Part A

1. **List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**
   
   (PLOs should be appropriate to the degree and consider national disciplinary standards, if they exist. Each outcome should describe how students can demonstrate learning.)

   PLO1 Conceptualize planning problems from complex, real-world situations so that the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research-worthy.
   
   a. Frame research questions and hypotheses
   b. Design appropriate methodologies to answer research questions

   PLO2 Communicate effectively.
   
   a. Communicate effectively in writing.
   b. Communicate effectively by expressing concepts in visual terms.
   c. Communicate effectively through public speaking.

   PLO3 Work effectively as team members and leaders of planning teams, and to apply an understanding of interpersonal and group dynamics to assure effective group action.

   PLO4 Analyze and synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to address actual planning problems.

   PLO5 Develop planning strategies to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and do so in a manner that deliberately incorporates multicultural and historical perspectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcome&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Course(s) When PLO is Assessed</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>University Learning Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conceptualize planning problems from complex, real-world situations so that the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research-worthy.</td>
<td>URBP 298</td>
<td>Planning Report rubric: &lt;ul&gt; &lt;li&gt;Outcome 1.1 to assess PLO 1a. &lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;Outcome 1.3 to assess PLO 1b. &lt;/li&gt; &lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>ULG 1 – Specialized Knowledge*  &lt;br&gt; ULG 2 – Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Frame research questions and hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Design appropriate methodologies to answer research questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Communicate effectively in writing.</td>
<td>Internship (2a and 2c)</td>
<td>Internship form: &lt;ul&gt; &lt;li&gt;Item 2 to assess PLO 2a. &lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;Item 3 to assess PLO 2c &lt;/li&gt; &lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communicate effectively by expressing concepts in visual terms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Communicate effectively through public speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work effectively as team members and leaders of planning teams, and to apply an understanding of interpersonal and group dynamics to assure effective group action.</td>
<td>URBP 201</td>
<td>Peer Review rubric</td>
<td>ULG 1 – Specialized Knowledge*  &lt;br&gt; ULG 4 – Applied Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyze and synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to address actual planning problems.</td>
<td>URBP 298</td>
<td>Planning Report rubric: &lt;ul&gt; &lt;li&gt;Outcome 2 Internship form &lt;/li&gt; &lt;li&gt;Item 9 &lt;/li&gt; &lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>ULG 1 – Specialized Knowledge*  &lt;br&gt; ULG 2 – Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop planning strategies to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and do so in a manner</td>
<td>URBP 201</td>
<td>End of Semester Reflection grading rubric</td>
<td>ULG 1 – Specialized Knowledge*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that deliberately incorporates multicultural and historical perspectives.

- Criteria 1

ULG 5 – Social and Global Responsibilities

*a* All students graduating from the MUP program at SJSU are expected to have graduate-level mastery of the key “Knowledge, Skills, and Values” for professional planners as identified by the Planning Accreditation Board (see [http://www.sjsu.edu/urbanplanning/courses/pabknowledge.html](http://www.sjsu.edu/urbanplanning/courses/pabknowledge.html)).

* Upon successful completion of the MUP degree at SJSU, students will have a graduate-level mastery of all five program learning outcomes which will result in graduate level mastery of ULG 1 – Specialized Knowledge (“depth of knowledge required for a degree, as identified by its program learning outcomes”).
2. **Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)**
See table above.

3. **Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses**
See table above.

