorts** |  | **2009-10****All cohorts** | **2010-11****All cohorts** | **2011-12****All****cohorts** | **2012-13****All cohorts** | **2013-14****All****cohorts** | **2014-15****All cohorts** | **2015-16****All cohorts** |
| **Satisfaction with program**(combined very satisfied and satisfied) | **86%**(36% very satisfied; 51% satisfied) |  | **87%**27% very satisfied; 60% satisfied) | **84%**(40% very satisfied;44% satisfied)  | **78%**(35% very satisfied;43% satisfied) | **82%**(47% very satisfied;40% satisfied) | **87%**(42% very satisfied;48% satisfied)  | **%**(52% very satisfied;42% satisfied) | **80%**(40% very satisfied;40% satisfied) |
| **Recommend****the Program?** | **84%** strongly or generally; 15% possibly |  | **83%**Strongly or generally; 14% possibly | **80%**Strongly or generally; 16% possibly | **77%**Strongly or generally; 15% possibly | **88%**Strongly or generally; 10% possibly | **85%**Strongly or generally; 5% possibly | **%**Strongly or generally; 5% possibly | **83%**Strongly or generally; 9% possibly |
| **Quality of Instruction**(combined very satisfied and satisfied) | **90%**(50% very satisfied, 41% somewhat) |  | **81%**(43% very satisfied; 38% somewhat) | **90%**(46% very satisfied; 44% satisfied) | **82%**(42% very satisfied;40% satisfied) | **93%**(57% very satisfied;36% satisfied) | **89%**(40% very satisfied; 48%satisfied) | **%**(40% very satisfied; 48%satisfied | **89%**(49% very satisfied; 40%satisfied |
| **Program Meets Learning Goals**(combined great and moderate) extent) | **87%**(46% great extent; 41% moderate extent) |  | **89%**(43% great extent; 49% moderate extent) | **86%**(46% great extent; 40% moderate extent) | **80%**(37% great extent; 43% moderate extent) | **88%**(59% great extent; 29% moderate extent) | **84%**(48% great extent; 35% moderate extent) | **%**(48% great extent; 35% moderate extent) | **85%**(38% great extent; 47% moderate extent) |

As indicated in Table 1, satisfaction with the program generally increased from 2003 through 2007, with some variation reflecting yearly differences in teaching teams and program content as well as cohort vagaries.  Overall satisfaction indicators had been dropping in the years 2008 through 2011 years.  However, this past year, and to a degree, this year, showed a marked increase in students’ satisfaction with the program.

As with 2012, survey data reveals that 1st year general and 2nd year tribal cohorts had a more rewarding experience than the 2nd year general cohort.  Comments from student surveys seem to point to issues of inadequate feedback and support from some 2nd year faculty members coupled with challenges associated with the abrupt switch to deeper analytical studies and work.

### ARE WE MEETING OUR MISSION?

Overall, the answer is most certainly.  The MPA faculty adopted the current mission beginning in the Fall of 2006.  We now have comparative data on mission accomplishment since in the Spring of 2007.  It has consistently shown that students have reported increased knowledge, skills, and abilities at healthy levels.

We ask students to tell us the extent to which their capabilities have been enhanced, due to their work in the MPA program, in our primary mission areas, as indicated in Table 2.  Most students indicated that their capabilities in mission-related areas have been enhanced to a great or moderate extent.

For the years of this annual report, while most measures had been decreasing slightly, 2012 the program appears to have strongly delivered on our mission when it comes thinking critically and creatively, communicating effectively, working collaboratively, imagining new possibilities, and accomplishing positive change.  However, we did lose ground or remain steady this year in all areas but valuing fairness and equity and advocating on the behalf of the public, where we gained slightly.  We will pay closer attention to the areas showing the lowest measures in the coming year.

**Table 2.  Extent MPA Program Enhancing Student Capabilities in Mission-Specific Areas**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2007\*** | **2008\*** | **2009\*** | **2010\*** | **2011\*** | **2012\*** | **2013-14\*** |
| **Think Critically** | 95% | 90% | 91% | 92% | 91% | 96% | 91% |
| **Think Creatively** | 87% | 81% | 79% | 75% | 78% | 93% | 91% |
| **Communicate Effectively** | 90% | 85% | 82% | 91% | 84% | 91% | 89% |
| **Work Collaboratively** | 90% | 87% | 80% | 89% | 88% | 89% | 87% |
| **Embrace Diversity** | 74% | 73% | 74% | 73% | 78% | 74% | 73% |
| **Value Fairness & Equity** | 80% | 74% | 78% | 78% | 86% | 77% | 81% |
| **Advocate on Behalf of Public** | 85% | 86% | 78% | 81% | 84% | 82% | 86% |
| **Imagine New Possibilities** | 81% | 84% | 79% | 81% | 80% | 89% | 89% |
| **Accomplish Positive Change** | 80% | 88% | 74% | 75% | 81% | 90% | 79% |

\* % responding “great” or “moderate” extent