



**FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW:  
MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY (MPP) PROGRAM**

*May 23, 2013*

**Pepperdine  
School of  
Public Policy**

*Report prepared for internal University purposes only. Not to be distributed without permission.*

**Prepared under the leadership of  
the SPP Assessment Committee**

**School of Public Policy  
Pepperdine University  
24255 Pacific Coast Highway  
Malibu, CA 90263**

# Contents

<b>Contents .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Tables .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. Introduction and Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Thoughts on Peer and Aspirational Schools .....	2
Peer Schools.....	2
Aspirational Schools.....	3
Follow-up on Issues from our 2007 Program Review.....	4
Organization of this Analysis.....	5
<b>2. Evidence of Program Quality .....</b>	<b>6</b>
SPP Program Educational Objectives.....	6
Process for Developing SPP’s PEOs .....	7
Development of Assessment Processes .....	8
The Curriculum and Learning Environment .....	10
Program Overview .....	10
Changes in the Curriculum .....	11
Student Learning and Success.....	15
Assessment of Student Learning .....	16
Assessments of Student Success .....	24
Faculty and Staff .....	31
<b>3. Evidence of Program Viability and Sustainability.....</b>	<b>39</b>
Demand for the Program.....	39
Applications and Recruiting .....	40
Admissions .....	41
Deposits and Enrollments .....	41
Allocation of Resources.....	44
<b>4. Summary and Reflections .....</b>	<b>46</b>
Addressing Demand in the Future – Pepperdine’s Distinctives .....	46
Integrating the Great Ideas into Public Policy .....	47
Preserving and Promoting the Founding Values.....	47
Serving as a Safe Haven for Diverse Political Perspectives .....	47
Integrating Faith into Public Policy.....	48
Leveraging These Distinctives into Demand .....	48
Increased Outreach to Christian Undergraduate Institutions.....	48
Expanded Outreach to Conservative Political and Policy Organizations.....	49
New Outreach to Veterans .....	50
Reaching All Students Including Those Not Motivated Our Distinctives .....	51
Building Prestige and Profile .....	51
Elevating the School’s Rankings.....	52
Naming the School .....	53

Building a Reputation for Quality Scholarship.....	53
Hosting Important Conversations and Dialogues.....	54
Attracting Leaders to the Campus.....	54
<b>5. Goals, Actions and Plans .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Response to the Reviewer’s Comments .....	56
Priority SPP Strategic Initiatives .....	57
Fundraising.....	58
Raise the SPP Profile and Rankings.....	58
Executive Doctorate.....	59
<b>Exhibit A - Assessment Rubric for Summer Internship Experience.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Exhibit B - Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports - Analytics .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Exhibit C - Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports - Economics.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Exhibit D - Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports - Moral Reasoning .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Exhibit E - Questions for Survey of Recent Alumni 2012-13.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Exhibit F - External Reviewer Comments .....</b>	<b>78</b>
External Reviewer’s Letter to SPP.....	78

## Tables

Table 2.1 – MPP Program Curriculum Matrix .....	12
Table 2.2 – School of Public Policy Program Educational Objectives .....	16
Table 2.3 – Map of School of Public Policy MPP Program Educational Objectives to Pepperdine University Institutional Educational Objectives.....	17
Table 2.4 – MPP Program Curriculum Matrix .....	18
Table 2.5 – Percent of MPP Course Syllabi Including PEOs and SEOs .....	19
Table 2.6 – Internship Assessment Results, Summer 2010 - 2012 .....	20
Table 2.7 – Results of Capstone Assessment Ratings, AY 2012-13 .....	21
Table 2.8 – Recent Alumni Survey Student Rating of SPP Effectiveness in Achieving Program Educational Objectives, Spring 2013 .....	23
Table 2.9 – SPP Student Retention Analysis Results from September 2012 .....	25
Table 2.10 – Graduating Cohort Employment Rates at Graduation and Six Months Later, 2004 - present .....	26
Table 2.11 – Demographic Characteristics of Enrolled Class, Fall 2008-Fall 2012 .....	27
Table 2.12 – Racial and Ethnic Composition of SPP Entering Classes, Non-international Students Whose Ethnicity is Known, Fall 2007-Fall 2011 .....	28
Table 2.13 – Undergraduate Majors of SPP Entering Classes .....	29
Table 2.14 – Political Party Identification of SPP Entering Classes .....	30
Table 2.15 – Washington Politics Assessment of SPP Entering Classes.....	30
Table 2.16 – Number of Course Sections Taught by Faculty Type, AY 2008-09 to 2012-13 .....	35
Table 2.17 – List of Adjunct Faculty Who Have Taught at SPP, AY 2008-09 to AY 2012-13 .....	35
Table 2.18 – Current Administration and Staff at the School of Public Policy, May 2013.....	38
Table 3.1 – Completed Applications Received by SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012 .....	40
Table 3.2 – Applications Accepted for Admission by SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012 .....	41
Table 3.3 – Students Who Send Deposits and Enroll at SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012 .....	42

## 1. Introduction and Overview

The Pepperdine School of Public Policy is located at the Drescher Campus of Pepperdine University in Malibu, California. It currently houses one degree program, the Masters in Public Policy degree which is a 64-unit, two-year degree intended to be completed residentially on a two-year calendar. The program was founded in 1997 and “built on a distinctive philosophy of nurturing leaders to use the tools of analysis and policy design to affect successful implementation and real change. This requires critical insights balanced with personal moral certainties that only a broad exposure to great ideas, courageous thinkers, and extraordinary leaders can encourage.”<sup>1</sup> It was founded with generous commitments from a range of friends and donors who shared that vision and a belief that public policy in the United States and the world would benefit from a school committed to these core values and direction.

In 2012, under the leadership of President Andrew Benton, Pepperdine University reaffirmed its commitment to its vision and mission to raise up alumni who are leaders living lives of purpose, service and leadership. That commitment was elaborated in the University’s strategic plan *Pepperdine 2020: Boundless Horizons*. In that document, the University set the following five goals:

1. Advance student learning and superior scholarship;
2. Strengthen our commitment to the faith mission of the University;
3. Build meaningful community and enduring alumni loyalty;
4. Increase institutional diversity consistent with our mission; and
5. Develop resources that support the aspiration to be a premier, global Christian university.

The School of Public Policy reaffirms and reflects these goals and priorities in its strategic plan with the following four strategic objectives:

1. To model leadership in the areas of faith, freedom, opportunity and responsibility;
2. To create a vibrant community of learners engaged in thoughtful discourse and committed to actively achieving these core values;
3. To lead an international conversation about the implications of these core values; and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pepperdine University School of Public Policy 2012-2013 Academic Catalog*, p. 8.

4. To build a lifelong learning experience that transforms all whose lives it touches, including the School's alumni, faculty, staff, students and supporters.

These are our aspirational goals—set intentionally high to serve as a series of guiding principles as we seek to fulfill our mission through our students, scholarship and service.

## Thoughts on Peer and Aspirational Schools

One dimension of these reviews is to reflect on where we are in the context of the field of public policy. Over its brief 15 years of existence, the School of Public Policy has developed a strong reputation as one of the nation's leaders in three areas: (1) preserving a dialogue where even conservative values and perspectives are welcomed at the table; (2) integrating the issues of ethics and values into the public dialogues that shape our policy choices; and (3) reconciling how faith and religion do and should define, inform, and drive our public policy choices. The School of Public Policy was cited in the discussion following the field's 2006 Spring Meeting in Park City, Utah<sup>2</sup> as the leading example of a program that preserves political and philosophical diversity within our program—unlike most other programs.

### *Peer Schools*

As we evaluate those schools we see as our peer institutions, we note that these programs are largely found at large, well-established Carnegie I Research Institutions. We see the following schools as our peer institutions:

**Sol Price School of Public Policy at the University of Southern California (USC):** The Price School at USC has finally distinguished itself from the public administration program at USC as a stand-alone program with a growing stature fueled in part by its ability to raise nearly \$70 million in new gifts over the past two years. In the modern political context, USC also has a research and policy center headed by a former Republican campaign strategist that has been successful at bringing conservative scholars and Republican leaders to be

---

<sup>2</sup> This meeting was organized to celebrate the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1986 Hilton Head Island meeting where a small group of faculty assembled to discuss the future of the field. At the Park City meeting, a series of reports were commissioned to stimulate an active discussion on where the field goes from there. These papers were published in the Winter 2008 edition of the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (Vol. 27, #1, pp. 171-214).

involved at the USC campus. USC also shares Pepperdine's strong interest in Los Angeles and California as important dimensions of its intellectual mission.

**University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Luskin School of Public Affairs:**

The proximity of UCLA and the near simultaneous founding of our two programs lead us to see the UCLA Luskin School as a peer institution. There is also some overlap in the scholarship of one of our leading professors, Dr. Angela Hawken, with work done at the Luskin School.

**The Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M:** The Bush School, reflecting its namesake, is an institution which often competes for students whose political interests are not dominated by political liberalism. The Bush School, interestingly enough does not offer an MPP, but rather a Master of Public Service and Administration.

**School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, College Park:** This program remains on our list as a legacy of the time when the School actively sought to bring conservative scholars, faculty and students to campus. To quote a former dean at Maryland, "There are two policy schools where Republicans and conservatives can be themselves and be comfortable doing it – Pepperdine and Maryland."

In each of these instances, these are the schools against whom we compete most for students and whose actions, policies, initiatives and changes most directly reflect the School of Public Policy. They also reflect institutions whose level and quality of scholarly reputation in public policy are on a par with ours.

### *Aspirational Schools*

Most of our aspirational schools are found at major research universities around the country. These schools are established, have very strong scholarly reputations, and are widely recognized as the leaders in the academic dimensions of public policy. We should note that we believe the quality of our faculty and program are on a par with theirs, but their reputations are stronger, due in part to history, in part to being parts of large institutions with tremendous research reputations, and in part to their leadership in founding the field of public policy.

The schools on our aspirational list are: the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley; the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Austin; and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.

These schools represent some of the leading names in the field of public policy. We do not see matching them article-for-article in the pursuit of academic reputation for it is highly unlikely we will ever have the size and resources they possess, but aspire to reach the perception of level of quality and thinking associated with their names. Pepperdine's School of Public Policy is well-situated to develop this reputation, although time and resources are necessary to advance that process.

## **Follow-up on Issues from our 2007 Program Review**

In our 2007 five-year program review, the School of Public Policy identified several issues that we felt were shaping our program at that time and offered some goals and direction as we looked ahead. Some of our targets at that time included attracting more international students (we have done well here), developing some semester abroad agreements (this has not happened due to limited resources), creating several new research institutes and initiatives (we are still actively pursuing this), and exploring a mid-career degree option (we have dropped this focus, but are now exploring the possibility of offering an executive doctorate). This latter option is discussed further in Chapters Four and Five.

In thinking about our future five years ago, we saw program cost, endowment availability, and the small size of our program as driving factors. In the five years since, we have been quite successful in raising scholarships, although tuition levels continue to rise significantly. Our endowment is maturing slowly, but growing. Student preparation and the size of the program continue to be challenges. In addressing the issue of preparation, we have, over the past five years experimented with many approaches to addressing the concern, including expanding support resources dramatically (both writing and econ labs are available 10-20 hours a week), changing the sequencing of the core courses (still being tested), experimenting with a math camp to try to strengthen skills at the beginning of the program, and even tracking the economics sequence to create a less math-dependent path for students in the area. We are not yet satisfied with the results, and continue to explore alternatives to improve our students' ability to perform at an appropriate professional level.

The threats in our environment we identified then sound familiar today—a shrinking domestic applicant pool, increased competition from well-endowed competitors, and the cost of housing for faculty. For example, the University of California, Irvine opened its doors to its inaugural MPP class in Fall 2011 and the University of California, Riverside will launch theirs in 2014. Pepperdine's investment in housing and a declining real estate market took care of the latter,

but the first two challenges are alive and well today. These two concerns—market size and competition—drive much of our thinking about the future and are the focus of Chapter Four.

## **Organization of this Analysis**

This analysis is organized into five chapters—each intended to report on different aspects of the School of Public Policy’s review of its current programming and its plans to respond to both the internal reviews and external reviewer comments. The next chapter will focus on program quality and the evidence that we have assembled and evaluated in our assessment thereof. The third chapter will include a brief review of the educational market and a sense of some of the budgetary challenges that shape graduate education in our degree areas, while the final two chapters will discuss (1) our reflections on our priority strategic initiatives given the realities defined in the preceding chapters; and (2) how we expect to implement these initiatives in the context of these plans.

## 2. Evidence of Program Quality

Since the School of Public Policy currently has only one degree, the analysis in this section is focused on the MPP program. Much has happened in the past five years in this area as the University has lead a thorough re-vamping of its annual review process to bring itself in alignment with assessment best-practices nationally. Even though this effort was triggered in part by the University's reaccreditation process with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), Pepperdine has worked extensively to go beyond "compliance" to instill a culture of assessment throughout the University.

One of the key agencies in this transformational initiative was the creation of the Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC). This group, which features representation from all five schools at Pepperdine University, has served the role of facilitating the expansion of good assessment best-practices throughout the university and schools. This education and leadership process has included workshops, seminars, conferences and training focused on good assessment practices, as well as holding the various schools, divisions and departments accountable for follow-through and results (as they relate to executing these best practices). Additionally, the University committed the not-insubstantial time of the Provost's annual Faculty Conference to issues of assessment.

At the School of Public Policy, the effort to improve assessment practices was operationalized through the creation of the SPP Assessment Committee, a sub-committee of the SPP faculty, which is charged with examining how these best practices should be included and implemented within the unique educational context of the MPP program. Recommendations from the SPP Assessment Committee are then deliberated by the SPP full-time faculty and adopted for action.

### **SPP Program Educational Objectives**

As a result of this process, the School of Public Policy has adopted the following four Program Educational Outcomes (PEOs):

Upon completion of the MPP program, graduates will:

1. Understand the purpose of public policy and its place within the political process;

2. Master the basic methodologies used in public policy: economic analysis, quantitative methods and moral reasoning;
3. Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests; and
4. Develop professional skills that foster the proper course of action.

The mastery of these educational objectives will result in students who are prudent and ethical leaders in public policy who will lead communities to make prudent choices to address their issues of mutual concern.

### *Process for Developing SPP's PEOs*

However, it is worth noting that the process involved in the development of this process is a great example of the collaborative processes that shape the School's assessment and governance processes.

1. Conversation was initiated by the development of draft Institutional Educational Objectives by the WASC Executive Steering Committee. This effort led to the development of a set of university-wide IEOs that incorporated input from the entire university community – including students, faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends, donors, and supporters.
2. SPP's faculty then undertook a dialogue examining how these university-wide IEOs played out within the specific context of the SPP mission and the MPP program.
3. Faculty assembled a core list of skills, abilities and approaches that it had previously identified as being essential to our desire to develop leaders in public policy.
4. Two faculty (of seven full-time faculty) were then commissioned to reconcile the school's mission, the University's mission, the university IEOs and the practical challenges of creating strategic goals and desired outcomes for the MPP program. The central thrust of these dialogues was how SPP sought to foster good leadership in our students. This subcommittee reflected both the qualitative and quantitative sides of the program and worked together over several weeks to develop a draft set of educational objectives for the school.
5. The proposed 15-item list of objectives was then brought to the broader committee of the faculty, deliberated, and revised. The faculty then adopted this list as the PEOs and a curriculum matrix was developed around the 15 items. They were also published on the student services portion of the SPP external website.

6. Immediately subsequent to this adoption, the chair of the SPP Assessment Committee participated in a WASC Program Review Workshop with an assistant dean from SPP. In the course of that workshop, the SPP team met with a mentor from WASC. In the course of the dialogue with that mentor, it became clear that SPP would be much better served with a list of PEOs that were more comprehensive in their definition while preserving the critical components identified and previously adopted.
7. At the next faculty meeting, the subcommittee was again commissioned to reorganize our PEOs around the more comprehensive set of themes. With additional deliberation and input from the faculty, the revised PEOs were adopted and published. The assessment committee then prepared for approval a revised curriculum matrix and a table reconciling SPP's PEOs to the University's IEOs. In each case, the votes for adoption by the faculty were unanimous.

As can be seen here, our current PEOs reflect not only the results of this collaborative process arising from the ASLC and WASC processes, but generally reflect the thoughtful and collaborative processes within the School of Public Policy. In each instance, the faculty of the school work collaboratively to address issues and concerns about curriculum as soon as they arise.