4. **Planning – Assessment Schedule**

```markdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

In addition to the assessment data collection noted above, each year during the initial Fall faculty meeting, URBP faculty will discussion the preceding year’s assessment data and discuss curricular changes as needed. This table provides an assessment schedule through our next accreditation visit (site visit in Fall 2017, accreditation decision in Spring 2018).

5. **Student Experience**
We include information about our PLOs and Knowledge, Skills and Values in all course syllabi and on our department website. We annually post information to our website documenting student achievement for our PLOs ([http://www.sjsu.edu/urbanplanning/pabperformancedata/index.html](http://www.sjsu.edu/urbanplanning/pabperformancedata/index.html)). In addition, we conduct an exit survey of all graduating students to identify their perspective of our program’s curriculum, advising, etc. This information is reviewed by faculty annually in order to identify what changes, if any, are needed to our curriculum. We also invite student representatives from our student planning organization to participate in faculty meetings (usually once per semester) to discuss issues of importance and/or concern, including curriculum. As a direct result of both the exit surveys and student meetings, we have implemented a new course designed on technology tools for spatial visualization in planning which we offered for the first time Fall 2015.

**Part B**

6. **Assessment Data and Results**
(Please briefly describe the data collected for this report (e.g., student papers, posters, presentations, portfolios, assignments, exams). The instruments used to evaluate student achievement (e.g., rubrics or other criteria) and actual data (e.g., assignment description or instructions) should be attached as appendices.)

**PLO1**
1. Conceptualize planning problems from complex, real-world situations so that the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research-worthy.
   a. Frame research questions and hypotheses
   - URBP 298 Planning Report rubric:
     - Outcome 1.1 to assess PLO 1a.
b. Design appropriate methodologies to answer research questions

Students prepare a comprehensive planning report during their final two semesters in the MUP program. A rubric (see attachment) is used by each faculty advisor to evaluate student learning. Outcome 1.1 is used to assess PLO1a. Outcome 1.3 is used to assess PLO1b. In 2015-16, 32 students completed their planning reports.

1a. Students received an average score on this rubric outcome of 1.7 (out of 2). Qualitatively, this score is considered between “excellent – this work is ready for public distribution without any substantial modification” and “good – this work is essentially sound, but in need of some refinement before public distribution.”

1b. Students received an average score on this rubric outcome of 3.02 (out of 4). Qualitatively, this score is considered “good – this work is essentially sound, but in need of some refinement before public distribution.”

PLO2

2. Communicate effectively.
   a. Communicate effectively in writing.
   b. Communicate effectively by expressing concepts in visual terms.
   c. Communicate effectively through public speaking.

URBP 298 (2a and 2b) Internship (2a and 2c)

Planning Report rubric:
   • Outcomes 3.8, 3.9, 3.12 to assess PLO 2a.
   • Outcomes 3.10 and 3.11 to assess PLO 2b.

Internship form:
   • Item 2 to assess PLO 2a.
   • Item 3 to assess PLO 2c

Students prepare a comprehensive planning report during their final two semesters in the MUP program. A rubric (see attachment) is used by each faculty advisor to evaluate student learning. Outcomes 3.8, 3.9, and 3.12 are used to assess PLO2a. Outcomes 3.10 and 3.11 are used to assess PLO2b. In 2015-16, 32 students completed their planning reports. In addition, all MUP students complete a minimum 180 hours of professional work experience. Their supervisor completes an evaluation form (see attachment). Item 2 on this rubric is used to evaluate PLO2a and Item 3 on this rubric is used to evaluate PLO2c.

Thirty-two students were evaluated on their final planning reports and by their supervisors in 2015-16. All students met the department’s minimum threshold for learning achievement.

2a. Students received an average score of 3.17 (out of 4) on Outcome 3.8 (writing organization), 1.53 out of 2 on Outcome 3.9 (grammar/typos), and 1.65 out of 2 on Outcome 3.12 (citations). These scores correspond, qualitatively to “good” across all three outcomes. On internship evaluations, the average rubric score for ability to compose written reports and memos across the 32 students evaluated was 4.55 (out of 5).

2b. Students received an average score of 1.59 out of 2 on Outcome 3.10 (tables and figures) and 1.61 out of 2 on Outcome 3.11 (report attractive and professional in appearance) which, qualitatively, correspond to “good” on our rubric.

2c. Students received an average score of 4.54 (out of 5) on their ability to give an oral presentation as evaluated by their internship supervisors.
PLO3

3. Work effectively as team members and leaders of planning teams, and to apply an understanding of interpersonal and group dynamics to assure effective group action.

Twenty-nine students (across both Fall ’15 and Spring ’16 semesters) took URBP 201 and were evaluated using a standard rubric (see attached) on their ability to work effectively as team members. Four students did not meet the department’s threshold for learning achievement on this outcome. Four students exceeded the department’s threshold for learning achievement.

PLO4

4. Analyze and synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to address actual planning problems.

Students prepare a comprehensive planning report during their final two semesters in the MUP program. A rubric (see attachment) is used by each faculty advisor to evaluate student learning. Outcome 2 (combined score) is used to assess student learning on PLO4. In addition, all MUP students complete a minimum 180 hours of professional work experience. Their supervisor completes an evaluation form (see attachment). Item 9 on this rubric is used to evaluate PLO4.

