PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT 2010-2011
PROGRAM INFORMATION

Date submitted: March, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program(s):</th>
<th>Master of Urban Planning</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Urban &amp; Regional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair:</td>
<td>Prof. Dayana Salazar</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>4-5854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Prepared by:</td>
<td>Rick Kos, AICP</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>4-5875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Self-Study due:</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rickkos@gmail.com">rickkos@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHIVAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>WSQ 216E</th>
<th>Person to Contact:</th>
<th>Rick Kos</th>
<th>4-5853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bldg/Room #)</td>
<td>(Name)</td>
<td>(Phone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERVIEW

This report of program-level student learning objectives for the Urban & Regional Planning Department is comprehensive, embodying all of our SLOs, since our program’s accreditation board will visit with our faculty and students in Fall, 2012.

Since we are required to complete a thorough review of all of our program-level SLOs prior to this visit, we wanted to share this complete report with the COSS Assessment Committee at this time.

1 Note: Schedule is posted at: http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/programplanning/

2 Assessment schedule is posted at http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment
Please send any changes to the schedule or to student learning outcomes to Jackie Snell jacqueline.snell@sjsu.edu
**SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>C,D,I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C,D</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This template is based on a five-year program planning cycle. If your program planning follows another cycle (e.g., based on accreditation), please feel free to add (or subtract) columns as necessary.
**SLO-1**

Apply the history and theory of planning in relation to social and economic structures, including, but not limited to, such characteristics as income, race, ethnicity, and gender.

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The Ethics assignment in URBP-200 (Seminar on Urban and Regional Planning).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration was to develop an understanding of the ethics of professional practice and behavior, including the relationship to clients and the public, and the role of citizens in a democratic society.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2006
Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
- In 2007, a ‘City History Assignment’ and ‘Interview with Practicing Planner Assignment’ was used in place of the Ethics assignment
- Past instructors have considered further improving the directions in the assignment to make expectations clearer for the students
- Past instructors have considered adjustments to the grading rubric to better reflect the SLO

Evidence of student learning after the change:
In Fall, 2005 65% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better
In Fall, 2010 100% of students achieved the same.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?
The instructor anticipates changing the relative importance of the course assignments so that the Literature Review is worth 50% (previously 30%) and the Ethics assignment remains 20% of the total grade.
**SLO-2**

*Understand the ethics of professional practice and behavior, including the relationship to clients and the public, and the role of citizens in a democratic society.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The Ethics assignment in **URBP-200** (Seminar on Urban and Regional Planning).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration was to develop an understanding of the ethics of professional practice and behavior, including the relationship to clients and the public, and the role of citizens in a democratic society.

**This SLO was first assessed in:**
Fall, 2005

**This SLO was subsequently assessed in:**
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2006
Fall, 2010

**Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:**
- In Spring 2007, an ‘Ethics Analysis Assignment’ was used in place of the Ethics assignment and a grading rubric was redesigned to specifically focus on the SLO. Students at that time needed to earn a grade of B+ or higher to meet the SLO. In that semester, 86% of students met the criteria. It appears that subsequent instructors returned to using a grade of ‘B’ as the threshold.
- Aside from the Spring 2007 semester described above, no other adjustments have been made to the curriculum because 97-100% of students met the criteria each semester since data collection began in Fall, 2005.

**Evidence of student learning after the change:**
In Fall, 2005 100% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.
In Fall, 2010 100% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.

**Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?**
The instructor anticipates changing the relative importance of the course assignments so that the Literature Review is worth 50% (previously 30%) and the Ethics assignment remains 20% of the total grade.
**SLO-3**

*Understand the role of government and citizen participation in a democratic society and the balancing of individual and collective rights and interests.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The Ethics assignment in **URBP-200** (Seminar on Urban and Regional Planning).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration was to develop an understanding of the role of government and citizen participation in a democratic society and the balancing of individual and collective rights and interests.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2006
Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

**Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:**

- In Fall, 2006 the instructor noted that “because the assignment used to assess this SLO overlaps with a similar assignment in URBP 225, another core course in the department, a new assignment will be developed for future semesters which will capture the same SLO, but in a manner that is not duplicated elsewhere in the curriculum. Also the threshold for determining SLO accomplishment would be raised from “B” to “B+.” This change was implemented in Spring, 2007 as described below.