### *Development of Assessment Processes*

Beyond the collegiality and collaboration seen in the development of the PEOs, SPP has worked aggressively during the past five years to develop a set of assessment practices and routines that will assist us in identifying areas of our curriculum that need strengthening and allow us to take appropriate evidence-based action. Steps taken within these areas include:

- **Development of Internship Rubrics:** In conjunction with our reexamination of the requirements for the Summer Internship at the School of Public Policy, the faculty developed a specific rubric for assessing our three primary objectives from the experience and instituted an in-person interview and rating process to assess the success of that experience in accomplishing those goals. (See Appendix A for a copy of that rubric.) Each year, the SPP Assessment Committee prepares an analysis of the results of that review which is discussed at a full meeting of the faculty. It is also archived on the SPP Assessment page to facilitate faculty access and use.

- **Development of Capstone Assessment Process and Rubrics:** SPP has developed and adopted an assessment program for assessing the school's PEOs by reviewing the work products of the Capstone Policy Seminars each year. Not only have rubrics been developed for each of the general "areas of inquiry" within the program, but a repository of these capstone documents has been developed as well.
- **Creation of SPP Internal Assessment Website:** The School of Public Policy has established a page on Pepperdine's implementation of Sakai (called "courses.pepperdine.edu") where important academic and assessment-related documents are posted. Faculty can also post documents (such as meeting minutes from university-wide committees) from other university-wide initiatives on this site.
- **Formalization of Overall Retention Data:** SPP has historically relied on year-to-year assessments of student retention rates. This analysis is complicated by the existence of many joint-degree students whose enrollment in SPP is complicated by the requirements of their program and obligations to the partnering school at Pepperdine. This past year, the SPP Assessment Committee compiled an exhaustive analysis of all students who have enrolled at SPP, analyzing the long-term trends and offering complete, detailed analysis of student retention including appropriate handling of joint-degree students. The results of that analysis are discussed below.
- **Adoption of Syllabus Standards for SPP:** In conjunction with the establishment of university-wide syllabus standards adopted by the University Academic Council, SPP adopted a set of standards and requirements for syllabi within the School of Public Policy. These standards were included as part of a special training at our 2012 SPP Faculty Retreat. This retreat included all full-time and part-time faculty within the school.
- **Continuation of SPP Recent Alumni Survey:** SPP continued its practice of surveying its recent alumni as part of its five-year review process. As recent (within the past five years) alumni, these individuals possess an understanding of the program in its current form coupled with the realistic value and applicability of the MPP degree in the context of their professional experiences.
- **Adoption of the University Five-year Program Review Framework for SPP Review:** As can be seen in this document, SPP has adopted the formal, University-recommended framework for program review.
- **Development of the SPP Strategic Plan:** The School of Public Policy is currently in the process of developing a strategic plan for the school.

This document will provide an overall context and framework for the school's initiatives into the future and directly reflects the initiatives identified by the University in its 2012 strategic plan entitled *Pepperdine 2020: Boundless Horizons*. The process behind the development of that strategic plan included formal meetings with the school's faculty (SPP Faculty Retreat, June 2012), its Board of Visitors (April 2012 Board of Visitors meeting), its staff (December 2012) faculty meeting, its alumni (Winter 2013 recent alumni survey), and its current students (student issue surveys during MPP 604 in the Fall of 2011 and 2012). This input was integrated into a draft strategic plan that is currently undergoing a response and feedback process.

Each of these steps reflects the School's serious commitment to ensuring program quality and continuity in a reflective and intentional (evidence-based) environment.

## The Curriculum and Learning Environment

Overall, the curriculum of the School of Public Policy has remained relatively intact over the past five years. There have been some reviews and revisions in that time related to accomplishing the specific learning objectives of the program that have resulted in changes to small components of the program, but the overall core and elective frameworks have remained essentially intact.

### *Program Overview*

The MPP program requires the completion 64 units of course over two years. This full-time program also requires student participation in the New Student Orientation Workshop during the week preceding their first fall semester in attendance as well as the completion of a 240-hour summer internship during the summer between their first and second years. Students are also required to complete a capstone project in their terminal semester as part of the course MPP 607 (Capstone Policy Seminar).

The program currently has seven required courses including:

1. **MPP 600.** The Roots of the American Order: What is Public Policy?
2. **MPP 601.** Ethical Dimensions of Public Policy: Great Books and Great Ideas
3. **MPP 602.** Applied Economic Analysis of Public Policy 1
4. **MPP 603.** Applied Research Methods in Public Policy

5. **MPP 604.** Political, Organizational and Strategic Aspects of Public Policy Analysis
6. **MPP 605.** Applied Economic Analysis of Public Policy II
7. **MPP 607.** Capstone Policy Seminar.

In addition, students must complete a 240-hour summer internship for which they receive credit for MPP 699. Summer Internship. Beyond these requirements, students must complete nine additional elective courses of four units each, with at least one in each of the school's four academic tracks, and a minimum of three in one track. The four tracks are:

- Public Policy and Economics;
- Public Policy and American Politics;
- Public Policy and International Relations; and
- State and Local Policy.

The mix and balance of the courses and experiences are intended to further the MPP program's educational objectives. Table 2.1 provides a curriculum matrix which shows the crosswalk between the objectives and the various curricular and co-curricular components of the program.

### *Changes in the Curriculum*

The faculty of the school, over the course of the past five years, have instituted several changes in the way that some minor components of the curriculum were addressed. These changes have come about as the result of specific concerns, issues and initiatives within each of the specific content areas that were affected.

#### **Changes in the Core Curriculum**

There have been two changes in the core curriculum over the past five years: (1) the elimination of MPP 606. Public Policy and the Legal Framework; and (2) creation of a separate required course within the Public Policy and Economics specialization.

**Eliminating MPP 606. Public Policy and the Legal Framework.** MPP 606 had previously been required in the first semester of the second year of the program. This course had been part of the core curriculum since the inception of the program and reflected a genuine sense that the legal process and the courts are critical actors in the context of the public policy process. A review of the number of required courses in the School of Public Policy's MPP program relative to our peer and aspirational programs, however, found we had more core classes than

Table 2.1 – MPP Program Curriculum Matrix

Component	Understand the Purpose of Public Policy and Its Place	Master the Basic Methodologies	Apply Appropriate Decision Frameworks	Exhibit Professional Skills That Produce Proper Action
Fall Orient Workshop	I	I	I	I
MPP 600 – Roots	I, D	I, D		
MPP 601 – Ethical Dimensions of Pub Pol	I, D	I, D	I	
MPP 602 – Applied Econ Analysis (Micro)		I, D	D	
MPP 603 – Applied Research Methods		I, D	D	
MPP 604 – Political, Organizational, Strategic Aspects			D	I, D
MPP 605 – Applied Econ Analysis (Macro)		I, D	D	
Track Electives	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M
Nontrack Electives	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M
MPP 699 – Summer Internship	D	D	D	D
Speakers Series	D	D	D	D
MPP 607 – Capstone Policy Seminar	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M

**Matrix Intensity Key:** **I**=Learning activities that **introduce** the materials and learning associated with the educational objective; **D**=Learning activities that **deepen** understanding and increasing facility with the educational objective; and **M**=Learning activities that help the student to achieve **mastery** of the educational objective.

most. Additionally, the School is deeply interested in creating an environment in the future where students could participate in overseas exchange and specialized programs wherein students would need to be able to take a full slate of elective courses. The SPP curriculum had no semester where there was not a required core class.

After extensive deliberation, the faculty examined each of SPP's core courses and determined that MPP 606 was the course that met the two core criteria:

- 1) Its content could most easily be integrated into other core courses within the program – that is that its intended contribution to student learning could be encompassed into the requirements of other courses in the core curriculum; and
- 2) Removing it from the sequence in the core courses in the SPP curriculum would create a window of opportunity for SPP students seeking travel abroad or other high-impact opportunities not currently available in the curriculum.

After a series of faculty conversations and consultations with staff, university administrators, the instructors of the course, alumni and students, the change was made and MPP 606 was eliminated from the core curriculum and its learning objectives incorporated into other core courses.<sup>3</sup> This change was unanimously approved by the school's faculty and approved by the Pepperdine University Academic Council.

**Exploring Alternative Core Sequencing.** In the current year, the faculty of the School of Public Policy are exploring alternative sequencing for both the moral/philosophical (MPP 600 and MPP 601) and analytical (MPP 604 and 603) components of the core curriculum. These analyses are in process and reflect concerns that we wish to (1) build a deeper and more extended dialogue about the great ideas and issues behind public policy (PEOs #1, #2, and #3) while integrating more of the applied professional and leadership-specific skills (PEOs #3 and #4) earlier into the core curriculum. The review of these issues and proposals will continue over the next two years and are a focal point of our evaluation when conducting the analyses of the Capstone Policy Seminar as part of our SPP Assessment Strategy.

### **Modifications to the Public Policy and Economics Specialization**

Another example of the faculty's attention to the quality of the curriculum was the recent modifications made to the requirements for the requirements for the A concern was raised by a member of the core faculty about the level of econometric fluency exhibited by students in our program. Specifically, the concern was whether SPP graduates with a concentration in economics reflected a level of quantitative proficiency comparable with our peer and aspirational

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that that a version of the Legal Framework course is still offered as an elective in the American Politics track (MPP 656. Public Policy and the Legal Framework).

institutions. A review was done of these institutions and an informal assessment was made of the economic proficiency of students in our capstone courses with the Public Policy and Economics specialization. A review of our class schedules and curriculum ascertained that it was possible for students to matriculate without completing an empirically-focused economics courses. The school, upon the advice of its core faculty in the area of economics, adopted an additional requirement that students who wish to complete the Public Policy and Economics specialization complete the course MPP 622. Applied Econometrics. In this way, the quality of our graduates with this specialization will have skills consistent with those graduating with this or a similar concentration in our peer and aspirational institutions.

### **Revisions to the MPP/JD Joint Degree Program**

One of the areas of concern for the SPP faculty that resulted from our on-going annual review discussions and processes was a sense of concern about the joint MPP/JD degree program offered in conjunction with the Pepperdine School of Law. The original program was conceived in a curricular model wherein existing students at the School of Law could simply add on a year (two semesters) of coursework at the School of Public Policy and receive the MPP degree in addition to the JD degree. This approach was originally conceived at the school's inception to allow students currently enrolled in the law school and near completion to take advantage of the newly-offered MPP opportunity. It continued in this start-up mode for several years until annual "status-review" discussions in the School of Public Policy identified it as an area needing action.

Over the course of a conversation that overlapped our last five-year review in 2007, the School of Public Policy actively sought a conversation with the School of Law to address their concerns about the joint degree proposal. In our analysis, it was also uncovered that the School of Law's other joint degree program with the Graziadio School of Business and Management (the JD/MBA degree program) included 3 semesters within the business school and 5 within the School of Law as compared with our 2 semesters at SPP and 6 semesters with the School of Law. After extensive negotiations, stretching over the course of four years, the School of Public Policy was able to negotiate a model that roughly corresponded in units to that in the joint MPP/JD program. In this model, the School of Public Policy would accept 16 units of law school courses rather than the pre-existent 32 units. This would still allow students to complete their joint degrees in the same 8 semesters, but the curriculum they would complete would include a fuller set of the coursework that the faculty of the School of Public Policy believe is necessary to achieve the learning attendant with the MPP degree.

**Revisiting the Administrative Law Course Requirement.** In the current academic year, another requirement of the joint MPP/JD degree has also come under review in direct response to students' concerns and inquiries. Specifically, one of the courses previously required in the joint MPP/JD program was the Administrative Law (Law 872) course in the School of Law.

This course is offered in the School of Law to students on a selective basis (they must be in the top tier percent of their law school cohort to enroll). It is one of the most demanding and difficult courses in the law school curriculum. When combined with the School of Public Policy's policy of not accepting courses from other programs taken on a pass-no pass basis, joint MPP/JD students were often placed at a serious competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis their law school counterparts who were allowed to take the fully-curved courses on a High Pass/Pass/No Pass basis. Not only did this result potentially penalize joint degree student GPAs, it triggered a substantive dialogue amongst the faculty at SPP whether requiring the course at all was necessary in the context of the school's learning objectives. A review of the syllabi for the Administrative Law course and consultation with the JD's who serve on our full- and part-time faculty lead to the conclusion that this specific courses was not integral to student learning outcomes at the School of Public Policy and the requirement was subsequently eliminated by unanimous faculty action.

## **Student Learning and Success**

Since the school's last five-year review in 2007, tremendous progress has been made developing assessment infrastructures within the MPP program – the school's sole academic program at this time. The school has developed and subsequently revised a robust set of learning objectives; created curriculum matrices explaining where those outcomes will be introduced, developed and mastered within the curriculum; established new policies integrating those outcomes into the school's courses; introduced a comprehensive assessment strategy to measure the school's effectiveness in achieving those outcomes; and built extensive rubrics to assess the summer internship experience and the capstone policy seminar, two critical high-impact modules of the program that are at the center of the school's assessment program. Additionally, the school surveyed its recent alumni to see how the real-time results of the MPP program play out in the professional experiences of our students. The school also executed a detailed review of student retention and employment data to understand how successful the school has been in equipping our students for

lives of purpose, service and leadership. This section will examine these processes and the insights and actions that have resulted from them.

### *Assessment of Student Learning*

Under the leadership of the university-wide efforts to develop a culture of assessment, evaluation and reflection, the faculty of the School of Public Policy undertook to develop a set of Program Educational Objectives (PEOs) that would not only reflect the University's Institutional Educational Objectives, but also capture the key outcomes that the faculty believed would be requisite in a successful graduate from our program. This process included integrating the University's mission and objectives, the School's founding vision and documents, the practices, successes and failures of our peer and aspirational institutions, and a detailed understanding of what the School of Public Policy meant when it discussed its commitment to leadership in public policy – the key and founding focus of our MPP program. These conversations were led by faculty within the school collaboratively over the course of more than 18 months under the leadership of the SPP Assessment Committee Chair, Dr. Michael Shires. One of the core issues, which required special attention and effort was the school's understanding of leadership and how it envisioned imparting those skills to its students. Special recognition is due here to the efforts of Dr. Gordon Lloyd who lead the school's discussions in this important area.

### **Program Educational Objectives for the MPP Program**

The result of these deliberations was a set of fifteen PEOs that served as the first set of PEOs adopted by the faculty and the drafting of a memorandum that served to explain the school's vision for how the curriculum contributed to the development of leadership within our students.

As the faculty's understanding of the function and role of these PEO's in relation to its assessment processes grew (combined with the best practices in assessment learned at WASC workshops on the topic), the faculty coalesced those fifteen PEOs into the school's current four PEOs listed in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2 – School of Public Policy Program Educational Objectives**

---

In the course of completing our program, students will:

1. Understand the purpose of public policy and its place within the political process;
  2. Master the basic methodologies used in public policy: economic analysis, quantitative methods, and moral reasoning;
  3. Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests; and
  4. Develop professional skills that foster the proper course of action.
-

These PEOs generally organize the original fifteen PEOs in to four categories and the specifics of the originals have become student educational outcomes. One issue of concern was how these PEOs reflected the University's broader Institutional Educational Objectives. As a result, the PEOs for the MPP program were compared to the University's IEOs and Table 2.3 maps each PEO to the relevant University IEO.

**Table 2.3—Map of School of Public Policy MPP Program Educational Objectives to Pepperdine University Institutional Educational Objectives**

MPP PEO	Related Student Learning Outcomes from IEOs
PEO1: Understand the purpose of public policy and its place within the political process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</li> <li>• Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</li> </ul>
PEO2: Master the basic methodologies used in public policy: economic analysis, quantitative methods, and moral reasoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</li> <li>• Apply knowledge to real- world challenges.</li> <li>• Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly.</li> </ul>
PEO3: Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</li> <li>• Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</li> <li>• Apply knowledge to real- world challenges.</li> <li>• Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly.</li> <li>• Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</li> </ul>
PEO4: Develop professional skills that foster the proper course of action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</li> <li>• Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</li> <li>• Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</li> <li>• Recognize the responsibility and call to use one's talents in the service of others rather than merely for personal or material gain.</li> <li>• Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</li> <li>• Read widely, think critically, and communicate clearly.</li> <li>• Engage in responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</li> <li>• Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</li> </ul>

Additionally, the MPP program has developed an intentional scheme for when these component PEOs are taught within the curriculum. Table 2.4 presents the

MPP program's curriculum matrix showing when each of the PEOs will be introduced (I), developed (D) and mastered (M) within the programs curricular and co-curricular components.