Thirty-two students were evaluated on their final planning reports and by their supervisors in 2015-16. All students met the department’s minimum threshold for learning achievement.

Students received an average score of 12.2 (out of 16) on Outcome 2 (ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize information from multiple sources). Qualitatively, this corresponds to “good” on the rubric. On internship evaluations, the average rubric score for ability to synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to actual planning problems across the 32 students evaluated was 4.71 (out of 5).

PLO5

5. Develop planning strategies to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and do so in a manner that deliberately incorporates multicultural and historical perspectives.

Twenty-nine students (across both Fall ’15 and Spring ’16 semesters) took URBP 201 and were evaluated using a standard rubric (see attached) on their ability to develop planning strategies to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders. Three students did not meet the department’s threshold for learning achievement on this outcome. Six students exceeded the department’s threshold for learning achievement.

7. Analysis

Overall, the department is pleased that all students met our minimum learning achievement threshold for PLOs 1, 2, and 4, and the vast majority of students met our minimum threshold for PLOs 4 and 5. Efforts put in place to ensure that students are exposed early (and throughout) their MUP program to key learning expectations appear to be working. In particular, the implementation of a literature review assignment in URBP 200, well before they take URBP 298 provides early exposure to the needed skills to
identify appropriate literature on a research topic and to learn how to effectively analyze and synthesize the information. Similarly, exposing students in URBP 204 to research questions and hypothesis testing has a similar benefit. Finally, we implemented a new required 1-unit course in Fall 2012 (URBP 297P) to help students prepare early for their 298 reports and the results seems to be that students enter the 298 course sequence better prepared to conduct independent research.

We would still like to see students improve their writing and oral communication skills. Although students are meeting our threshold, these two items on our internship evaluation rubric receive the lowest collective scores across all items. At our annual assessment faculty meeting, a key topic for discussion will be on identifying ways to improve student communication skills.

For PLOs 3 and 5, which are both evaluations in URBP 201, the faculty teaching those classes this year proposed the following improvements to improve student learning:

For PLO3: provide students the opportunity to participate in conducting a meeting with project stakeholders. This could be assigned later in the semester after relationships and trust with the community has been established and students have gained confidence speaking and engaging the community. Although it is important to mention, students have extensive opportunities to act as effective team members and leaders of planning teams in this course by developing team agendas, holding meetings within and outside of class, establishing strong communication protocols during team formation, and communicating between planning teams throughout all phases of the course.

For PLO5: provide students the opportunity to engage more frequently with the diversity of stakeholders within a community, opposed to a primary neighborhood association (that is typically demographically homogenous). First points of engagement between students and the diversity of the community may begin with establishing a variety of neighborhood meetings in a variety of diverse locations. Supporting smaller groups of ethnically similar backgrounds allows for focused attention on their needs and removes language barriers and language insecurity.

8. Proposed changes and goals (if any)
No specific changes were identified, however, at the Fall faculty meeting, efforts to improve students’ communication skills will be addressed and instructors in URBP 201 will be provided with the recommendations for improving student learning related to PLOs 3 and 5.

Assuming that next year’s assessment report will be due earlier, we will schedule two faculty meetings to discuss assessment results (fall for 2015-16) and spring for 2016-17). This timing will result in the ability to better report and track on proposed assessment changes that come directly from the assessment analysis conducted on an annual basis.

Part C
(This table should be reviewed and updated each year, ultimately providing a cycle-long record of your efforts to improve student outcome as a result of your assessment efforts. Each row should represent a single proposed change or goal. Each proposed change should be reviewed and updated yearly so as to create a record of your department’s efforts. Please add rows to the table as needed.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes and Goals</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
<td>TBD after Fall faculty meting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication skills</td>
<td>TBD after Fall faculty meting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively as team members</td>
<td>TBD after Fall faculty meting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning strategies</td>
<td>TBD after Fall faculty meting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING REPORT - ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student:</th>
<th>Semester:</th>
<th>Evaluator:</th>
<th>Advisor:</th>
<th>Project title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Excel-lent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outcome 1.** Demonstrates ability to conceptualize problems from complex, real world situations so the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research worthy (maximum score: 12)

1. Are the research **questions** and/or **goals** well defined and clearly stated?  
   4 3 2 1 0.5 0

2. Does the author demonstrate in-depth familiarity with relevant **literature** on the subject?  
   4 3 2 1 1.5 0

3. Is the **methodology** appropriate to answer the research question(s)?  
   4 3 2 1 1 0