- In Spring 2007, an ‘Interview with a Professional Planner Assignment’ was used in place of the Ethics assignment and a grading rubric was redesigned to specifically focus on the SLO. Students at that time needed to earn a grade of B+ or higher to meet the SLO. In that semester, 86% of students met the criteria. The slight decrease in the percentage of students achieving this SLO might be a result of raising threshold for achieving this SLO. More monitoring is required before further action is contemplated. It appears that subsequent instructors returned to using a grade of ‘B’ as the threshold.

- Aside from the Spring 2007 semester described above, no other adjustments have been made to the curriculum because 100% of students met the criteria each semester since data collection began in Fall, 2005.

**Evidence of student learning after the change:**
In Fall, 2005 **100%** of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.
In Fall, 2010 **100%** of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.

**Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?**
The instructor anticipates changing the relative importance of the course assignments so that the Literature Review is worth 50% (previously 30%) and the Ethics assignment remains 20% of the total grade.
**SLO-4**

*Interpret case laws relevant to the field of urban and regional planning and application of these laws to realistic hypothetical situations.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The final exam in URBP-229 (Planning and Environmental Law).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration was to develop an understanding of interpreting case laws relevant to the field of urban and regional planning and application of these laws to realistic hypothetical situations.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Spring, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Spring, 2007

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
- In Spring, 2006 the instructor noted that more in-class participation needed to be encouraged to facilitate better understanding of this learning objective.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
In Spring, 2005 63% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.
In Fall, 2010 100% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?
- After the curriculum change listed above was implemented, the percentage of students meeting the learning objective increased from 83% to 94%, suggesting that the changes were beneficial.
- In Fall 2010 the instructor noted: “The Final was a very difficult one this semester, and I am surprised my students did so well. The only thing I might do differently in the future would be to make the exam more challenging. I also plan to make the class more interactive than it currently is, encouraging students to be more forthcoming with what they have learned and sharing it with their classmates.”
**SLO-5**

*Understand the contexts in which planning takes place, focusing particularly on agencies conducting planning or employing planners, and the processes by which plans are made and implemented.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The written portion of the final exam in **URBP-225** (Land Use and Urban Planning).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration was to develop an understanding of the contexts in which planning takes place, focusing particularly on agencies conducting planning or employing planners, and the processes by which plans are made and implemented.

**This SLO was first assessed in:**
Spring, 2006

**This SLO was subsequently assessed in:**
Spring, 2006
Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

**Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:**
- In Spring, 2006 the instructor noted that more emphasis was needed on the importance of following assignment instructions.
- In Spring, 2007 the instructor noted: “review of assignment instructions and reinforcement of course principles helped the students achieve SLO 5”.

**Evidence of student learning after the change:**
In Spring, 2006 92% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.
In Fall, 2010 100% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.

**Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?**
- In Fall, 2010 the instructor noted: “Assignment 5 is the final assignment in Urban Planning 225, Introduction to Land use, which I also call the practitioner’s class. It takes two class sessions, or approximately five hours, to complete. The class is randomly divided into groups of five people, and each group gets to choose a real-world development plan to review and to write a staff report about. With each plan set, students are also given the appropriate regulatory documents, including the City’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and relevant design guidelines, to use as the basis for their review. After spending approximately 90 minutes reviewing the plans as a group, the students split up, and write their final papers individually. After making a site visit, the students return the following week as a group to present their project in front of the class and reflect on what happened in real life, with class members asking questions, and giving feedback on the presentations. After all the hard work, there’s usually a celebratory edge to the presentations”.
- The Fall 2010 instructor also noted: “This is the sixth or seventh year I’ve given this style of final. From past experience, one of the biggest things that students have trouble with is applying findings to their review of a project, and making a recommendation using applicable findings as a threshold for approval. The purpose and necessity of findings is one of the key takeaways from the class. To really make it a focus, it’s now called out as a learning objective for the class, and we touch on findings in multiple class sessions, in order to give students a chance to grasp and apply the concept in a variety of contexts. For me, the students’ reasonably good performance on the final is based on adapting from my previous mistakes, and really focusing on the key points, such as findings, that students should be getting from the class”.
**SLO-6a**  
*Design and conduct first-hand research.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:  
Scores earned by students earned in Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 on the masters project grading rubric.  
The two outcomes and their subsections are listed below. A minimum score of 8 is needed for Outcome 1, and a minimum score of 10 is needed for Outcome 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1. Demonstrates ability to conceptualize problems from complex, real world situations so the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research worthy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the research questions and/or goals well defined and clearly stated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the author demonstrate in-depth familiarity with relevant literature on the subject?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the methodology appropriate to answer the research question(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2. Demonstrates ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize information from multiple sources.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the data collected sufficient in quality and depth to answer the research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the analysis direct, competent, and appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the conclusions sophisticated and based on the results of the analysis, as a logical extension of the findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the author show how his/her analysis and findings fit into the larger context of the literature and current professional practice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This SLO was first assessed in:**  
Spring, 2006

**This SLO was subsequently assessed in:**  
Spring, 2007  
Spring, 2008  
Fall, 2010

**Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:**  
- Instructors emphasized the importance of designing and conducting first-hand research in Phase 1 of URBP 298  
- Increased the threshold so that now students need to obtain a score of 3 out of 4 on each of the Outcomes 1 to 6 of the URBP 298 grading rubric to achieve SLO # 6a.  
- The URBP 298 grading rubric was substantially revised for Spring 2007.  
- In order to improve the quality of the URBP 298 - Master’s Report (and thereby enhance the student learning on outcomes 6a, 6b and 6c) the faculty in Spring, 2007 decided to make several changes to the structure of the Master’s Planning report. The major one being strengthening the lecture component of the Phase 1 of the Planning Report (now called URBP 298 A). From Spring 2008 onwards the students would be required to attend a pre-298 workshop the semester before they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A. They would also be required to submit a preliminary research proposal few weeks before the beginning of the semester in which they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A.  
- It was decided that students need to get a minimum of 8 out 12 on Outcome 1 to pass URBP 298.  
- Instructors continued to strengthen Phase 1 of the Planning report (URBP 298A).

**Evidence of student learning after the change:**  
- In Spring, 2008 82.5% of students met the learning objective.  
- By examining 67 grading rubrics for Fall, 2008; Spring, 2009; Fall, 2009; Spring 2010 and Fall, 2010, 95.5% of students met the learning objective by achieving the minimum score in Outcomes 1 and 2 on the masters project grading rubric.
Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?

- Continue to promote effective first-hand research techniques in URBP-298A classes and in individual advising sessions with students
- Continue to log URBP-298B grading rubrics in a master database after each semester to track progress in meeting student learning objectives.
SLO-6b
Frame research questions and hypotheses.