**Table 2.4 – MPP Program Curriculum Matrix**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Understand the Purpose of Public Policy and Its Place</b>	<b>Master the Basic Methodologies</b>	<b>Apply Appropriate Decision Frameworks</b>	<b>Exhibit Professional Skills That Produce Proper Action</b>
Fall Orient Workshop	I	I	I	I
MPP 600 - Roots	I, D	I, D		
MPP 601 - Ethical Dimensions of Pub Pol	I, D	I, D	I	
MPP 602 - Applied Econ Analysis (Micro)		I, D	D	
MPP 603 - Applied Research Methods		I, D	D	
MPP 604 - Political, Organizational, Strategic Aspects			D	I, D
MPP 605 - Applied Econ Analysis (Macro)		I, D	D	
Track Electives	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M
Non-track Electives	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M
MPP 699 - Summer Internship	D	D	D	D
Speakers Series	D	D	D	D
MPP 607 - Capstone Policy Seminar	D, M	D, M	D, M	D, M

In recognition of the need to make sure these PEOs were being embraced by all faculty in their courses, training was provided at the June 2012 faculty retreat to all full-time and adjunct faculty about how these objectives should interact with their courses and their course planning. At that same meeting, guidelines were offered to faculty to explain the importance of including these outcomes on their syllabi and making them central to their courses as appropriate (the curriculum matrix was the focus of this conversation). The School of Public Policy has subsequently done an analysis of the syllabi for *all* of the courses offered in the

MPP program over the last three years to ascertain whether these outcomes have become central to the assessment of their courses. A rubric was developed and executed by a research assistant to measure the extent to which the PEOs and their related SEOs are present and integrated into the courses in the program. As Table 2.5 shows, this initiative has been tremendously successful, as the full- and part-time faculty are intentional about including the program's objectives in both their core and elective courses. Note also that, as a result of the June 2012 faculty retreat workshop, SPP has shown marked improvement in this important dimension.

**Table 2.5 – Percent of MPP Course Syllabi Including PEOs and SEOs**

Semester	Core		Total
	Courses	Electives	
Fall 2010	40.0%	62.5%	53.8%
Spring 2011	60.0%	46.7%	50.0%
Fall 2011	72.7%	35.7%	52.0%
Spring 2012	55.6%	26.7%	37.5%
Fall 2012	90.0%	85.7%	87.5%
Spring 2013	87.5%	75.0%	79.2%

Semester	Faculty		Total
	Full-time	Adjunct	
Fall 2010	50.0%	58.3%	53.8%
Spring 2011	42.9%	53.8%	50.0%
Fall 2011	54.5%	50.0%	52.0%
Spring 2012	46.2%	27.3%	37.5%
Fall 2012	91.7%	83.3%	87.5%
Spring 2013	83.3%	75.0%	79.2%

In each case we have seen improved compliance with the objectives set by the school, although our goal is 100 percent inclusion of SEOs and PEOs on course syllabi, with internal assessment strategies toward these ends. It is important to note that SPP sees this as a necessary step towards its assessment goals, but syllabi are not the primary mechanism for evidence in our assessment strategy. This information results from the capstone assessment program described and analyzed below.

### **Internship Assessment**

As part of our on-going assessment plan at the School of Public Policy, the faculty developed a rubric (see Exhibit A) for assessing the summer internship experience. While the summer internship is intended to provide development for all four learning objectives for our students, the faculty have set intermediate

goals related to leadership, integration and professional development for the summer internship. Consequently, our rubric focuses on these three dimensions of our program. After completion of their summer internship (which is completed during the summer between their first and second years in the program), students are required to (1) prepare written responses to three questions summarizing their experiences from the summer internship along the three assessed dimensions; and (2) to meet with their assigned faculty member for approximately 30 minutes to discuss their responses and experiences. The faculty then use the internship rubric to rate the quality of their responses and experience. Table 2.6 shows the results from the most recent analysis of these assessment results (February 2013).

**Table 2.6 – Internship Assessment Results, Summer 2010 - 2012**

<b>Year</b>		<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Raw Scores	Leadership	2.37	2.67	2.56
	Application	2.49	2.74	2.64
	Career Opps	2.49	2.50	2.48
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7.35</b>	<b>7.91</b>	<b>7.67</b>
Number Failing on Standards	Leadership	3	3	5
	Application	1	1	3
	Career Opps	3	3	6
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total Internships</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>54</b>

Overall, the internship scores are in the acceptable range, falling above 6 and greater than 1 in all categories. There is a significant range buried within the averages, with a few internship results deemed unacceptable while many received the maximum score of 9. There are some issues with inter-rater reliability, but given the in-person nature of this assessment, that is likely hard to overcome (having multiple reviewers simultaneously would likely bias the results downward). This year's rising share of internships falling short in at least one area has led the faculty to coordinate with the Director of Career Services to discuss the importance of attention to the three areas when identifying and pursuing summer internships.

Overall, SPP believes that the Internship portion of the program is meeting the program's goals with respect to the program's educational objectives. The key challenges in this area center more on the need for additional summer support

dollars to supplement existing financial resources to underwrite the students' internship experiences. With the annual student budget as high as it is, there is always the need to provide as many opportunities as possible for students to obtain funded summer internships. Coupled with the university and school's desire to maximize global opportunities and the high proportion of our students interested in the International Policy area, this need is even greater.

### Capstone Assessment

The cornerstone of our assessment strategy at the School of Public Policy is the implementation of our Capstone Assessment Program. In 2012-13, the analytic faculty at the School of Public Policy conducted a detailed review of a large sampling of the capstone policy seminar papers submitted this year in completion of the MPP 607 coursework.

As a central element of its assessment strategy, the school has accumulated a database which includes ALL of the capstone policy seminar papers for the past several years. This academic year, the two core faculty in the analytic section of the curriculum (Professors Hawken and Shires) evaluated a sampling of the capstones submitted in the Spring of 2012. In total some 18 capstone papers (out of 40 possible) were evaluated using the Analytic Curriculum Rubric (see Exhibit B). Note that there are three total rubrics – one for each of the three academic areas of the core curriculum: analytic, economic, and moral and reasoning (see Exhibit C and D for the other two rubrics).

The results from capstone analysis are presented in Table 2.7 below.

**Table 2.7 – Results of Capstone Assessment Ratings, AY 2012-13**

PEO1	PEO2	PEO3	PEO4	Total	Faculty	Format
5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	18.00	Faculty 1	Group
5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	18.67	Faculty 2	Group
<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>18.40</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Group</b>
4.14	3.43	3.43	3.57	14.57	Faculty 3	Individual
4.67	4.83	4.00	4.17	17.67	Faculty 4	Individual
<b>4.38</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Individual</b>
<b>4.56</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Overall</b>

In this assessment process, the analytic faculty identified some specific trends in the capstone documents. First, and foremost, is the reality that group-based capstones provided final products that reflected higher mastery of the school's PEOs. What cannot be discerned from this assessment process is whether this

merely reflects the ability of the strongest students to ensure their work featured more prominently in the final product (through either active leadership or the disengagement of their peers) or whether the individual group processes produce stronger scholarship. The second observation is that there is some variation in quality across the faculty who are teaching the capstone policy seminar. This has led the analytic faculty to recommend that SPP provide expanded explanations of the type and range of products that are expected from the experience. The third observation is that part of what we may be observing is random sorting wherein the stronger students gravitate toward certain faculty and away from others. The analytic team recommended correlating these scores against student GPAs to ascertain whether such sorting could account for the observed differences.

Overall, however, the review found that the capstone seminar offers some evidence that students are mastering the desired content along the key dimensions targeted in the rubric. The average overall score for all of the papers reviewed approached 17/20 and was approximately 18/20 in three of the four sections. Additionally, students scored approximately 4/5 for all four of the PEOs evaluated in this year's review. The PEOs for understanding the role of policy (PEO #1) and the analytic tools common to the field (PEO #2) scored most highly in the assessments (over 4/5 on average), while students exhibited weaker performances across-the board on the remaining two PEOs (#3 and #4), which focus on applying decision frameworks appropriately and exhibiting appropriate professional skills for leadership. This pattern was pervasive across all four sections and in roughly the same relative proportions. The first PEOs tend to focus on the more traditional, knowledge-oriented goals of the program, while the latter two focus more on practice and leadership/professional skills. The 2013 capstone assessment team recommends that we counsel our adjunct faculty to engage the rhetorical, analytical, and persuasive aspects of policy analysis and leadership more actively in their courses in both oral and written formats. Students need to understand more clearly the quality standards associated with professional work products—something some still do not understand as evidenced by their capstone products.

Finally, due to circumstance and logistics, the economics faculty will be missing two core members during the period when the capstone assessment process planned to focus on economic thinking. Furthermore, the faculty in the third area (moral reasoning) feel strongly that they need another year of data before they assess the impact of the program's recent decisions to test alternative sequencing in the moral reasoning and ethical analysis portions of the core curriculum. Consequently, the committee intends to have the analytic faculty

engage the review once again in 2013, looking for changes and patterns in student performance along the core dimensions defined in the analytic rubric with one caveat—these faculty will also add a score category for mastery of the economic assessment rubric to serve as a bridge across issue areas.

### Curriculum Comments from Recent Alumni Survey

Additionally, the School of Public Policy conducted as part of this five-year review a survey of the alumni from the past five years. This survey, now in its third iteration, was given to alumni from the classes of 2007 through 2012. It is very comparable to the survey given in 2007 so that we can compare our results. At the same time, additional questions relating to the PEOs were also added. A copy of the survey instrument is included as Exhibit E.

Response rates were relatively high for a survey of this nature with almost 50 percent of eligible alumni responding. Participation was highest in recent years (2010-2012) and much lower in the first two years (2008-2009). As a result, for the answers in these first two years, a single response can have strong representative impact. On a (low) 1-to-7 (high) scale, the program received a high mark 5.86 in “fulfilling students’ expectations of what a good program should be.”

Additionally, the survey specifically queried respondents about how well the program addressed each of the Program Educational Outcomes (with a detailed breakout among the three field-specific areas) on a seven-point scale where a “1” is “Poorly” and a “7” is “Superbly.” The average results for each area are given in Table 2.8 below.

**Table 2.8 – Recent Alumni Survey Student Rating of SPP Effectiveness in Achieving Program Educational Objectives, Spring 2013**

Program Educational Objective	Score (1-7, 7 high)
PEO 1: Understand the purpose of public policy and its place within the political process.	5.64
PEO 2a: Master the basic economic methodologies used in public policy.	5.25
PEO 2b: Master the basic quantitative methodologies used in public policy.	5.12
PEO 2c: Master the basic moral reasoning frameworks used in public policy.	5.59
PEO 3: Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests.	5.32
PEO 4: Develop professional skills that foster the proper course of action.	5.06

As this table shows, the program's alumni rate it highly with respect to all four of the program's PEOs. The two areas where the alumni rated the program weakest were the quantitative and professional development aspects of the program. In the case of the quantitative curriculum, the scores are ascending monotonically with each cohort, from 4.65 in 2008 to 5.67 in 2012. In the case of professional skills, the results are more randomly distributed about the mean, although the final cohort is above the mean at 5.17. The analytic faculty are incorporating this result in their discussions of the implications of the capstone review assessments and what courses of action are appropriate.

### *Assessments of Student Success*

In assessment best practice, student outcomes are measured from multiple perspectives and dimensions at every point of possible divergence within the education production function. For undergraduates, this necessitates exhaustive analysis of transitions from semester to semester and year to year with separate analyses of transfer students. This is then further complicated by the need to assess a wide range of outcomes as diverse as is the student body.

In our case, there is but one program and it is two years long, so transitions are simplified. Furthermore, the program determined that the primary indicator of programmatic success or outcomes would be the employment rate six months after graduation. Additionally, the school determined that, to serve its primary educational purposes, its definition of diversity had to go beyond the crude socioeconomic distinctions that are typically used (we do look at these), to include broader measures of the ideological, philosophical, and political diversity of our students. Furthermore, the school commissioned a survey of its recent alumni to gain perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of the program from the perspective of their professional experiences after the program. This section conveys the results of our examination of the outcomes upon which we have chosen to focus in our review of the MPP program.

### **Student Outcomes – Retention**

SPP has a strong record on student retention and completion. The results of our most recent retention analysis using detailed student records that accounted for the final status of every student who has ever registered in the School of Public Policy is provided in Table 2.9 below.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that the data is for students who *enter* SPP in the specified year. This means that the most recent results possible at the time of the preparation of this analysis extended through those who

As this table shows, average completion rates for students who enter the program are in excess of 90 percent. In fact, if you remove the outlier cohort who entered in the fall of 2007, completion rates average 91.4 percent overall and 93.5 percent overall if you remove those who were dismissed for academic reasons.

It is worth noting that the primary attrition points in our program center on the end of the second semester. This is because those who struggle academically are usually placed on probation after the first semester and have until the end of the second semester to show academic progress. Failure to do so usually results in dismissal, so attrition related to academic issues tends to be clustered at the end of the second semester. Students who have financial issues usually discover them at the very onset (Semester 1) or at the end of the first year (Semester 2). Attrition during the second year is typically VERY uncommon and no students left during the second year for the five years analyzed in Table 2.9. These data do not lead us to believe any action needs to be taken here.

**Table 2.9--SPP Student Retention Analysis Results from September 2012**

<b>Year Students Entered SPP</b>	<b>Five-Year Totals 2006-10</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Number Admitted</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Graduated in 2-3 yrs</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Joint Degrees</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Dismissed - Academics/Discipline</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Dropped 1st Sem</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Dropped Yr 1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Dropped Yr 2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0</b>
<b>In Progress / Other</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Overall Completion Rate</b>	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>91.1%</b>
<b>Overall Completion (Without Dismissals)</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>91.1%</b>
<b>Retention through Semester 1</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>94.6%</b>
<b>Retention through Semester 2</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>91.1%</b>
<b>Retention through Year 2</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>91.1%</b>

entered in Fall 2010 because this is the first cohort for whom completion is possible in a two-year program.

### Student Outcomes - Employment

The employment status of our alumni is perhaps the purest measure of the most important dimension of a professional graduate program—did the program provide students with skills that are marketable in the labor market.

Accordingly, the School of Public Policy has commissioned its Director of Career Services to track employment status at graduation and six months after graduation to allow us to monitor the extent to which our students are succeeding in the labor market. The summary results of that analysis are provided in Table 2.10.

**Table 2.10—Graduating Cohort Employment Rates at Graduation and Six Months Later, 2004 - present**

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Percent Unemployed at Graduation</b>	<b>Percent Unemployed at Six Months</b>
2004	4.9%	12.5%
2005	2.6%	0.0%
2006	4.8%	0.0%
2007	0.0%	2.1%
2008	0.0%	4.2%
2009	3.1%	8.6%
2010	25.6%	8.7%
2011	31.5%	5.2%
2012	62.7%	20.8%
2013	69.8%	Not available yet

Data are included for all years available to provide some longer-term perspective to the recent trends. Over the course of the last few years, students have been waiting longer and longer to secure employment. In the most recent graduating class, only 30 percent of them had jobs as they walked across the stage. These are strong deviations from the norms before the economic collapse in 2008-09. The good news is that the vast majority of graduates did have employment some six months later. The class of 2012 does raise cause for concern with nearly 1 in 5 students still unemployed six months after graduation. Given the high values for these unemployment rates in the 2012 and 2013 graduating cohorts, the faculty will ask the Director of Career Services to investigate and provide recommendations for action. With the instability of the national and regional labor markets, SPP must respond proactively to signals such as those seen in Table 2.10. If the fall-off in the numbers who have jobs at graduation reflect changes in the labor market, SPP may need to act more aggressively to ensure more students secure employment before graduation.

### Student Outcomes – Recent Alumni Survey

In the Recent Alumni Survey, each alumnus' employment status was queried and 72 percent reported that they were employed full-time. Another 10 percent indicated they were in a full-time graduate program. Nine percent (11 respondents total) indicated they were unemployed but looking, with the majority of those reporting this status from the class of 2012. Some 22.6 percent of the respondents in this cohort indicated they were unemployed in February 2013 and "looking for work." Consistent with the six-month data provided above in Table 2.10, this is much higher than all of the other cohorts and likely reflects the new uncertainties associated with the marketplace. When combining "employed full-time" and "attending graduate school," the cohorts showed high workforce employment totaling 76.5 percent, 85.7 percent, 100.0 percent, 79.3 percent and 67.8 percent, respectively, for the classes of 2008 through 2012. The results for the last year raise some concerns and the Career Services Offices is investigating approaches to providing additional assistance to our students as they graduate into an increasingly volatile labor market. Conversations with career services staffs at peer and aspirational institutions point to similar issues across the field.

### Diversity of Student Body

Diversity is an essential element of SPP's pedagogical model. The pursuit of solutions to problems of mutual concern in an universe of constrained resources and competing interests and values necessitates being able to navigate in very heterogeneous environments. Consequently, SPP seeks to recruit a student body each year that not only is diverse among socioeconomic dimensions like race, ethnicity, age and gender, but also in terms of life experience, ideology, and outlook. So in this section, we will not only provide information on the socioeconomic diversity of our students, but also along the other dimensions. Table 2.11 shows the demographic descriptors of the entering (enrolled) students for the past five years.

