

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: [Campus Review]: Report Review Draft WASC Institutional Report

Date: October 30, 2017

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy has reviewed the draft WASC Institutional Report. We commend the work group's efforts to develop this report. We have provided suggestions regarding issues related to the School of Public Policy in addition to some general suggestions/edits to improve clarity.

Gaps regarding information related to the School of Public Policy

- Page 8. Item 10. SPP will be managing and accepting students in Public Policy Major starting in the fall of 2018.
- Page 11. Item 20/21. SPP developed a student ambassadors program for a select group of undergraduate students and the SPP advisers have set up internships for students in the Public Policy major. See Mark Manalang for details.
- Pages 14 and 15. Section titled, "Interdisciplinary". SPP has a very diverse group of faculty whose area of expertise spans economics, sociology, health, political science, immigration, geography, spatial relationships, etc. The main areas of emphasis for the MPP program are policies and policy-related issues focused on health, inequality, crime, immigration, and the environment. See Mark Manalang and Jolene Sedita for more information.
- Page 15. Section titled, "Engagement with Community." SPP facilitates student internships at local, regional, and statewide agencies/businesses. SPP also provides a seminar series that focus on local, regional, and statewide issues of concern to the region/communities. See Mark Manalang and Jolene Sedita for more information.
 - Page 20. Section titled, "School of Public Policy". This section can be updated with discussions of major themes of the MPP program, faculty expertise, internship and ambassador program advising, and expectations to manage and offer an undergraduate degree in Public Policy. See Karthick Ramakrishnan, Mark Manalang, Jolene Sedita for details.

Minor suggestions / comments

- Page 6. Item 4. May be useful to add what the baseline contract and grants were for comparison (i.e., grown to over \$139 million from what?).
- Page 6. Item 6. Strike either “increased” or “doubled”
- Page 9. Item 13. Switch flip “to” and “better” (so reads, “...to better understand”)
- Page 12. Item 23. Spelling – the; strike “good” and replace with “effective”; Teaching Assistants (add an “s”); strike “in this well” and replace with “well”. Add to the end something to the effect that each college’s executive committee reviews new class proposals as well.
- Page 12. Item 24. Strike “a” in second line.
- Page 13. Item 27. Strike “determine what really works to” and replace with “evaluate what factors”
- Page 14. Item 30. “...because hiring multiple faculty members means a greater diversity of applicants are likely to be successful.” Is this true because we say it or is there some evidence of this? Also, a bit awkwardly worded.
- Page 16. Item 37. Strike “run”
- Pages 16 and 17. Section titled, “Core Competencies”. Many departments offer professional development courses that focus on resume writing, presentation skills, interviewing, job search strategies and how to write grants, abstracts, etc. (see, e.g., Environmental Sciences Department).
- Page 18. Item 43. Two “trainings” in same sentence – perhaps replace second with “skills”.
- Page 24. Item 59. Strike “that sequences” and replace with “those sequences”
- Page 28. Item 72. SPP’s MPP program can also be included in having a graduate rate over 90%.
- Page 36. Item 95. A bit ambiguous who “they” refers to; suggest replace with “graduate students are evaluated...”
- Page 39. Subsection titled, “Assessment of Student Affairs”. Seems misplaced under Section, “Assessment of Graduate Learning-Professional Schools”. Similar indictment re the next few subsections.
- Page 43. Item 115. Insert “the” before “Multidisciplinary Research Building”, and a comma after it.
- In terms of areas of weakness or concern, we could probably identify “space” and both instructional and research facilities. Seems that this issue receives little attention in the document, and that the attention it receives is (nearly) uniformly rosy.