The two assessment tools used to measure student learning are:
- Scores earned by students earned on criterion 1 in Outcome 1 on the masters project grading rubric. The outcome and criterion are listed below. Students need to earn a minimum score of 3 (on a scale of 1-4) in this section of the grading rubric to demonstrate that they have achieved the learning objective. A score of 3 of the rubric corresponds to a value of 1.5 (since the score is weighted with a value of 0.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1. Demonstrates ability to conceptualize problems from complex, real world situations so the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research worthy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the research questions and/or goals well defined and clearly stated?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In URBP-204A (Quantitative Methods I), earning a score of 36 or greater (out of 40) on question #1 of the mid-term exam.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2006
Spring, 2007
Spring, 2008
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
- Instructors continue to emphasize the importance of framing research questions in Phase 1 of URBP 298.
- In Spring, 2006, increased the threshold so that now students need to obtain a score of 3 out of 4 on Outcome 1 to achieve SLO #6b.
- The URBP 298 grading rubric was substantially revised for Spring 2007.
- In order to improve the quality of the URBP 298 - Master’s Report (and thereby enhance the student learning on outcomes 6a, 6b and 6c) the faculty in spring 2007 decided to make several changes to the structure of the Master’s Planning report. The major one being strengthening the lecture component of the Phase 1 of the Planning Report (now called URBP 298 A). From Spring 2008 onwards the students would be required to attend a pre-298 workshop the semester before they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A. They would also be required to submit a preliminary research proposal few weeks before the beginning of the semester in which they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A.
- In Fall, 2008 it was decided that students need to earn a minimum of 8 out 12 on Outcome 1 to pass URBP 298.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
- In Spring, 2008 82.5% of students met the learning objective for URBP-298A.
- In Spring, 2008 74% of students met the learning objective for URBP-204A.
- By examining 67 grading rubrics for Fall, 2008; Spring, 2009; Fall, 2009; Spring 2010 and Fall, 2010, 91% of students met the learning objective by achieving the minimum score on criterion 1 of Outcome 1 on the masters project grading rubric.
- In Fall, 2010, 83% of the students met the learning objective in URBP-204A.
Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?

- Continue to promote effective techniques for framing research questions and hypotheses in URBP-298A classes and in individual advising sessions with students.
- Continue to log URBP-298B grading rubrics in a master database after each semester to track progress in meeting student learning objectives.
- In Fall, 2010 the instructor of URBP-204A noted: “Need to focus more on the difference between (1) concept and conceptions and (2) independent and dependent variables. Also need to focus more on the probable source of quantitative urban planning data.”
**SLO-6c**  
*Analyze and synthesize data from multiple sources.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is: Scores earned by students earned in Outcome 2 on the masters project grading rubric. The outcome and its subsections are listed below. A minimum score of 10 is needed for Outcome 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2. Demonstrates ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize information from multiple sources.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the <strong>data collected</strong> sufficient in quality and depth to answer the research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the <strong>analysis</strong> direct, competent, and appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the <strong>conclusions</strong> sophisticated and based on the results of the analysis, as a logical extension of the findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the author show how his/her analysis and findings fit into the larger <strong>context</strong> of the literature and current professional practice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This SLO was first assessed in:  
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:  
Spring, 2006  
Spring, 2007  
Spring, 2008  
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:  
- Instructors continue to emphasize the importance of analyzing and synthesizing data from multiple sources in Phase 1 of URBP 298.  
- The URBP 298 grading rubric was substantially revised for Spring 2007.  
- In order to improve the quality of the URBP 298 - Master’s Report (and thereby enhance the student learning on outcomes 6a, 6b and 6c) the faculty in spring 2007 decided to make several changes to the structure of the Master’s Planning report. The major one being strengthening the lecture component of the Phase 1 of the Planning Report (now called URBP 298 A). From Spring 2008 onwards the students would be required to attend a pre-298 workshop the semester before they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A. They would also be required to submit a preliminary research proposal few weeks before the beginning of the semester in which they plan on enrolling in URBP 298A.  
- In Fall, 2008 it was decided that students need to earn a minimum of 10 out 14 on Outcome 2 to pass URBP 298.

Evidence of student learning after the change:  
- In Spring, 2008 **82.5%** of students met the learning objective.  
- By examining 67 grading rubrics for Fall, 2008; Spring, 2009; Fall, 2009; Spring 2010 and Fall, 2010, **98.5%** of students met the learning objective by achieving a minimum score of 10 on Outcome 2 on the masters project grading rubric.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?  
- In spite of continuous increase in threshold for achieving this SLO, the percentage of students achieving this SLO has remained high.  
- Continue to promote effective techniques analyzing and synthesizing data from multiple sources in URBP-298A classes and in individual advising sessions with students  
- Continue to log URBP-298B grading rubrics in a master database after each semester to track progress in meeting student learning objectives.
SLO-7
Apply statistical and other analytic techniques, as well as computer methods, to define planning problems, generate alternatives, and evaluate their consequences. Use census data to inform policy formulation.