**Table 2.11-Demographic Characteristics of Enrolled Class, Fall 2008-Fall 2012**

Enroll Year	Mean Age	Share who are Female	Share of International Students	Share from Out of State	Share who are Minority
Fall 2008	25	52%	9%	35%	35%
Fall 2009	26	51%	8%	38%	19%
Fall 2010	24	62%	15%	30%	35%
Fall 2011	24	68%	25%	22%	28%
Fall 2012	24	49%	30%	13%	17%

As can be seen here, SPP has a very diverse student population. Note that minority and international students<sup>5</sup> comprise nearly half the student body. The predominant trends are toward younger students, who are increasingly international. For US students, more students are from California than in the past. The share of minorities vacillates from year to year between 17 percent and 35 percent. Table 2.12 provides more detail on the racial and ethnic diversity of SPP's student body.

**Table 2.12— Racial and Ethnic Composition of SPP Entering Classes, Non-international Students Whose Ethnicity is Known, Fall 2007-Fall 2011**

	<b>White, Non- Hispanic</b>	<b>Black, Non- Hispanic</b>	<b>American Indian / Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian / Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Other</b>
Fall 2007	51.7%	3.4%	3.4%	6.9%	20.7%	13.8%
Fall 2008	43.9%	9.8%	2.4%	17.1%	12.2%	14.6%
Fall 2009	68.4%	5.3%	0.0%	12.3%	12.3%	1.8%
Fall 2010	53.8%	19.2%	5.8%	15.4%	5.8%	
Fall 2011	54.3%	17.4%	2.2%	19.6%	6.5%	

As can be seen, in this table, SPP has an ethnically and racially diverse program. This reflects both the excellent recruiting and outreach strategies envisioned and executed by our recruiting office and staff, and the personal nature of the SPP recruiting process. Additionally, SPP works internally and collaboratively with external organizations such as the PPIA and the Millennium Momentum Foundation (MMF) to ensure opportunity for our students of color. Annually our students are high-profile recipients of scholarship awards from the Millennium Momentum Foundation—a program that recently received special acclaim from President Barack Obama at the White House. Not only are Pepperdine students participants in the MMF program and recipients of its support financially, but SPP as an institution provides direct support to the program staff especially through event planning and both SPP faculty and staff are active as mentors and instructors in their programs.

Beyond the traditional dimensions of diversity exhibited in Tables 2.10 and 2.11, the School of Public Policy strives to be a place that has philosophical, political and ideological diversity among its students. We literally want to “have a conversation” between students that have diverse perspectives on policy issues. Toward that end, the school has set out to survey its student’s about their political interests and perspectives. Students in the last two cohorts of entering

<sup>5</sup> For purposes of this table, Asian students are not counted as minority students.

students were required, as part of one of the core classes, to acquire student response devices (SRS devices or “clickers”).<sup>6</sup> While the clickers were used for other pedagogical purposes within the context of the course, they were also used to conduct a real-time, anonymous survey from students about political, philosophical and ideological perspectives. The results of these polls was assembled by the courses’ professor of record and the results point to the diversity of its student body along several dimensions beyond those in the tables above.

Table 2.13 presents the range and diversity of disciplinary training that our students bring to their SPP experience. While political science dominates, the representation among other fields of study is strong and widely distributed.

**Table 2.13 – Undergraduate Majors of SPP Entering Classes**

<b>Undergraduate Major</b>	<b>Fall 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2013 Cohort</b>
Physical Sciences	5.9%	0.0%
Political Science – Int’l Relns	37.3%	37.3%
Humanities / English / History	17.6%	19.6%
Social Science (except Econ)	13.7%	0.0%
Economics	2.0%	13.7%
Art /Performing Arts	3.9%	0.0%
Business / Social Work	5.8%	11.8%
Other	13.7%	17.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

The many ways of thinking about society, its needs, its people, and its resources are a key ingredient to the recipe for the MPP degree. Table 2.14 looks at the question from a slightly different perspective. As part of that same assessment dialogue, students were asked about their political affiliations and a series of questions about public policy problems designed to expose their ideological proclivities. Table 2.14 looks at the first of these dimensions – political affiliation and identification.

<sup>6</sup> The school recently received a grant from the University to expand the use of these devices for assessment purposes and the school will be pioneering some new approaches to assessment through these devices over the next year.

**Table 2.14 – Political Party Identification of SPP Entering Classes**

<b>Party</b>	<b>Fall 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2013 Cohort</b>
Not US	19.2%	16.3%
Republican	28.9%	24.5%
Democrat	23.1%	30.6%
Other	5.8%	10.2%
Unaffiliated	23.1%	18.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

As this table shows, SPP students come from a range of partisan perspectives and interests, and by the time they are done are able to transcend these boundaries and focus on the problems at hand. It is important to note that, far from a place that is overrun and dominated by conservatives, the school has a remarkably diverse political base in its students. In fact, in the latest cohort, Democrats actually outnumbered Republicans. Students were also asked a series of policy perception questions focusing on their ideological perspectives on a range of issues that relate to government and its role in society. The results of one such question are presented in Table 2.15.

**Table 2.15 – Washington Politics Assessment of SPP Entering Classes**

<b>Blame for Dysfunctionality in DC Rests Primarily With:</b>	<b>Fall 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Fall 2013 Cohort</b>
Republican Lawmakers	41.9%	27.1%
Democrat Lawmakers	27.9%	14.6%
President Obama	30.2%	20.8%
No one	<sup>a</sup>	22.9%
DC is not dysfunctional	<sup>a</sup>	14.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> – option was not offered

Again there was a strong mix of perspectives and experiences exhibited by students. For the most part, the student population ended up separating into roughly equal thirds across the political spectrum – one-third conservative, one-third liberal and one-third moderate on each issue. It is worth noting that there was some movement between the groups – students would vote conservatively on one issue and liberal or moderate on the next – much like the American population from which they are derived. This pattern was pervasive no matter whether the topic was foreign policy, domestic policy, the economy, politics, or even civil rights. We have been able to attract a truly diverse student population.

## Faculty and Staff

Because these components remain largely unchanged since our last five-year review in 2007, this section of the report provides very brief data on the faculty and staff of the School of Public Policy. We continue to have seven (the same seven) full-time, core faculty and the schools administrative policies remain the same. Teaching loads, committee assignments, faculty's role in governance (strong), all remain essentially the same. Perhaps the greatest change has been the development of the assessment processes, system and culture described in the earlier sections of Chapter Two.

### Full-time Faculty

Our core seven full-time faculty remain the same. The only new development is that, in 2013, all seven of SPP's core faculty have now been granted tenure by the University. These faculty include (bios for each follow):

- Dr. Luisa Blanco-Raynal,
- Dr. Angela Hawken,
- Dr. Robert Kaufman,
- Dr. Gordon Lloyd,
- Dr. James Prieger,
- Dr. Ted McAllister, and
- Dr. Michael A. Shires.

**Associate Professor<sup>7</sup> Luisa Blanco-Raynal:** Professor Blanco, an immigrant from Mexico, has published widely in a dozen leading journals and teaches core courses in Macroeconomics and additional courses in global economics and Latin American economic development. At the same time, she is a Research Fellow in the Center for Latin American Social Policy at RAND, and in the Resource Center for Minority Aging Research at UCLA. Her reputation is growing through her research on such topics as Liberal Politics in Latin America and global challenges to economic development. She served last year as president of the Pacific Coast Council of Latin American Studies, and is additionally working on projects related to crime and security in Latin America as well as a pilot study related to financial exclusion among the elderly minority populations of the US.

**Associate Professor Angela Hawken:** A graduate of the Ph.D. program at RAND, Professor Hawken is currently overseeing approximately \$2 million of research grants awarded to her and her team of two professional research

---

<sup>7</sup> Title is effective August 1, 2013.

assistants as well as a dozen graduate assistants. She has also recruited a group of judges in five cities, together with teams of social workers and parole officers in each city – all trained by Professor Hawken – to replicate cutting edge research she has done over the past five years. Her work was featured recently in a two-full page story in the *Wall Street Journal*, and her findings are already having an influence on practitioners in the field of drug related incarceration. Her Pepperdine teams of researchers have also included researchers from UCLA and RAND and she has been invited to the most prestigious universities in the nation to share the results of her work. Her work on government corruption in emerging democracies has often taken her to East Europe as well as Afghanistan, and her under-the-radar polling in Syria, long before the recent civil war there, revealed early the discontent of Syrian citizens toward their government, polling that was widely covered in the American mainstream press.

**Professor Robert Kaufman:** Professor Kaufman is a three-time graduate of Columbia University where he received his BA, MA, and Ph.D. in International Relations, as well as a JD from Georgetown University Law School. The author of three highly acclaimed books, including an award-winning biography of Henry (Scoop) Jackson, an earlier book, *Arms Control During the Pre-Nuclear Era* (Columbia University Press), and most recently, *In Defense of the Bush Doctrine* (University of Kentucky Press), he is at work on a biography of Ronald Reagan focusing on his presidency and his pursuit of it. His excellent work on Henry Jackson chronicles the enlistment of many of the close associates of Democrat Jackson, such as Richard Allen and Jeanne Kirkpatrick, to join the Reagan team.

Professor Kaufman has been a Bradley Scholar at the Heritage Foundation and has taught at Colgate University, the Naval War College, and the University of Vermont before joining Pepperdine as the anchor faculty member of the school's International Relations major track. Acknowledged by President Richard Nixon for his assistance in writing his final book, *Beyond Peace*, Professor Kaufman also consulted with the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation on the content and sequencing of the educational displays associated with the Air Force One Pavilion at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library.

**Professor Gordon Lloyd:** Professor Lloyd serves on the National Board of Advisors to the Walter and Leonore Annenberg Presidential Learning Center at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Foundation. His academic preparation includes the equivalent of two doctoral level experiences. After completing all courses except a dissertation in the world-renowned economics program at the University of Chicago (under Milton Friedman and other Nobel Laureates), he subsequently completed a Ph.D. in political science at the Claremont Graduate School. The six published volumes bearing his name, are

all related to the origins of the American constitutional system and the conversation about the nation's founding principles that have carried over into the Roosevelt-Hoover debates and a revival, at Pepperdine, of the field of political economy.

Beyond his writings, Professor Lloyd has developed the most widely referenced website in the world related to the Constitutional Convention, making him a perfect anchor faculty member to work with other professors in designing and teaching the core course on the Roots of American Order. In addition to his service at the Reagan Foundation and his classes with full time students at Pepperdine, he teaches hundreds of high school teachers each summer to better prepare them to teach American history. His widely heralded website for their use may be accessed through the Ronald Reagan Library website [<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/>]. (When "Constitutional Convention" is typed into *Google*, over eight million hits are recorded with Professor Lloyd's as the first -- most popularly referenced -- website to appear.)

**Associate Professor Ted McAllister:** Professor McAllister is the anchor professor for Pepperdine's unique "Great Books" core courses reflecting his own training in Intellectual History (Ph.D., Vanderbilt) and his widely heralded book, *Revolt Against Modernity: Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin and the Search for a Postliberal Order*. Shortly after coming to Pepperdine, Professor McAllister helped to organize a national conference whose presentations were published by Kansas University Press in a volume titled *The Reagan Presidency: Pragmatic Conservatism and Its Legacies*. Professor McAllister is currently on a one year sabbatical leave as a James Madison Fellow at Princeton University, completing a major work on Walter Lippmann, and recently authored an essay on the positive populism of Ronald Reagan in contrast to the negative and angry outpouring of the recent Presidential election.

**Associate Professor James Prieger:** Professor Prieger received his undergraduate degree from Yale and his Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, and has written for major scholarly journals on topics such as the impact of regulation on innovation. He took a one year leave of absence to serve in Washington, DC, as the resident economist for the Federal Communication Commission. He has also worked closely with a team of associates at the Brookings Institution as well as the American Enterprise Institute, both in Washington, DC and has been invited to serve as a visiting professor next year at the University of California, Berkeley in their Goldman School of Public Policy. At Pepperdine he teaches core courses in microeconomics and econometrics as well as courses related to his fields of research dealing with communication and regulation.

**Associate Professor Michael Shires:** Professor Shires received an MPhil and his Ph.D. from the RAND Graduate School following a BA and MBA from the UCLA School of Business and Management. Before joining Pepperdine he was the inaugural research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California and his writings have focused largely on California state policies and issues related to higher education and budgeting of the State of California. Writing largely for practitioners in state and local agencies, before whom he often appears to provide expert testimony, he is the co-author of the index of business friendly cities that is published annually by *Forbes Magazine*. He is widely quoted in such publications as the *Los Angeles Times*, *Sacramento Bee*, *Christian Science Monitor* and the *Wall Street Journal*, as well as his annual featured work in *Forbes*. In addition, he does a significant amount of commentary on local television and other media, as well as CNN. Most recently he was one of the architects of the widely-used *Pepperdine – California Business Roundtable Poll*, quoted often during the recent election and bringing considerable attention to the School of Public Policy at Pepperdine. With broad academic training and significant experience in the private business arena before his RAND Ph.D., Professor Shires has constructed one of the core courses that is truly unique in the School’s curriculum, described as “Political, Organizational, and Strategic Aspects of Public Policy Analysis.”

Professor Shires’ foundational class reflects the influence of Pepperdine’s highly regarded executive MBA programs and their influence in helping public policy students to develop leadership skills for implementing policies as well as analyzing them. When students return from their summer internships, no class is more highly referenced in their fall mentor-meetings for benefiting their summer experience in a “real world” setting than Professor Shires’ core class on strategy, organizational development, and leadership.

### **Adjunct Faculty**

In addition to the core, full-time faculty, the School of Public Policy employs adjunct faculty to supplement the course selections offered by the school. These adjunct faculty include full-time faculty from other schools at Pepperdine, instructors who teach part time at other institutions, and professionals and practitioners in the field of public policy. Table 2.16 shows the number of sections of courses taught by adjunct and full-time faculty over the past five academic years.

**Table 2.16 – Number of Course Sections Taught by Faculty Type, AY 2008-09 to 2012-13**

	Full-Time Faculty <sup>a</sup> - Fall Sem	Adjunct Faculty – Fall Sem	Full-Time Faculty - Spr Sem	Adjunct Faculty – Spr Sem
2008-09	11	7	13	10
2009-10	17	6	16	9
2010-11	14	12	14	15
2011-12	13	15	14	12
2012-13	12	13	13	12
<b>Average</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>

<sup>a</sup> - Full-time faculty includes only the seven faculty currently tenured in SPP.

Of these adjuncts, several additional Pepperdine faculty members are jointly appointed to teach in both the School of Public Policy and the School of Law, the Graziadio School of Business and Management, and Pepperdine's undergraduate Seaver College. These include outstanding faculty covering their specialties in such areas as international relations in Africa, East Europe, Asia, South America, and the Middle East. Other joint appointments offer specialties in public diplomacy, homeland security, tax policies, environmental policy, education, the family, nonprofit management, and Presidential history.

As this table demonstrates, the School of Public Policy is heavily dependent on the contributions of its adjuncts for delivering the quality coursework necessary for the MPP program. Table 2.17 contains a list of the adjunct faculty who taught in the MPP program from Academic Year (AY) 2008-09 through AY 2012-13.

**Table 2.17 – List of Adjunct Faculty Who Have Taught at SPP, AY 2008-09 to AY 2012-13**

Robert Brooks (1)	Colleen Graffy (3)*	Gregory McNeal (1)*
Larry Bumgardner (1)*	Wade Graham (8)	Elan Melamid (4)
John Campbell (2)	Victor Davis Hanson (2)	Pete Peterson (2)*
Caroline Cicero (4)*	Steven Hayward (1)	Dennis Robbins (1)
James Coyle (11)	Sean Jasso (4)*	Robert Sexton (6)*
Michael Ditmore (1)*	Joe Johns (3)	Alexei Shevchenko (8)
Chris Doran (1)*	Douglas Kmiec (1)*	Arnie Steinberg (1)
Ashton Ellis (8)	Jonathan Kulick (1)*	Robert Tamura (1)
Joel Fox (5)	Joseph LeConte (1)	Wes Truitt (2)
Steven B. Frates (6)*	Matt Leighty (2)	Peter Wendel (2)*
Adam Gailey (4)	Robert Lloyd (4)*	
Brian Goff (1)	Jack McManus (1)*	

Values in parentheses indicate the number of sections taught over the five-year period. Asterisks (\*) represent adjuncts who have another affiliation with Pepperdine University.

### **Distinguished Visiting Professors**

SPP has also been able to raise support for a series of visiting professors that come to the school for a semester or year in residence. These faculty are leading scholars and experts in their respective fields and they are expected to teach at least one course for SPP students during their visit. Below are the biographies of several of our recent Visiting Professors.