**Outcome 2.** Demonstrates ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize information from multiple sources (maximum score: 16)

4. Is the **data collected** sufficient in quality and depth to answer the research question?  
   4 3 2 1 1.5 0

5. Is the **analysis** direct, competent, and appropriate?  
   4 3 2 1 1.5 0

6. Are the **conclusions** sophisticated and based on the results of the analysis, as a logical extension of the findings?  
   4 3 2 1 0.5 0

7. Does the author show how his/her analysis and findings fit into the larger **context** of the literature and current professional practice?  
   4 3 2 1 0.5 0

**Outcome 3.** Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively in writing and by expressing concepts in visual terms (maximum score: 12)

8. Is the material logically **organized**, so that a reader can easily follow the writer’s train of thought?  
   4 3 2 1 1 0

9. Is the writing grammatically **correct** and free of typos?  
   4 3 2 1 0.5 0

10. Do **tables** and **figures** add useful/important information for the reader?  
    4 3 2 1 0.5 0

11. Is the report attractive and **professional** in appearance?  
    4 3 2 1 0.5 0
12. **Are citations** included where appropriate, and are footnotes and bibliography properly formatted?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excellent:** As a supervisor, you would consider this work ready for public distribution without any substantial modification.

**Good:** As a supervisor, you would consider this work essentially sound, but in need of some refinement before public distribution.

**Marginal:** As a supervisor, you would conclude that the work contained some worthwhile elements, but required major revisions before public distribution.

**Unacceptable:** The work needs to be entirely redone.

**Note:** Passing reports must receive at least a score of 8, 10, and 8 on Outcomes 1, 2 and 3, respectively. To be considered for honors, reports must receive at least 36 points and demonstrate exceptional originality and creativity in the choice of research question, methodology, or analysis techniques.
Professional Work Experience/Internship Evaluation Form (used to assess PLOs 2 and 4)

**Rating of Intern/Employee Performance:**

Please rate the student’s performance on the following criteria on a scale from 1 (very low performance) to 5 (very high performance).

- **Ability to work effectively on a team**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Ability to compose written reports and memos**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Ability to make an oral presentation**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Ability to interface with the public or clients**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Ability to solve problems and think creatively**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Initiative and ability to work independently**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Knowledge expected of an entry-level employee**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Understanding of professional planning issues**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed

- **Ability to synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to actual planning problems**
  - [ ] 1  [ ] 2  [ ] 3  [ ] 4  [ ] 5  [ ] Not assessed
Rubric Used to Evaluate Student Learning on PLO3 in URBP 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Work effectively as team memebers & leaders of planning teams:** | Student exceeded the minimum requirements by, for example:  
- Consistently went above and beyond what was necessary. Able to step up to lead the team. Strong group facilitation.  
Exceptionally well prepared and cooperative. Almost always completed agreed-upon assignments by agreed-upon deadlines. An exceptional team member and leader in all aspects. | Student met the minimum assignment requirements by:  
- Consistently did what was necessary. Well prepared and cooperative. Almost always completed agreed-upon tasks by agreed-upon deadlines. A good team member, facilitator, and leader in all aspects. | The student presented material that was substandard in any or all of the aspects of this assignment; for example:  
- Sometimes failed to show up or complete agreed upon assignments. Rarely well prepared. A marginal team member. |
## Rubric Used to Evaluate Student Learning on PLOS in URBP 201

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List at least two ways that our work in URBP-201 this semester has advanced community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders. Also, describe at least one way that we have deliberately incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives of the study neighborhood into the advancement of community priorities.</td>
<td>Student <strong>exceeded</strong> the minimum assignment requirements by, for example:</td>
<td>Student <strong>met</strong> the minimum assignment requirements by:</td>
<td>The student presented material that was <strong>substandard</strong> in any or all of the aspects of this assignment; for example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describing more than two methods that we used in the course to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and more than one way in which we have incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives in this regard.</td>
<td>• Describing two methods that we used in the course to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and one way in which we have incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives in this regard.</td>
<td>• Not listing at least two methods of collaborative engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceptional level of detail in articulating and describing these methods, especially when considering the short timeframe given to complete the assignment</td>
<td>• Adequate level of detail in articulating and describing these methods</td>
<td>• Not listing one method of incorporating multicultural and historical perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing, unclear and vague attempts to address the assignment tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear evidence that minimal effort was devoted to completing this assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>