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The cohort-component model assignment in URBP-204B (Quantitative Methods II).

Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration is as listed above.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Spring, 2006

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
• In Spring, 2006 and Spring, 2007 the instructor used the “Quality of Life Indicator Assignment” to measure this SLO – it has since been changed to the cohort-component model assignment
• In Spring, 2006 the instructor noted: “use census data to inform policy formulation….revise the relevant section of the syllabus and refine Excel spreadsheet template and its documentation.
• In Spring, 2007 the instructor noted: “this exercise was moved to the start of the semester instead of the end of the semester as was the case in past terms. This was a major mistake as the exercise was too difficult for several students who were not fully competent in Excel. In Spring 2008 this exercise will be returned to the end of the semester at which time all students will have more experience with Excel. Instructions will be revised and the Excel spreadsheet template will be revised to be clearer.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
In Spring, 2006 96% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.
In Fall, 2010 100% of students earned a grade of ‘B’ or better.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?
• In Fall, 2010 the instructor noted: “reinforce the need to think of the models as flexible methods and tools to be used throughout the planning field”
The assessment tools currently used to measure student learning are:
- The Literature Review assignment in **URBP-200** (Introduction to Urban and Regional Planning). Students needed to earn a ‘B’ or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration is as listed above.
- Scores earned by students earned in Outcome 3 on the **masters project grading rubric**. The outcome and its subsections are listed below. A minimum score of 8 is needed for Outcome 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3. Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively in writing and by expressing concepts in visual terms (maximum score: 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the material logically <strong>organized</strong>, so that a reader can easily follow the writer’s train of thought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the writing grammatically <strong>correct</strong> and free of typos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do <strong>tables</strong> and <strong>figures</strong> add useful/important information for the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the report attractive and <strong>professional</strong> in appearance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are <strong>citations</strong> included where appropriate, and are footnotes and bibliography properly formatted?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past, other assessment tools were considered:
- In Spring, 2006 the instructor of **URBP-204B** gave a quality of life indicator assignment (this assessment tool has not been used since, though 96% of students achieved the SLO at that time).
- In Fall, 2006 the instructor of **URBP-200** gave ethics analysis and planning commission analysis assignments (this assessment tool has not been used since, though 93% of students achieved the SLO at that time).

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006  
Fall, 2006  
Spring, 2007  
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
- In Spring, 2007 the threshold was increased so that now students needed to obtain a score of 3 out of 4 on each of the Outcomes 7 to 11 of the URBP 298 grading rubric to achieve SLO # 8a. Also, instructors have urged continued use of 298 proof-readers.
- Instructor to encourage out-of-class improvement in writing skills.
- Instructor of URBP-204B considered revising the relevant section of the syllabus including organizational guidelines for effectively relating theoretical concepts to conditions revealed by “ground truthing” observed conditions.
- Instructor of URBP-200 considered new grading rubrics that would be tailored to better reflect and capture student achievement as related to this SLO.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
For **URBP-200**:
- In Fall, 2005 **68%** of students met the criteria
- In Fall, 2006 **91%** of students met the criteria
In Fall, 2010 82% of students met the criteria

For URBP-298:
- In Spring, 2006 100% achieved a score of 8 out of 12 on Outcome 3 (thus achieving the SLO).
- In Spring 2007, 93% of students earned the same
- In Fall, 2010 97% of students earned the same.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?

- Continued faculty monitoring of completed 298-B grading rubrics
- Instructors to encourage out-of-class improvement in writing skills
**SLO-8b**

*Communicate effectively by expressing concepts in visual terms.*

The assessment tools currently used to measure student learning are:

- The Statistical Data Presentation in **URBP-204B** (Quantitative Methods II). Students needed to earn a 'B' or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO. Specifically, the criterion under consideration is as listed above.
- The Final Project Poster Map assignment in **URBP-278** (Introduction to Geographic Information Systems). Students needed to earn at least 40 out of 50 points on the map design component of the final course project. This tool was added as an SLO measure in Fall, 2010.