**Victor Davis Hanson:** Professor Hanson has served on several occasions as the William E. Simon Distinguished Visiting Professor at Pepperdine. As the author of some fifteen books, he has written extensively on various aspects of classical warfare and lessons learned for contemporary challenges. A professor of classics emeritus at California State University, he is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study of Behavioral Sciences at Stanford and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.

**Steven F. Hayward:** Professor Hayward has been the F.K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute before being appointed as the William E. Simon Distinguished Visiting Professor at Pepperdine. He is well known as a biographer of President Ronald Reagan, with his two volume *The Age of Reagan*, as well as biographies of President Jimmy Carter and Winston Churchill. With a Ph.D. from Claremont Graduate School, he has also written extensively on environmental policy and other policy issues.

**Wilfred McClay:** Professor McClay has been SunTrust Bank Chair of Excellence in Humanities at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, where he has also served as Professor of History since 1999. He has also taught at Georgetown University, Tulane University, and Johns Hopkins University. He is currently a Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, a Senior Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, also in Washington, DC, and a member of the Society of Scholars at the James Madison Program of Princeton University. He was appointed in 2002 to the National Council on the Humanities, the advisory board for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

### **Staffing**

Staffing at the School of Public Policy includes support infrastructure for the program, student services, administration, and some research support. Current Staff at the School of Public Policy are listed below in Table 2.18.

The staffing levels of the School of Public Policy have remained relatively flat over the past five years, even though the volume of outreach, research and social networking initiatives has risen significantly.

It is important to acknowledge that our staff are one of our key distinctives. Repeatedly students communicate – in person, in surveys, in informal conversations with peers and faculty – that the student services and administrative team at SPP stand out among all the MPP programs out there. The Dean at SPP conducts a series of lunches wherein he meets with each of the graduating class in groups for lunch. In nearly every session, the students indicate that one of the main reasons they chose to come to Pepperdine were the extremely positive relationships they built with our outstanding student services team – from the administrative assistant answering the phone, to those they met at recruiting events, to the admissions and financial services staff. And all of these roles are filled by full-time staff at the School of Public Policy who have significant other responsibilities.

One of the faculty at SPP has described our graduates as “hand-made.” SPP’s commitment to small classes, personal attention, individual support, a vibrant student community, and face-to-face learning and interaction means that all of our students are the result of a unique learning process that is intended to meet their individual needs. Our student services and administrative team are one of the critical ingredients in this process that sets us apart from the other schools that are out there.

**Table 2.18 – Current Administration and Staff at the  
School of Public Policy, May 2013**

---

<b>James R. Wilburn</b> , Dean
--------------------------------

---

<b>Michael Warder</b> , Vice Chancellor & Senior Fellow, Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership
--

---

<b>Sheryl Covey</b> , Assistant Dean of Administration
<b>Melinda van Hemert</b> , Assistant Dean of Student Services
<b>Christopher Denham-Martinez</b> , Director of Career Services
<b>Pete Peterson</b> , Executive Director, Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership
<b>Jonathan Kulick</b> , Project Director
<b>Christina Ramirez</b> , Director of Communication
<b>Deirdre Shipstead</b> , Senior Advancement Officer

---

<b>Cielo Cruzaedo</b> , Admission Assistant
<b>Marissa Davis</b> , Student Services Assistant
<b>Renee Gomez</b> , Administrative Assistant
<b>Mary Jo Hardman</b> , Administrative Assistant
<b>Nayneet Kaur</b> , Administrative Assistant
<b>Joshua Lippincott</b> , Student Services Advisor
<b>Marie Ann Thaler</b> , Administrative Assistant to Faculty
<b>Ashley Trim</b> , Research Coordinator, Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership
<b>Brittany Weber</b> , Executive Assistant to the Dean/Project Coordinator

---

### 3. Evidence of Program Viability and Sustainability

The School of Public Policy has a strong track record for such a young program. Founded just over 15 years ago, the school has survived many of the pitfalls and struggles that come from both emerging as a startup program and adapting to the challenges arising as it scales up to become a sustainable, long-term program. Over the course of those years, the school has developed a strong core of leadership, staff, processes, faculty, friends and visitors who contribute to the program's on-going success and sustainability. Our program is a leader in the field of public policy. Pedagogically, leaders from many of our peer institutions point to our great books approach and diverse student body as an example of what public policy programs should represent. Our faculty are regarded as leaders within their disciplines and our alumni are, quite literally, changing the world and communities around them.

And yet, as is the case for all academic institutions and especially professional degree programs, the School of Public Policy is facing an increasingly challenging student recruiting environment. Nationally, fewer students overall are pursuing professional degrees in law, business, education, public administration and public policy. Whether driven by long-term trends in the professions or general concerns about the professional and economic cost-benefit of professional degrees, professional graduate schools nationally have been facing a dwindling student population. It is a reality that the School of Public Policy both understands and embraces in its plans for the future – with some degree of qualified optimism.

#### **Demand for the Program**

Perhaps the biggest indicator of a product's overall marketability is its actual "sales" – in this case how many students attend the School of Public Policy. SPP exists in a competitive landscape as many other institutions have added MPP degrees to their existing portfolios or created new programs. Appendix F includes a description of how several of our peer programs define themselves. From a viability and sustainability perspective, the faculty and administration at SPP have invested significant time to understand this end demand for the MPP degree. To fully understand the market and demand for the MPP, one must

review all three components of the admissions cycle: applications, admissions, and enrollment.

### *Applications and Recruiting*

In this respect, SPP is doing respectably well. Nationally, there has been a two-threaded trend among professional degree programs: (1) fewer applicants overall who (2) submit applications to more programs. Table 3.1 below shows the annual total applications for the five years since our last annual review and as it shows, the total number of applications each year has been quite strong and rising. The decline from Fall 2007-2008 is most likely attributable to a strong election year with many strong and active political campaigns in both parties nationally – a work environment that is likely to directly cannibalize potential candidates who would be interested in pursuing an MPP degree.

**Table 3.1 – Completed Applications  
Received by SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012**

<b>Enroll Year</b>	<b>Apps received</b>	<b>Percent Growth from PY</b>
Fall 2008	123	-14%
Fall 2009	166	35%
Fall 2010	193	16%
Fall 2011	194	1%
Fall 2012	213	10%

In the years since, however, the SPP application pool has been growing each year, although it was relatively flat from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011. This pool has seen a shift from U.S. applicants to international applicants over these past five years – especially applicants from the Peoples’ Republic of China. This pattern has been particularly strong over the past two years. The school has been intentional during its admission processes to ensure that the program retains a balance between U.S., international and Chinese students in response to this trend. Such a balance is essential to our educational pedagogy and learning community. Even so, as will be seen below, international students are an important part of our student population and we have developed new acclimation and educational resources to assist them in their transition to residency in Malibu.

## *Admissions*

Once the School of Public Policy has received a completed application, the admissions process ensues. Admissions at SPP are by review of a committee of the entire full-time faculty. Two faculty members read a file independently and, if they agree on the disposition of that file (accept or deny admission), then the file is passed on to the Assistant Dean of Admissions for final review and processing. If there is disagreement, a third review by another faculty is independently conducted to break the “tie.” In some instances, where there are particularly divergent readings of a file, it will be considered in a face-to-face meeting of the available faculty – usually 5 or more members of the full-time faculty.

Table 3.2 below shows the resulting admission stream for the past five years. Note in this table the significant bump in admitted numbers over the past four years.

**Table 3.2— Applications Accepted for Admission by SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012**

<b>Enroll Year</b>	<b>Applicants Admitted</b>	<b>Percent of Total Applicants</b>
Fall 2008	97	79%
Fall 2009	142	86%
Fall 2010	156	81%
Fall 2011	149	77%
Fall 2012	151	71%

Note that these numbers are not the highest in the program’s history and that the average acceptance rate for completed applications was 77.6 percent for the eleven years preceding this five-year window (since the program’s founding). These acceptance rates are declining each year – reflecting in part the school’s efforts to preserve the compositional balance of its program in the face of a growing share of applicants from China.

## *Deposits and Enrollments*

Once a student is accepted, there are two steps remaining until they count are officially members of our program: (1) sending in a deposit to hold their space in the program; and (2) actually enrolling in classes in the fall semester. Table 3.3 shows the data for these two aspects of the admissions process for the past five years.

**Table 3.3—Students Who Send Deposits and Enroll at SPP, Fall 2008-Fall 2012**

Enroll Year	Deposits Received	Deposits as Share of Accepted Students	Share of Deposits Received Who Enroll	Admitted Students Enrolled	Share of Admitted Enrolled
Fall 2008	70	72%	79%	55	57%
Fall 2009	100	70%	73%	72	51%
Fall 2010	74	47%	89%	66	42%
Fall 2011	78	52%	77%	60	40%
Fall 2012	70	46%	76%	53	35%

As can be seen in this table, the number of students making their initial \$200 deposits to hold their seat in the entering class at Pepperdine has declined over the past five years. Of those students, some 75-80 percent actually enroll in the fall class at SPP. The yields in the last column of Table 3.3 show a marked decline in the share of accepted applicants who actually enroll – combining these two trends for the full, net effect. As we look at the cohorts who enroll, they are not dramatically different in quality than those we have enrolled in the past by any of the crude measures available. They are younger by an average of 2 years and their GPAs have fallen by 0.05 grade points in the latest cohort admitted.

The decline in the number of students who enroll as a share of those accepted raises some concerns, but is not unique to SPP. There is some consolation in the fact that quality has remained consistent as competition increases, but SPP must work to ensure that this remains the case into the increasingly competitive environment of the future. It generally reflects patterns in all professional graduate programs, and is consistent with our anecdotally-based understanding of what is happening at other programs.<sup>8</sup> Our interviews of those who decline to come to Pepperdine reflect four general trends:

1. **Applying to more programs:** Students are applying to more and more selective programs as they assess their options for professional graduate applications. In the past, we would often hear students applying to three or four programs. Today, students talk of applying to ten, eleven or even fifteen programs. This is a combination of more opportunities being available in selective programs and a student “customer” that wants to “shop” around for the best deal at the best school possible.

<sup>8</sup> The Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), the national professional organization for schools of public policy used to prepare detailed data series on the market, demand, admissions and enrollments in public policy programs. These series were discontinued in the early 2000's when a joint venture between NASPAA and APPAM was supposed to systematize the surveys. NASPAA has failed to launch the initiative and the partnership has been recently abandoned. APPAM is still considering alternatives to reinstating this valuable resource.

Application fees are a small price to pay relative to the cost of a two-year professional graduate degree like the MPP.

2. **National economic downturn and growing population of providers:** SPP has noted that its application cycles are roughly correlated with interest in public policy issues and politics. In the year following September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 we saw a huge surge in interest, for example. The recent recession has resulted in suppressed demand for professional graduate degrees in all sectors, and even for college overall. It has also made students more value-conscious (see point 4 below). Concurrent with that development has been an expansion in the number of seats available in MPP programs. Universities across the nation, and especially public universities, see serious the value in developing a public policy program that can strengthen their ties to their state capitals—often the primary source of their funding. Coupled with a decline in interest in Masters of Public Administration degrees, MPPs have emerged as one of the two newer “in vogue” degrees in the sector (Masters of Public Affairs is the other-closely related but distinct program). Additionally, one regional competitor (USC) recently received a large endowment and has announced that they will significantly increase their admitted class by 30-40 percent.
3. **Burgeoning applications by Chinese nationals:** Students who apply from the Peoples’ Republic of China face complicated visa and immigration requirements. While Pepperdine and SPP have extraordinary support and staffing for these students, these immigration challenges do preclude some fraction of students admitted from China from attending the program. With a significant share of our applicant pool coming from China, the number of students who cannot overcome these hurdles mean fewer students in the fall enrolled class.
4. **Cost of the degree:** The annual student budget at the Pepperdine School of Public Policy is nearly \$70,000 per year for two years. This is a significant investment for students pursuing careers of public service. Even with scholarship assistance when appropriate, many students cannot shoulder this cost. In fact much of the attrition associated with our students leaving during the first year is directly attributable to the student’s inability to fund their educational experience. The consolidation of student loan programs through the federal government has also reduced the range and diversity of loan arrangements available

to students – making it more challenging to borrow the money. Finally, the economic downturn has shaken students’ and families ability to pay and their long-term confidence in the labor market. High unemployment rates among youth and news stories of shrinking public employment have also cast a pall over students’ expectations of their future earnings capacity as a result of the MPP degree.<sup>9</sup>

These four trends combine to create what the School of Public Policy considers a challenging but not insurmountable environment for the school’s continued success. As is to be expected as an academic degree matures (public policy is only 50 years old as an academic discipline), our school is facing increased competition in the marketplace for students pursuing MPP degrees. At the same time there are some reasons for confidence in SPP’s position relative to the marketplace. The next section will address some of the issues and opportunities for the Pepperdine School of Public Policy.

## **Allocation of Resources**

The School of Public Policy fiscal model is relatively straightforward as school-level entities are concerned. With only one degree program at this juncture, budgetary decisions are focused on that program and the infrastructure to operate and sustain it. That having been said, it is not without its challenges. As a small program, for example, SPP does not have the staff to provide a range of support functions (such as IT support) that other programs do. Additionally, most SPP staff are heavily scheduled and widely spread across multiple functions and activities. As described in the staff section above, we have a remarkable staff, but the scale does limit what can be done and what new initiatives can be undertaken.

The SPP fiscal model is built around a projected student enrollment of approximately 109 full-time equivalent students. Historically, over the past five years, the School of Public Policy has been very close to its budgeted FTE total. However, smaller-than-predicted fall cohorts over the past two years, coupled with a higher-than-usual number of students taking leaves of absence for personal and financial exigencies has left SPP short of its budgeted FTEs in the 2012-13 academic year by some 19 FTEs. This significant shortfall has been

---

<sup>9</sup> Given Pepperdine’s focus on nongovernmental solutions to problems, we actually have a small comparative advantage here as many of our students are not looking to the government for their career plans, but rather the private and nonprofit sectors. That comparative benefit, however, is overshadowed by the cacophony of overall negative economic news.

covered through reserves accumulated in prior years. Note that in each of the prior three years, SPP had an average of 114.8 FTEs across the whole academic year while budgets only required 107.3 FTEs. While these surpluses have granted us some flexibility, the school cannot afford to live off its reserves indefinitely and will have to consider alternatives if enrollments do not recover or if fundraising is unable to relieve some of the budget pressure.

## 4. Summary and Reflections

The prior sections of this five-year review have focused on where SPP is today and provide a serious look at the threats and challenges it faces. Some highlights of those sections include the following highlights:

- Strong and diverse student populations
- Solid fundraising team
- High-quality faculty committed to ensuring student learning
- Program design and curriculum that is accomplishing program goals
- Exceptional and irreplaceable staff
- Increased competition for a limited pool of students
- High program cost
- Solid alumni employment record, although recent years point to risk
- Growing share of international, especially Chinese, applicants
- Strong need for expanded endowment funds to relieve fiscal reliance on student tuition revenues (especially endowed chairs)
- Need for additional staff to leverage faculty and scholarly resources
- Economic uncertainty that has slowed ability to raise funds for initiatives

In this section, as we reflect on where the School of Public Policy can and should position itself in the future. While the prior sections are about the program's current strengths, threats and concerns, this section is more focused on our potential advantages and opportunities.

### **Addressing Demand in the Future – Pepperdine's Distinctives**

There are several key areas of distinction for the Pepperdine School of Public Policy that will allow it to carve out an enduring niche for itself in the public policy scholarly and teaching communities. These distinctives set us apart as an institution and not only represent recruiting opportunities, but also unique fundraising opportunities. The four strongest distinctives of SPP center on its unique focus and mission: (1) its focus on the "Great Ideas" at the heart of public policy instead of pure empirical analysis; (2) its commitment to markets, liberty, freedom and traditional American values; (3) providing a community where all political and ideological perspectives are represented (including conservative

values); and (4) Pepperdine's unique commitment to integrating faith and faith communities into the public policy dialogue.

### ***Integrating the Great Ideas into Public Policy***

The Pepperdine School of Public Policy is a distinctive school of public policy founded on a set of political, philosophical, moral and professional imperatives that have not been duplicated elsewhere in the field. SPP's great books approach takes the MPP beyond a mere dialogue over data and methods (the historical focus of MPP degrees) to engage the complex "why" questions that define the choices made in the policy community. The unique integration of this critical set of analytic and moral reasoning skills sets the Pepperdine MPP apart from those provided by other programs.