In the past, other assessment tools were considered:

- In Spring, 2006 the instructor of **URBP-204B** gave a quality of life indicator assignment (this assessment tool has not been used since, though 96% of students achieved the SLO at that time). In Spring, 2007 this percentage dropped to 77%.

This SLO was first assessed in:

Spring, 2006

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:

Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:

- In Spring, 2006 the instructor of **URBP-278** proposed revisions to geographic information systems map documentation and instructions; revisions included the provision of instructions for integration of maps, charts, photos, tables and text.
- In Spring, 2007 the instructor of **URBP-204B** moved the exercise to the start of the semester instead of the end of the semester as was the case in past terms. This was a major mistake as the exercise was too difficult for several students who were not fully competent in Excel. In Spring 2008 the exercise was returned to the end of the semester at which time all students had more experience with Excel. Instructions were revised and the Excel spreadsheet template was revised to be clearer.

Evidence of student learning after the change:

For **URBP-204-B**:

- In Spring, 2006 96% of students met the criteria
- In Spring, 2007 77% of students met the criteria
- In Fall, 2010 94% of students met the criteria

For **URBP-278**: (assessment tool instituted in Fall, 2010)

- In Fall, 2010 94% of met the criteria.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?

- In Fall, 2010 the instructor of **URBP-204B** noted: “stress the point of knowing the audience to refine the level of complexity in all visuals”
- In Fall, 2010 the instructor of **URBP-278** noted: “Include additional lecture material prior to commencement of final project (i.e. week 12 or 13 of the semester) that places more emphasis on the importance of map clarity to communicate to the intended audience, and include additional, specific techniques to achieve this objective. Also consider including examples of poor cartography to emphasize the points”.

SLO-8c
Communicate effectively through public speaking.

The assessment tools currently used to measure student learning are:
• The Informational Presentation Assignment in URBP-213 (Communication Skills for Planners). Students needed to earn a 'B' or higher on this assignment to achieve the SLO.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2006
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
• In Fall, 2005 the instructor of URBP-213 noted: “Although most students completed acceptable work, the instructor plans to devote more time to presentation skills in future semesters to further improve their skills.
• In Spring, 2006 the instructor noted: “Instructor has made various changes in the course that are designed to improve students’ mastery of public speaking, either directly or indirectly:
  o Added a new homework exercise where students assess their vocal delivery style.
  o Slightly increased the time spent in class discussing vocal delivery.
  o Added several short lecture segments that repeat and reinforce a central idea introduced early in the class -- the need to focus a speaking assignment around a central purpose and thesis.
  o Reorganized the semester schedule so that the instructor meets one-on-one with students the second week of class. In the meeting, the instructor gives them feedback on a writing draft they submit. These meetings have several objectives: (1) To show students that the instructor is interested in them as individuals, and thus hopefully to increase their participation level in the class overall. (2) To model the level of careful attention to detail the instructor expects in all their class work, including public speaking assignments.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
• In Fall, 2006 84% of students met the criteria
• In Fall, 2010 73% of students met the criteria

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?
• In Fall, 2010 the instructor of URBP-213 noted: “Almost everyone improved from the first presentation”, which suggests that students benefit from multiple applications of similar assignments so that they can learn from their mistakes.
**SLO-9**
Work effectively as members and leaders of planning teams, and to apply an understanding of interpersonal and group dynamics to assure effective group action.