### ***Preserving and Promoting the Founding Values***

In a field dominated by empirically-driven quantitative analysts, the School of Public Policy has a strong track record and reputation for producing thoughtful, big-picture graduates who are comfortable integrating the value found in data with the messy political and ideological questions that complicate the public policy process. Because of our unique origins as a school that will focus on the values, ideas and principles that make this nation's democratic and economic institutions work, our students are better able to bridge the chasm between the data wonks and the policy makers. Layer on top of that the school's founding commitment to leadership, liberty, accountability, markets and freedom, and the school is uniquely positioned to compete in a marketplace where schools are increasingly common and indistinguishable from each other.

### ***Serving as a Safe Haven for Diverse Political Perspectives***

The School of Public Policy has established a reputation, not only leading the conversation around these "great ideas," but also as an institution where the dialogue between the students covers a full range of perspectives and where our students are diverse not only along socio-economic lines including race and ethnicity, gender, affluence, etc., but also philosophically and politically diverse. Our faculty have been formally sought out and invited to other institutions, including one of the original schools of public policy (the Goldman School at UC Berkeley), to visit to expose students to a more conservative perspective and philosophy. Another of our faculty, Visiting Professor Steven Hayward, will be the first "visiting scholar in conservative thought and policy" at the University of

Colorado at Boulder—a new position created by that university to broaden the intellectual diversity at the flagship campus’s self-described left-leaning faculty.

### ***Integrating Faith into Public Policy***

Pepperdine’s commitment to faith also creates a unique distinctive for the School of Public Policy. Implicit in the idea of great ideas is the foundation for those ideas. Pepperdine as an institution is seriously committed to engaging the questions about the role of faith in American and global societies and the School of Public Policy continues that commitment into the realm of public policy. Almost no other school of public policy is willing to enter into these waters—thereby preserving Pepperdine’s unique niche. Additionally, the scholarship of our faculty and the school’s events and speakers are continually pushing the boundary of the dialogue as the world’s policy debates are increasingly complicated by the conflicts between the world’s dominant faith systems and world views.

### **Leveraging These Distinctives into Demand**

So the school is distinctive in these important ways. Does it translate into students able and interested in taking advantage of these distinctives while obtaining an MPP from Pepperdine? Historically, the school has benefitted significantly from being one of few places where conservative students can feel comfortable publicly expressing their ideas. The question is can that value be expanded and leveraged. There are three general areas of opportunity with respect to the conservative community where the School of Public Policy can improve its yield of students: (1) stronger outreach and recruiting from universities affiliated with the Church of Christ and other likeminded denominations like the Conservative Baptist Convention; (2) expanded partnership and outreach to conservatively-oriented political groups and policy organizations; and (3) development of opportunities targeted at U.S. veterans returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. It should be noted that the school is already quite strong with respect to the first two of these opportunities.

### ***Increased Outreach to Christian Undergraduate Institutions***

Pepperdine University has a close relationship with the several national colleges and universities that are affiliated with the Churches of Christ. Consequently, there is a natural opportunity to connect with these colleges and universities. While SPP recruits directly at most of these institutions, it should seek out new

ways of opening dialogues with the undergraduate programs at these related institutions to increase exposure of their undergraduate student populations to the opportunities available at the SPP. We must go beyond the traditional recruiting mailers, college fairs, etc., and organize lectures, service activities, national dialogues and debates, undergraduate conferences, student publications, etc., that convey to this rich student population the opportunities and excitement that we experience every day at SPP. And we should make sure that our outreach goes down the hill to Seaver College students as well. More so than any other group, Seaver students see the value of attending Pepperdine University.

Beyond these Church of Christ-affiliated institutions, SPP should be targeting other conservative Christian universities like Harding, Baylor, Texas Christian University, etc., with its initiatives. Students at these institutions resonate directly with SPP's Christian foundations and mission. Again the emphasis here should be to develop programmatic activities based on intellectual or service activities that can directly touch the lives of the undergraduates there and make them aware of the opportunities at Pepperdine University.

Finally, the School of Public Policy can build natural synergies with the other schools and programs at Pepperdine University itself. Many of our finest students, for example participate in the MPP/JD, MPP/MBA, and MPP/MDR programs offered at SPP in conjunction with the University's other professional schools. There are additional opportunities to complement the educational experiences of students who already attend the university's other graduate programs with the MPP degree. Untapped opportunities could include the MA programs in Communications and/or Religion, the M.Div. program, the LL.M. program in the School of Law, and even the EDOL and MA programs in the Graduate School of Education and Psychology. While the total number of students that could come from these sources may not be large, SPP could benefit from four or five new, high quality students and developing these joint degree programs are inexpensive in terms of maintenance and support.

### ***Expanded Outreach to Conservative Political and Policy Organizations***

The School of Public Policy already has very strong relationships with some of the nation's leading conservative public policy organizations including The Hoover Institution, The Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, and the American Enterprise Institute. Our relationship with the Ronald Reagan Library and Foundation in nearby Simi Valley has been particularly beneficial and

productive. Not only do our students go to these prestigious think tanks for internships and jobs, but many of their leaders serve and support the School of Public Policy directly.

But there is more that can be done. Pepperdine must actively seek ways to partner with these organizations to sponsor scholarship, activities, events, academic experiences and service opportunities with these organizations. One of the best draws for students is to raise the prestige and reputation of the school and appropriate, high-profile activities with these prestigious organizations to significantly boost SPP's reputation. Note below, that this strategy should not be limited to conservative institutions, but can also extend to other secular and liberal institutions as well. It is incumbent on SPP to put its principles into practice in leading the national policy discussions on the important public policy issues of the day.

Another thread of outreach for reaching potential constituent communities who share SPP's mission is by expanding our presence and profile in Washington, DC. Nowhere else in the world is there a single nexus of influence that reaches a global stage as Washington, DC. The United States' preeminence as a world power dramatically extends the opportunity to reach a global audience with the school's scholarship, service and students. With the availability of additional space for graduate students and leadership that is committed to collaboration with SPP, we should be exploring new ways to expand our profile and presence there. Pepperdine's partnership with the Trinity Forum, a tenant in Pepperdine's Washington, DC, forum is a great start to seeking out new prospects and it should not stop there.

### *New Outreach to Veterans*

As the federal government promotes educational opportunities for veterans, SPP should be actively positioning itself to reach out to this group of potential new students. Not only do soldiers tend to have more conservative political tendencies, but their unique perspectives and experiences greatly enhance the classroom. Because there is no sector of the public or private sector that successfully teaches leadership like the military, these students are particularly attractive candidates for our MPP program. While specific strategies to reach

this important cohort have been slow to develop, SPP should aggressively look for ways to make it happen.<sup>10</sup>

## **Reaching All Students Including Those Not Motivated Our Distinctives**

One of the challenges that SPP faces in its competition for students with other public policy programs is that it is sometimes seen as a place where *only* conservatives go. And the initiatives above do little to address this concern. But as our diversity data showed in Chapter Two, only about one-third of our students express conservative inclinations and ideologies. About one-third identify themselves as liberal and one-third identify themselves as “moderate.” So reaching out beyond conservative audiences and perspectives is not only important to our pedagogical model and learning community, it is essential to our business model.

So how can SPP do it? The answer lies in two key dimensions: (1) quality and (2) leadership. While the School has been very successful in developing a strong reputation to date, especially given its relatively young age, it aggressively must build on that foundation to further raise its profile and grow its reputation as one of the premier policy schools in the nation even further. SPP must be recognized as the home of quality scholars and students whose reputations and work exemplify the very best in public policy. It must also be seen as a leading institution where leaders work and go to engage the serious problems facing our society and where the important conversations happen. This process happens as Pepperdine faculty, staff, alumni, and students assume leadership roles in addressing the important public policy problems facing the U.S. and global communities. It is truly about quality and leadership – two themes which will be developed extensively in the next section of this chapter.

## **Building Prestige and Profile**

Building the School of Public Policy’s prestige and profile is no small task. The reputation of an institution is defined on the positive side by literally decades of work, scholarship, service and leadership and undone by only a moment’s indiscretion. So the challenge is to accelerate the former and avoid the latter.

---

<sup>10</sup> This has been a priority for the School of Public Policy in its annual budget requests and, while the University was unable to support it, veterans’ outreach will continue to be a fundraising priority.

There are several avenues that the School of Public Policy can pursue simultaneously to build the school's reputation and profile. We have separated them into five categories: (1) *U.S. News and World Report* rankings; (2) the school name; (3) a place of quality scholarship; (4) a place of important conversations; and (5) a place where leaders come to learn.

### *Elevating the School's Rankings*

For SPP to be attractive to prospective students, for example, they must believe that it is a high-quality educational experience that will be worth the \$140,000 and two years of hard work it will require to earn the MPP degree. They must believe the faculty and resources are exceptional and that the degree they will receive will have the value to justify the costs they incur and the earnings they forego in its pursuit. For many students, the main resource they consult is the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings of graduate schools in the U.S. In significant part, because it is the *only* ranking that includes graduate programs related to public policy. In the latest ranking published in 2012, the Pepperdine School of Public Policy ranked 87<sup>th</sup> out of 266 programs. This makes recruiting more challenging when our competitor institutions are in the top 30 or 50. While the rankings are methodologically suspect,<sup>11</sup> students regularly use them to help decide their choices for graduate schools.

So one important initiative we must undertake to bolster our recruiting competitiveness is to be visible as a high-quality actor in places where MPA programs hang out—even though there may not be a substantive overlap with our interests. Consequently, Pepperdine has been intentional in taking a much higher profile role with NASPAA—the national professional association for schools with MPA programs, and in other venues where MPA programs are active like the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). Additionally, we are aggressively taking leadership roles in APPAM and at APPAM conferences, both within the US and abroad.

---

<sup>11</sup> The rankings are based on a 1 to 5 reputational scoring by the deans and one other at 266 schools with MPP, MPA, MPM and MPaf programs. Since public policy is the smallest of these fields, and votes count equally, the results are typically dominated by highly-ranked MPA programs and highly-ranked Carnegie I doctoral institutions whose institutional rank reflects onto all programs there. Pepperdine received a 2.6 out of 5 average rating. If that rating had been a 3.0, we would have ranked 53<sup>rd</sup>, while a 3.5 would have moved us to 29<sup>th</sup> place.

### *Naming the School*

Another approach to generating stature, prestige and profile is to find a generous donor to name the school. The policy school at Texas A&M University was afforded instant stature and prestige when it became the Bush School at Texas A&M. The naming of the Pepperdine School of Public Policy could have tremendous value in elevating the school's stature, especially if it is named for a prominent leader.

But just the act of an individual making a high-profile commitment to the mission and direction of the school through a large gift and naming can have a tremendous catalyzing effect on the fundraising community for the school. And the associated infusion of resources would be invaluable. The Sol Price School of Public Policy is an excellent example. Not only did USC receive \$50 million for their endowment, but it was followed a few weeks later by a \$20 million pledge to name an institute for former California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger.

So the pursuit of a naming grant remains high on the priority list for the School of Public Policy's fundraising campaign.

### *Building a Reputation for Quality Scholarship*

The School of Public Policy already has a disproportionately strong reputation for quality scholarship and thinking because of the body of work of its full- and part-time faculty. In many instances, the faculty are regarded as some of the nation's leading experts in their areas of scholarship. As described in the faculty section, its full-time, core faculty are active contributors not only to their disciplinary scholarly literature, but to extensive works that shape and define actual public policy. Additionally, SPP visiting scholars are seen as leading contributors to their fields of scholarship. Over the course of its existence, SPP has been able to attract extremely high profile academic leaders.

SPP must leverage this work and pursue ways to not only raise the standard in scholarship. There are several initiatives by SPP faculty to pursue and secure funding for centers of scholarship at Pepperdine. Several proposals are currently in circulation to fund centers on initiatives in social policy, accountability in government, developing practitioner trials, promoting American Exceptionalism and studying the intersection of faith and leadership.

Beyond our own development of scholarship within the school, SPP must also actively engage in partnerships with external research institutions of all political, philosophical and policy inclinations. We are a small school with a limited staff

and faculty. And yet we bring to any partnership a fresh perspective and energy that is often missing in traditional policy circles—especially those with academic roots. We must be willing to lead and to be known for our (and our nation's) founding principle and to communicate clearly the value of those principles in a rapidly changing world and policy landscape.

### *Hosting Important Conversations and Dialogues*

Through technology, our beautiful location in Malibu and the center in Washington, DC, the School of Public Policy has the opportunity to be the home to many important conversations that shape public policy choices in the United States and abroad. One such example is the special event that SPP will be hosting in February 2014 on the important contributions of the late Ronald Reagan Professor of Public Policy James Q. Wilson's work on faith to the public policy environment. Not only is SPP uniquely situated to host this event because of its commitment to the faith mission of the university, but we are also the benefactors of the legacy that Dr. Wilson left behind through his lectures and interactions with our students and through his fingerprints on the school's founding documents.

Beyond large-scale events like the James Q. Wilson conference, however, SPP should be a host of important academic and policy debates on topics that touch our core mission and model. Technology will allow SPP to have a national presence in these debates and to close the physical distance to the centers of power in Washington, DC, Sacramento, New York, and abroad.

### *Attracting Leaders to the Campus*

In its initial year, the School of Public Policy had former Soviet General Secretary and President Mikhail Gorbachev speak on campus. The School of Public Policy must continue to build on its reputation as a place where leaders come to learn and to meet. Over the past five years, SPP has hosted numerous events including workshops, Congressional Leadership meetings, and a meeting of the American Council of Ambassadors and our plans for the next five years should continue this emphasis. Additionally, SPP should launch a focused initiative to identify and bring even higher-profile leaders to campus—both as occasional speakers, graduation speakers and visitors. Pursuing even higher profile individuals will instantly afford the school more profile and prestige.

Finally, the school has identified a unique opportunity where it sees a change to profoundly affect the public policy discourses and processes in the U.S. and

abroad through the creation of a professional doctorate in policy leadership. This initiative would bring individuals who are already business and professional leaders to pursue both an understanding of the field of public policy and to design, as a requirement of that program, their own initiatives to address immediate problems of public concern. This executive doctoral program would bring a high-caliber faculty and elite leaders from the private sector into a close working relationship with a view to creating innovative, immediate solutions to pressing public policy programs. Pepperdine would be one of the pioneers in this new field of endeavor. The program not only will bring elite leaders together under Pepperdine's umbrella, but would also become a source of financial support for the rest of the programs at the School of Public Policy.

## 5. Goals, Actions and Plans

As we look ahead to the next five years, the School of Public Policy sees several initiatives as essential to our future success. These initiatives reflect the highest-priority steps necessary for us to be able to sustain and advance the program.

### Response to the Reviewer's Comments

Our reviewer provided some excellent insights and observations in her letter to the program. The full contents of that letter are included as Appendix F in this report. In her review she identified six areas (numbered paragraphs 5-10 in Exhibit F) where the School of Public Policy should pay additional attention. In response to items 5 (peer and aspirational schools) and 7 (response to last program review), we added language to the introduction of this report (Chapter One) that clarifies and expands on each of these points.

**Comment 6-Internship assessment:** The reviewer recommended looking more closely at the dynamics between other measures of student quality and their success in the internship experience. She also suggested looking at whether positions are paid, the type of experience, etc., to ascertain whether internship experiences that “fail” or receive weaker scores actually reflect a failure of the experience or the student’s contribution to it. This is an excellent suggestion and something we will explore (we will need to confirm the data are available) adding to our next internship review and analysis.

**Comment 8-Adding another PEO-oriented skills assessment before the second year:** This is a great observation. Given the small size of the program, there is an informal (and formal) review of students’ overall academic success – usually reflected in their grades. Students also receive extensive academic counseling and advising throughout their academic careers at the School of Public Policy. Formal reviews of each student’s performance are conducted each semester by the Assistant Dean of Administration, formal counseling sessions are conducted with each student a minimum of three times during their four semesters at SPP. Additionally, the Assistant Dean of Student Services and her staff meet with each student repeatedly during their first year to assist in “settling in”, to ensure student’s resource needs are being met, and to assist them in finding internships (during their first year) and full-time employment (during their second year). Pepperdine’s academic advisement and student services programs are truly a

“hands-on” experience where the individual needs of students are identified and addressed on a continuous and on-going basis.

Despite this net of support, the reviewer correctly identifies that this is an area where we may be able to strengthen our processes more systematically. While this is a difficult area of intervention given the restrictions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), it is one worthy of discussion and further exploration. To the extent there are issues, is there a way to identify problems earlier and mitigate the issues sooner? Clearly capstone is too late. The faculty will undertake this conversation in the fall.

**Comment 9-Employment and Student Success:** The reviewer proposes looking back at internships to see if there is some predictive power to be found in the results of the internship assessment. Do weak internship experiences lead to slower employment? This is an interesting empirical question and, next fall, perhaps the assessment committee can connect these two data sets. This is one of the most critical areas of concern for our program and for professional schools in general. She also asks about the scope of our students’ job searches and whether the local labor market could be hurting us there. The faculty and the support staff in the career services office will need to look in some detail over the next year at ways of enhancing the professional job-market skills of our students (networking, resumes, interviewing, etc.)

**Comment 10-Costs/Sustainability/Competitiveness:** The reviewer suggests that SPP examine the specifics of its scholarship and aid policies to see how the outcomes add up for our students. And how these play out in academic success and the job market. We agree and will include this in our conversations surrounding success indicators, labor market success and predictors discussed under Comment 9 above.

## Priority SPP Strategic Initiatives

In a continuation of our on-going commitment to self-assessment, planning and strategy, the School of Public Policy has identified three top-priority initiatives that anchor our efforts to advance the reputation and quality of the MPP program at Pepperdine University. Within each of these priority initiatives, we identify the specific areas where the administration is committing its energy, resources and, when appropriate financial resources to advancing these strategic priorities.

## *Fundraising*

The School of Public Policy has an excellent fundraising and development team and has placed at the top of its list of priorities the following initiatives as priorities for fundraising

- **Naming the school:** The School of Public Policy would benefit greatly from a grant to name the school, much as USC has prospered significantly directly as a result of the naming gift from the Sol Price Foundation. Beyond providing valuable financial resources, naming the school for a prominent leader in either policy or another circle would enhance the school's branding and reputation. Smaller amounts raised to name or endow chairs or even the deanship would also be helpful.
- **Scholarships to reduce costs:** Student scholarships continue to be a focus of the school's fundraising initiatives. The cost of providing full-service, professional graduate education is not expected to slow soon, and thus tuition is expected to grow. Money raised for scholarships can continue to offset the gross tuition price and improve the school's ability to attract and retain quality students.
- **Support for research initiatives:** SPP has several high-profile proposals for new research initiatives in the pipeline. Several of these initiatives, such as the James Q. Wilson Conference, will raise SPP's profile and reputation in areas of distinction.
- **Support for student services program:** SPP has undertaken an initiative to raise an endowment to underwrite the co-curricular components of our program. Leadership contains within it a component of application and practice—learning the professional skills necessary to succeed in the actual policy community. Many of these skills are developed in the co-curricular programs such as career workshops, summer internships, job search activities, guest speakers, new student orientation workshop, etc.

**The Dean of the School of Public Policy has agreed to provide support to faculty in preparation of proposals and grant applications to foundations, agencies and others to advance these agenda items.**

## *Raise the SPP Profile and Rankings*

SPP's academic profile and reputation are key drivers not only of how its work is received but also the quality and quantity of applicants and attendees. As a

result, the school has undertaken a strategic initiative to leverage its strong faculty and staff to expand the footprint of its brand in the public policy community. This initiative will take the form of the following specific initiatives:

1. Increase faculty participation in public policy and public administration conferences across the nation in the next two years;
2. Increase faculty and staff profile and leadership in the two primary professional organizations within our field (NASPAA and APPAM);
3. Increase faculty and staff interactions with undergraduate student bodies, especially at institutions who have been identified as high prospect institutions;
4. Form new partnerships with leading policy organizations;
5. Become a central organizer and participant in common events and activities across the region;
6. Increase the School's profile and activities in Washington, DC.

**The Dean of the School of Public Policy has agreed to provide resources from the Dean's Enrichment Fund to fund faculty involvement and development of these specific initiatives.**

### *Executive Doctorate*

A final initiative included in this five-year review is the development of an executive doctorate program at the School of Public Policy. This professional doctorate program would create a curriculum and program of study that would result in a Doctor of Policy Leadership degree at the School of Public Policy. This degree would provide synergies to the current MPP program by bringing high-profile leaders in the private and nonprofit sectors together with our learning community. These individuals would be actively involved in the development of new initiatives that could provide examples and opportunities for our students to both work and learn about how institutions and individuals can reshape the world around them to address issues of public concern. This program will need to be conceptualized, developed, submitted and staffed before it can begin. Interested parties are referred to the separate, fully-developed proposal for details on this initiative.

**In addition to pursuing resources through University and external sources, the School of Public Policy has undertaken to begin the development of the proposal for consideration by the University Academic Council with existing staff resources.**

## Exhibit A – Assessment Rubric for Summer Internship Experience

Objective	Outstanding Performance (3)	Above Average (2)	Average (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<b>Thinking About Issues of Leadership</b>	Student thoroughly thought about the leadership activities and attributes observed and experienced. Student essay and observations demonstrated deep and careful thinking.	Student identified and discussed leadership activities and roles within the organization. Review and application of insights was superficial and cursory, but included discussions of vision, communication and ethics, and integrity.	Student provided shallow review and understanding of leadership within the organization. Confused leadership with management and failed to provide distinction between the two.	Student provided cursory descriptions of leadership/management issues with little or no insight or depth of thought.
<b>Integration of Experience with Curriculum</b>	Student thoughtfully and deeply considered the use of skills offered in their courses at SPP to the problems they encountered in their internship. Student considered the interdependencies within the curriculum itself and the development of policy.	Student identified multiple courses and their application to their internship experience and reasons for skills developed.. Discussion lacks thoughtfulness about interdependencies within core and their application.	Student identified at least one course and its application to their internship experience. Discussion is cursory and does not reflect thoughtfulness. Discussion lacks consideration of interdependencies and reasons for skills developed.	Student's responses are shallow and descriptive, lacking depth, discussion or thoughtful analysis.
<b>Creating New Career Opportunities</b>	Internship provided student with extensive opportunities to develop and expand professional networks and opportunities.	Internship allowed student to interact with processes and offered limited opportunities to develop new professional networks.	Internship allowed student to participate in policy processes but provided little access to individuals or opportunities to develop new professional networks.	Internship provided little or no opportunities for professional development. Student and their experiences were isolated from actual policy processes.

## Exhibit B – Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports – Analytics

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
	<b>Ready for the President or Governor</b>	<b>Ready for Professional Internal Discussion and Review</b>	<b>Ready for Graduate Class Discussion</b>	<b>Extremely Rough Draft</b>	<b>Not Ready for Anyone</b>
<b>Understand the purpose of policy and its place within the political process</b>	Capstone analysis provides appropriate framing of the policy problem; full range of major issues were identified and addressed; appropriate stakeholders and actors were addressed in the analysis; recommendations address the problem.	Problem is properly cast in the context of the major issues and stakeholders in the case, but they are not adequately complete or balanced. Recommendations do address the defined problem, however, they may not credibly fully address its issues.	Problem is generally framed appropriately. Analysis provides an appropriate menu of the issues in the case, but fails to develop them in the context of other, broader issues. Important stakeholders may be omitted, or under-addressed in the analysis.	Some effort at identifying the issues and stakeholders are provided, but there is no structure around which these aspects are developed. The problem is not developed in the context of the issues. Typically, extensive, irrelevant background is included.	Analysis failed to frame problem appropriately; major issues were omitted or ignored; significant stakeholders and actors were not addressed in the analysis; no recommendation is provided or recommendation fails to address the problem.

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Master the basic methods: Exercise policy numeracy and analytic integrity</b></p>	<p>Analysis references data appropriate to the problem; it properly applies quantitative tools to data; it properly interprets data analysis performed; it properly interprets and integrates existing research by others on topics. Qualitative data are appropriately integrated and used.</p>	<p>Analysis includes a literature review and applies it properly to the problem at hand. Work in this category will include modest and limited gaps in its application of data analysis and literature reviews that do not call into question its recommendations. Qualitative data are properly included but may be incomplete or inadequately analyzed.</p>	<p>Analysis includes appropriate references to other studies and relevant data but fails to identify their limitations with respect to this analysis. Correct data techniques are identified, but incorrectly or inconsistently applied. Data interpretations are perfunctory and fail to address limits of persuasive power of data provided.</p>	<p>Analysis includes either relevant data analysis or a literature review of the relevant data, but not both. Whichever is included is not adequate, or properly interpreted and integrated. Work in this category demonstrates an understanding to have data inform the analysis but fails to integrate it adequately to do so.</p>	<p>Analysis fails to incorporate analyses by others or available data into analysis. If data are included they are incorrectly referenced and/or interpreted. Relevant quantitative and qualitative data review is missing entirely.</p>
<p><b>Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis contains a clear and cogent argument for its findings and recommendations. Arguments are built on a clear, balanced, credible and appropriate set of principles and issues. Tradeoffs are identified and appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>Analysis is almost complete but lacks one component: balance in the application of principles, an incomplete or blurred moral framework, incomplete evidence or unbalanced use thereof, inadequate consideration of credible alternatives, inadequate handling of tradeoffs.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some components of an analytic and/or rhetorical framework, but it is incomplete. It may be missing alternatives, biased, fail to address competing claims, or fail to complete the case for the recommendation. A case is present for recommended approach.</p>	<p>Initial components of a credible and balanced argument are present, but not developed. Analysis has a sense of the issues and their implications to the problem, but has not yet built a case for a specific approach. Tradeoffs and alternatives are blurred with recommendations. Structure is lacking.</p>	<p>Analysis does not contain clear, structured arguments. Cases are built on assertion instead of evidence or argument. Competing values are not properly balanced. Distinctions are not made between alternatives and a framework for making tradeoffs is not offered or discussed. Biases may dominate logic throughout.</p>

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Demonstrate appropriate professional skills that foster the proper action</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis is ready for public presentation, publication and review. Language is professional. Writing style is not bureaucratic but rather active and accessible. Words are used properly and meanings are unambiguous. Product is grammatically correct. Contains an appropriate executive summary.</p>	<p>Analysis contains all elements of a successful policy document: frameworks, evidence, argument and recommendation, but fails to assemble them persuasively. Grammatical and word usage problems are extremely infrequent and never in the important parts of the analysis. Document may be missing or weak on some key component, but only one or two.</p>	<p>Analysis is not professionally written. Writing style may be overly bureaucratic. Language is inaccessible. Structure of document confuses its understandability. There are occasional lapses in sequential logic. Grammar is mostly right, but proofing is needed. Ideas are solid by writing does not fully convey intent and meaning.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some elements of successful argument (framework, evidence, argument and recommendation), but is inadequate in two or more of them. May include logic gaps, leaps of faith, biased or unbalanced argumentation, <i>non sequitor</i> conclusions, or poor use of support and evidence. Arguments are built on evidence, but there could be bias problems.</p>	<p>Analysis is replete with grammatical errors. Words are used incorrectly. Structure obfuscates meaning and logic. There is no sequencing to the arguments as presented. Evidence does not point to conclusions. Argumentation is largely by assertion. Case usually is not credible for recommendation.</p>

## Exhibit C – Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports – Economics

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
	<b>Ready for the President or Governor</b>	<b>Ready for Professional Internal Discussion and Review</b>	<b>Ready for Graduate Class Discussion</b>	<b>Extremely Rough Draft</b>	<b>Not Ready for Anyone</b>
<b>Understand the purpose of policy and its place within the political process</b>	Capstone analysis provides appropriate framing of the policy problem; full range of major issues were identified and addressed; appropriate stakeholders and actors were addressed in the analysis; recommendations address the problem.	Problem is properly cast in the context of the major issues and stakeholders in the case, but they are not adequately complete or balanced. Recommendations do address the defined problem, however, they may not credibly fully address its issues.	Problem is generally framed appropriately. Analysis provides an appropriate menu of the issues in the case, but fails to develop them in the context of other, broader issues. Important stakeholders may be omitted, or under-addressed in the analysis.	Some effort at identifying the issues and stakeholders are provided, but there is no structure around which these aspects are developed. The problem is not developed in the context of the issues. Typically, extensive, irrelevant background is included.	Analysis failed to frame problem appropriately; major issues were omitted or ignored; significant stakeholders and actors were not addressed in the analysis; no recommendation is provided or recommendation fails to address the problem.

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Master the basic methods: Understand and apply economic concepts to the problem</b></p>	<p>Analysis appropriately addresses the economic literature and issues that shape and define the problem and its possible resolution. Economic tools addressing efficiency, incentives, and efficacy are addressed. Markets are analyzed and the appropriate roles for government, individuals and other institutions are properly addressed.</p>	<p>Analysis includes appropriate handling of the economic literature and issues shaping and defining the problem or issue, but is inadequate or deficient in minor ways. Such areas, when corrected, would strengthen the credibility and effectiveness of the argument and analysis presented.</p>	<p>Analysis identifies the appropriate economic framework and issues defining the policy issue and its implications. This is done in a perfunctory manner that fails to deeply develop the implications of that market structure to the issue at hand. Recommendations may fly in the face of what economic theory would proscribe.</p>	<p>Analysis attempts to identify some of the economic issues and parameters attendant to the policy issue. The paper incorrectly or inappropriately applies these insights. The role of markets in the policy issue is misunderstood or misrepresented.</p>	<p>Economic issues relevant to the problem are not included. Issues surrounding scarcity, prioritization, incentives, efficiency, and cost effectiveness are not addressed. The roles of markets and market failures in the issue are not addressed.</p>
<p><b>Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis contains a clear and cogent argument for its findings and recommendations. Arguments are built on a clear, balanced, credible and appropriate set of principles and issues. Tradeoffs are identified and appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>Analysis is almost complete but lacks one component: balance in the application of principles, an incomplete or blurred moral framework, incomplete evidence or unbalanced use thereof, inadequate consideration of credible alternatives, inadequate handling of tradeoffs.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some components of an analytic and/or rhetorical framework, but it is incomplete. It may be missing alternatives, biased, fail to address competing claims, or fail to complete the case for the recommendation. A case is present for recommended approach.</p>	<p>Initial components of a credible and balanced argument are present, but not developed. Analysis has a sense of the issues and their implications to the problem, but has not yet built a case for a specific approach. Tradeoffs and alternatives are blurred with recommendations. Structure is lacking.</p>	<p>Analysis does not contain clear, structured arguments. Cases are built on assertion instead of evidence or argument. Competing values are not properly balanced. Distinctions are not made between alternatives and a framework for making tradeoffs is not offered or discussed. Biases may dominate logic throughout.</p>

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Demonstrate appropriate professional skills that foster the proper action</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis is ready for public presentation, publication and review. Language is professional. Writing style is not bureaucratic but rather active and accessible. Words are used properly and meanings are unambiguous. Product is grammatically correct. Contains an appropriate executive summary.</p>	<p>Analysis contains all elements of a successful policy document: frameworks, evidence, argument and recommendation, but fails to assemble them persuasively. Grammatical and word usage problems are extremely infrequent and never in the important parts of the analysis. Document may be missing or weak on some key component, but only one or two.</p>	<p>Analysis is not professionally written. Writing style may be overly bureaucratic. Language is inaccessible. Structure of document confuses its understandability. There are occasional lapses in sequential logic. Grammar is mostly right, but proofing is needed. Ideas are solid by writing does not fully convey intent and meaning.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some elements of successful argument (framework, evidence, argument and recommendation), but is inadequate in two or more of them. May include logic gaps, leaps of faith, biased or unbalanced argumentation, <i>non sequitor</i> conclusions, or poor use of support and evidence. Arguments are built on evidence, but there could be bias problems.</p>	<p>Analysis is replete with grammatical errors. Words are used incorrectly. Structure obfuscates meaning and logic. There is no sequencing to the arguments as presented. Evidence does not point to conclusions. Argumentation is largely by assertion. Case usually is not credible for recommendation.</p>

## Exhibit D - Assessment Rubric for Capstone Reports - Moral Reasoning


Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
	<b>Ready for the President or Governor</b>	<b>Ready for Professional Internal Discussion and Review</b>	<b>Ready for Graduate Class Discussion</b>	<b>Extremely Rough Draft</b>	<b>Not Ready for Anyone</b>
<b>Understand the purpose of policy and its place within the political process</b>	Capstone analysis provides appropriate framing of the policy problem; full range of major issues were identified and addressed; appropriate stakeholders and actors were addressed in the analysis; recommendations address the problem.	Problem is properly cast in the context of the major issues and stakeholders in the case, but they are not adequately complete or balanced. Recommendations do address the defined problem, however, they may not credibly fully address its issues.	Problem is generally framed appropriately. Analysis provides an appropriate menu of the issues in the case, but fails to develop them in the context of other, broader issues. Important stakeholders may be omitted, or under-addressed in the analysis.	Some effort at identifying the issues and stakeholders are provided, but there is no structure around which these aspects are developed. The problem is not developed in the context of the issues. Typically, extensive, irrelevant background is included.	Analysis failed to frame problem appropriately; major issues were omitted or ignored; significant stakeholders and actors were not addressed in the analysis; no recommendation is provided or recommendation fails to address the problem.

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Master the basic methods: Understand and apply ethical and moral reasoning</b></p>	<p>Analysis appropriately builds a moral and ethical foundation upon which the argument and decision process for the proposal is based. Analysis includes a balanced and appropriate incorporation of the key values distinctions that underlie the problem or issue at hand.</p>	<p>Analysis includes an appropriate moral framework and provides appropriate discussion of tradeoffs. Makes key distinctions between driving concepts, issues and values, but fails to provide a systematic or complete application of the framework and its implications. Usually can be strengthened through a systematic review of the options.</p>	<p>Student analysis identifies the major categories of moral and ethical distinctions and issues that underlie the policy issue at hand. However, it is either inconsistent, unbalanced and/or incomplete in application of these frameworks to the policy problem. Handles distinctions without subtlety or nuance.</p>	<p>Analysis identifies some of the moral tradeoffs and ethical issues but fails to unify them into an analytic framework. Fails to identify the degrees of distinction necessary to analyze all but the grossest level of tradeoffs. May use incorrect, incomplete or inconsistent moral frameworks to shape the analysis.</p>	<p>Relevant moral and ethical issues are not directly addressed by the analysis. Discussion fails to motivate a framework for framing and deciding the values-driven tradeoffs intrinsic to the policy problem. Student analysis fails to provide a credible referential foundation on which to base their arguments about what should be done or not done.</p>
<p><b>Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis contains a clear and cogent argument for its findings and recommendations. Arguments are built on a clear, balanced, credible and appropriate set of principles and issues. Tradeoffs are identified and appropriately addressed.</p>	<p>Analysis is almost complete but lacks one component: balance in the application of principles, an incomplete or blurred moral framework, incomplete evidence or unbalanced use thereof, inadequate consideration of credible alternatives, inadequate handling of tradeoffs.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some components of an analytic and/or rhetorical framework, but it is incomplete. It may be missing alternatives, biased, fail to address competing claims, or fail to complete the case for the recommendation. A case is present for recommended approach.</p>	<p>Initial components of a credible and balanced argument are present, but not developed. Analysis has a sense of the issues and their implications to the problem, but has not yet built a case for a specific approach. Tradeoffs and alternatives are blurred with recommendations. Structure is lacking.</p>	<p>Analysis does not contain clear, structured arguments. Cases are built on assertion instead of evidence or argument. Competing values are not properly balanced. Distinctions are not made between alternatives and a framework for making tradeoffs is not offered or discussed. Biases may dominate logic throughout.</p>

Objective	Highly Developed (5)	Developed (4)	Emerging (3)	Underdeveloped (2)	Initial (1)
<p><b>Demonstrate appropriate professional skills that foster the proper action</b></p>	<p>Capstone analysis is ready for public presentation, publication and review. Language is professional. Writing style is not bureaucratic but rather active and accessible. Words are used properly and meanings are unambiguous. Product is grammatically correct. Contains an appropriate executive summary.</p>	<p>Analysis contains all elements of a successful policy document: frameworks, evidence, argument and recommendation, but fails to assemble them persuasively. Grammatical and word usage problems are extremely infrequent and never in the important parts of the analysis. Document may be missing or weak on some key component, but only one or two.</p>	<p>Analysis is not professionally written. Writing style may be overly bureaucratic. Language is inaccessible. Structure of document confuses its understandability. There are occasional lapses in sequential logic. Grammar is mostly right, but proofing is needed. Ideas are solid by writing does not fully convey intent and meaning.</p>	<p>Analysis contains some elements of successful argument (framework, evidence, argument and recommendation), but is inadequate in two or more of them. May include logic gaps, leaps of faith, biased or unbalanced argumentation, <i>non sequitor</i> conclusions, or poor use of support and evidence. Arguments are built on evidence, but there could be bias problems.</p>	<p>Analysis is replete with grammatical errors. Words are used incorrectly. Structure obfuscates meaning and logic. There is no sequencing to the arguments as presented. Evidence does not point to conclusions. Argumentation is largely by assertion. Case usually is not credible for recommendation.</p>

## Exhibit E – Questions for Survey of Recent Alumni 2012-13

The following survey was administered by the SPP Assessment Committee to all 232 alumni of the School of Public Policy for the past five years (2008-2012). 123 alumni responded for a response rate of 53 percent during January and February 2012. Faculty and staff have reviewed the alumni responses in detail and selected results have been included in this five-year review.



**Pepperdine School of Public Policy Recent Alumni Survey 2012-13**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The School of Public Policy is conducting a periodic review of its program and your comments and thoughts will be invaluable as we look for ways of strengthening our program for the future.

**1. SPP Class of ?**

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

**2. Your gender:**

Male

Female

**3. Specialization (mark all that apply):**

Public Policy and Economics

Public Policy and American Politics

Public Policy and International Relations

State and Local Policy

Other (Joint Degrees)

**4. Program at SPP:**

- MPP
- Joint MPP - MBA
- Joint MPP - JD
- Joint MPP - MDR

Other (please specify)

**5. Current employment status:**

- Self-employed
- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Unemployed but looking
- Attending graduate school
- Out of the workforce
- Decline to answer
- Other

Other (please explain)

**6. On a scale of 1 (Failed Expectations) through 7 (Fully Met):**

Failed Expectations (1) (2) (3) Barely Met (4) (5) (6) Fully Met (7)

To what extent did your SPP experience fulfill or fail to meet your expectations of what a good program should be?

**7. On a scale of 1 (0% Return) through 7 (100% Return)**

0% Return (1) (2) (3) 50% Return (4) (5) (6) 100% Return (7)

Do you believe your MPP was worth its cost in time, tuition and lost earnings?

**8. On a scale of 1 (Poorly) through 7 (Superbly):**

Poorly (1) (2) Similar (3) (4) Better (5) (6) Superbly (7)

Overall, how did the quality of the faculty compare with others you have had in the past?









Do you agree with the School of Public Policy Mission?

Do you feel the program represents everything you were told it would deliver?

**15. Using the response scale of 1 (Poor) through 7 (Outstanding), how would you rate the school's effort in the following academic disciplines/programs?**

	Poor	(2)	Fair	(4)	Good	(6)	Outstanding
American Politics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost/Benefit Policy Programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Economic Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethical/Moral Issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integration and Application	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International Relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy Tools and Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Policy Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State and Local Policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strategy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please feel free to share with us any comments/thoughts you might have regarding the above academic disciplines/programs:

**16. Using the response scale of 1 (Poor) through 7 (Superbly), how helpful were the following classes in developing your own intellectual, theoretical and analytical skills as a policy maker?**

	Poorly	(2)	Somewhat	(4)	More so	(6)	Superbly
Roots of the American Order	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ethical Dimensions of Public Policy: Great Books	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Applied Research Methods in Public Policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Applied Economic Analysis of Public Policy - Micro	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Applied Economic Analysis of Public Policy - Macro	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Political, Organizational and Strategic Aspects of Public Policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Capstone Policy Seminar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please feel free to share with us any comments/thoughts you might have regarding the above classes:

**17. SPP has adopted the following four learning objectives for the MPP program. Using the response scale of 1 (Poor) through 7 (Superbly), how well did the MPP program at Pepperdine enable you to:**

	Poorly	(2)	Somewhat	(4)	More so	(6)	Superbly
Objective 1. Understand the purpose of public policy and its place within the political process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Objective 2a. Master the basic economic methodologies used in public policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Objective 2b. Master the basic quantitative methodologies used in public policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Objective 2c. Master the basic moral reasoning frameworks used in public policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Objective 3. Apply decision frameworks that appropriately incorporate and balance competing perspectives and interests.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Objective 4. Develop professional skills that foster the proper course of action.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please feel free to share with us any comments/thoughts you might have regarding the above learning objectives:

### Some Final Thoughts

**18. What was the single greatest benefit of the program?**

**19. What was the least beneficial aspect of the program?**

**20. Which classes were the most helpful?**

**21. In which area(s) would you like to see more electives offered?**

**22. If you were to change one thing about the curriculum, what would it be?**

**23. In what ways could we strengthen our program?**

**24. How well did the program prepare you for your current job?**

Not at all                      Somewhat well                      Fairly well                      Extremely well

Comments

**25. What distinguishes the Pepperdine School of Public Policy program from other programs?**

**26. Do you have any final thoughts?**

**27. Would you be willing to be interviewed in more detail about any of your responses on this survey?**

Yes     No

If yes, please specify the best way to reach you (including email or phone number.)

## Exhibit F – External Reviewer Comments

Below is the text from our external reviewer, Associate Dean Rachel Swanger of the Pardee RAND Graduate School.<sup>12</sup> For convenience of reference, we have inserted numbers into her main remarks and reformatted it to fit into this Exhibit. Our responses to her review are included in Chapter Five of this Program Review Document.

Our external reviewer was selected as someone who is deeply acquainted with the field of public policy, who is familiar with the graduate students, programs and issues that define the field, and someone who is deeply familiar with the best practices in assessment and review. Dean Swanger recently oversaw the Pardee RAND Graduate School’s Re-accreditation process which resulted in a 10-year accreditation.

### External Reviewer’s Letter to SPP

Thank you for offering me the opportunity to review your Master of Public Policy (MPP) Program. First, let me congratulate you on a very nicely written and thorough document. It contains ample evidence that you have an engaged faculty who are committed to teaching and care deeply about student learning. Altogether, it’s an impressive piece of work and I learned a lot about your program.

I’d like to start my review with a focus on those things where I think your program is exemplary.

1. **Excellence of Faculty:** I commend you for the quality of your faculty. The credentials of the seven core faculty are impressive and their commitment to both scholarship and teaching is impressive. You accomplish a great deal with a small, but clearly dedicated, staff.
2. **Solid Academic Program:** Your academic program fills a unique and valuable niche. There must certainly be a need at this time and into the future for “prudent and ethical leaders” who “recognize the responsibility and the call to use one’s talents in the service of others rather than merely for personal or

---

<sup>12</sup> The Pardee RAND Graduate School is the largest producer of Ph.D.’s in the field of public policy in the world. The Pardee RGS is *only* a doctoral program and, in the interests of disclosure, two of our full-time faculty are alumni of the program and several of our students have gone on to pursue graduate study there.

material gain.” The continued emphasis on reading and understanding the philosophies and ideas contained in the “Great Books” as well as the solid economic and econometric training available to your students should certainly provide your graduates a most solid foundation on which to build their careers and their lives of service and leadership.

I was also impressed by the thoughtful manner in which you approached changes in your core curriculum. It is always very hard to eliminate something from the core. Adding is so much easier. So I really appreciate how difficult it must have been to eliminate Public Policy and Legal Framework. Your goal of freeing up more time for students to study off campus is a worthy one and I’m delighted to hear that you were able to incorporate many of the learning objectives from this course into other core courses so that the essential ideas from this course are not lost to your students.

And I applaud you for your decision to add Econometrics to your Public Policy and Economics specialization. In the world of “big data” that segment of your students will need to be familiar with this tool of empirical analysis. And I’m also glad to hear that this movement towards more sophisticated quantitative training is being matched by a focus this year and next on how to improve the dialogue on the great ideas and issues behind public policy while at the same time integrating more professional skills into the curriculum. These are the sorts of discussions that should be happening on the campuses of the best programs.

3. **Evidence of a Culture of Assessment and Learning:** It is clear from reading your report that over the past five years you have gone beyond mere compliance to build a culture of assessment throughout the university. This is especially evident in the deliberate way you went about developing the School of Public Policy’s (SPP) Educational Objectives. But I was also impressed with the rubrics you developed and implemented for your internship program and your capstone policy seminar. Overall, they are clear and understandable and must surely enable both the faculty and the students to grasp more fully what is expected in each case and how students have performed against these expectations. And it’s clear that the results of these assessments are enabling faculty to think carefully about what is driving the results and what changes might be made to address areas where there appears to be a weakness such as the quality of the oral and written products of the capstone seminar.
4. **Student Success:** I was impressed with the response rates from your alumni surveys and agree that the scores indicate overall you are achieving your four Program Educational Outcomes. It’s also impressive that this data is making it back into faculty discussions and may result in changes to the capstone review assessments. The program’s retention rates are terrific. I also commend you for

both defining diversity broadly, but also having a truly diverse student body no matter how one defines it.

In the next section of this review, I'd like to just highlight some areas where I had questions that you might want to consider as you move forward.

5. **Peer and Aspirations Institutions:** It wasn't immediately clear to me which institutions you were using as your benchmarks or why. I subsequently learned that your peer institutions are: USC Price, Texas A&M (Bush), UCLA Luskin, and U Md College Park and that your aspirational schools are U Washington, UT Austin, Princeton (Wilson) and Berkeley (Goldman). I don't disagree with these designations. And I think you have done a fairly good job of talking about what your advantages and disadvantages are vis a vis your peer schools, but I wonder if you might articulate better what the gaps are between where you are now and your aspirational schools. Are there areas where you are already as good as or better than some of these schools?
6. **Internships:** I am fascinated by what you've done with regard to internships. It's impressive at the MPP level that you require that students secure at 240-hour internship the summer between their first and second year. And that while the career services office and the faculty provide support, to some degree you allow and encourage them to test their wings on the labor market putting together resumes, writing cover letters, doing interviews, etc. So there is learning even before they get to their destination. In thinking about how to assess and evaluate these experiences, I would like to know more about how the scores breakdown for "good" students versus "weaker" students; paid and unpaid internships; internships at large prestigious institutions like the UN, State Department, Hoover, Heritage, etc versus local NGOs, etc. I'm particularly interested in understanding how the scores break down for the Career Opportunities. Can certain students make something out of even a mediocre experience? In other words, are low scores on Career Ops more likely to be the fault of the structure of the internship or the student?
7. **Response to Your Last Program Review:** It's clear you've accomplished a lot over the five years since your last review. As I read your report I wondered, how much of this was in direct response to your last review? It's clear that the 2007 review spawned the conversations about joint degrees. I also understand you identified student preparation as one area that needed additional focus and that since 2007, you have dramatically expanded support resources by making writing and econ labs available 10-20 hours per week. And that you're testing other ways of dealing with the inevitable gaps in preparation we all see in policy programs by adjusting the sequencing of the core courses and offering your economics sequence in two flavors quantitative and non-quantitative. I'd be

eager to learn if you find any of these changes produce measurable positive results. It sounds like the math boot camp you piloted and then retired did not. It would be interesting to know why you think that was ineffective. Was it that those lacking the requisite math skills either had no interest or were so far behind a week or two of math camp couldn't bridge the gap?

8. **Educational Objectives and Assessment:** I applaud you for publishing data on the number of syllabi with EOs on them. It seems like a fairly simple thing, but we at the Pardee RAND Graduate School have seen similar trends and difficulty obtaining 100% compliance with this request consistently. I understand that you are not trying to link these EOs on the micro level to test questions or one type of assessment but rather are asking faculty to keep them in mind as they grade and assess all assignments. I also understand that you are relying on the Capstone Assessment as the comprehensive overview on how well students are doing in the program. I wonder if you might not want to think about something earlier in the program. Is there some sort of "First Year Review" in which faculty could flag students who seemed to be struggling? I suspect this is already happening in some form, but perhaps not formally.
9. **Employment and Student Success:** Employment is the most important indicator on whether students are learning what you want them to learn. So I think it's terrific that you've done such a thorough job of tracking this indicator. I do wonder if you've tracked whether successful internships predicted success in employment and, if so, if this might be viewed as an earlier indicator? I also wondered if the recent weak job market in Los Angeles and the greater Southern California region was driving the decline in employment recently or if your students were seeking work nationally?
10. **Costs/Sustainability/Competitiveness:** You are not alone in worrying about these issues. I wondered as I read this what percentage of your students receive tuition scholarships as \$60,000 per year is a significant amount of money to pay for a professional degree that is not necessarily going to have the same payoff in terms of starting salary as an MBA or a law degree. It goes without saying that being able to offer the most talented students full tuition scholarships is a great way to increase your competitiveness. We've both seen this in action at USC recently.

I think many of the ideas you put forward for increasing demand for your program in the future are worthy. I assume you've already thought of reaching out to foundations that are supportive of programs that integrate faith and learning such as Lily and Templeton as possible sources of funding for some of the ideas you present.

The challenges are many, but you're a unique asset and well-positioned to take advantage of a growing need in the public and private sectors for leaders who prudent, ethical and seeking more than their own material gain.

We at the Pardee RAND Graduate School have benefitted from your efforts on more than one occasion and we look forward to continuing to have well-qualified applicants from your program in ours. Thanks again for asking me to serve as a reviewer of your program. Should you wish me to elaborate on any of the above, I am most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel M. Swanger  
Associate Dean  
Pardee RAND Graduate School  
RAND