The assessment tools currently used to measure student learning are:

- Peer evaluation of teamwork in **URBP-201** (Community Assessment). Students are asked to rate the effectiveness of their colleagues in a confidential, anonymous, end-of-semester evaluation. Students complete a rubric using a scale of 1 (ineffective) to 5 (highly effective) with a score of more than 3.5 (between “average” and “above average”), indicating that the students have met the learning objective. The rubric considers these criteria:
  - Participated effectively in group discussions or meeting *during* class sessions
  - Participated effectively in group discussions of meetings *outside of* class sessions
  - Helped keep the group focused on the task
  - Contributed useful ideas
  - Quality of work done
  - Quantity of work done

In the past, other assessment tools were considered:

- **Fall, 2005**: Instructor in one section each of URBP 201 and URBP 203, using the “Peer Evaluation of Team Work” form.
- **Spring, 2006**: Internship instructor asked the Internship Supervisor to rate the student interns on a scale of 1 to 5 and measured the number of students obtained a score of 3 or above (thus achieving the SLO).
- **Fall, 2006**: Instructor in two sections of URBP 201 administered teammate peer review evaluation, entire team performance evaluation, and personal reflection and evaluation; objective was to measure the number of students who achieved a score of 4 or higher (thus achieving the SLO).
- **Spring, 2007**: Assessment of this learning objective was conducted using the "Internship Supervisor's Evaluation of Student Intern Performance." The students needed to achieve a score of 3 or better on Questions 1 and 4.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Fall, 2005

This SLO was subsequently assessed in:
Spring, 2006  
Fall, 2006  
Spring, 2007  
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
- In Fall, 2005 the instructor of URBP-201/203 noted: “The instructor has observed (and received informal comments from students) that a larger number of students in fact perform below the ‘satisfactory’ level. Other instructors and professionals who take active part in the class project will supplement peer reviews with evaluations. Additional guidelines and practice sessions on providing constructive criticism will be introduced in class.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
- In Spring, 2006 100% of students met the criteria
- In Fall, 2006 91% of students met the criteria
- In Fall, 2007 100% of students met the criteria
• In Fall, 2010 97% of students met the criteria. This was calculated using the grading rubric as described in the first section, above, using results from two sections of URBP-201 with 33 students total.

• Students were also asked to complete open-ended comments to describe their participation in the three project phase teams. Selected comments are listed below, which were chosen based upon the insights they reveal into team dynamics and suggesting improvements to pedagogical methods and/or changes to the evaluation rubric:

  o Student x was the hero here. She did a fantastic job of organizing and motivating the group.
  o There was a bit of laziness and thus lost time in this group. Roles were not clearly defined until the very end, so no one knew exactly what they were responsible for.
  o This group worked very well together. Unfortunately we were not a complete group the entire time because members missed class during this phase. However, we communicated well and everyone held up their end of the work. Student x was also a GREAT help in this group.
  o This group worked well together. Everyone had fairly clear goals and objectives. However, due to time constraints and the holidays I think we were all rushed in the end. Overall everyone did a good job...some worked more than others! This group had the most difficult tasks to complete as compared to my other two groups and we did a great job at it.
  o Although this team was productive and completed a large amount of work, it was extremely hard to get people to perform at a level that was expected. Some people missed deadlines, did not always respond to emails, and some people simply slacked off on most class dates. The level of respect for teamwork was not experienced to the level it was in phase 1.
  o I felt this writing phase experienced a lack of a strong leadership role and direction/focus. We faced a lot of frustration w/lack of communication from other class members outside of this group. With what we had (only 4 people and missing info), I felt our team pulled together a well-collaborated document effort. Although if we had had the needed assistance it could have been much stronger of a final document.
  o We were getting our feet wet, but not as effective as we could have been had we a better idea of the end product, but all-in-all did good based on the knowledge we had at the time.
  o Our team really divided into two teams. I’m impressed by the quality of the work they produced though. The three of us have different working approaches, ideas, processes etc. but I think we managed to work well together. I think we all just had different ideas and a bit of a personality clash but that’s what makes this fun.
  o Student x was an awesome team leader but I feel like she put a lot of work onto herself despite offers from other team members. I think she is a great editor so her leading this team was a good fit. The team as a whole was a bit disconnected at times only because we pretty much took on individual tasks, but overall we communicated well. The only member I felt was a bit negative was Student x - he seemed to find our tasks (especially the style guide) less than useful for the project so Student x and I had to edit it.
  o I felt bad for Student x since this team had a hard time, partly due to waiting on final edited chapters but I think it was also too many people for too few tasks. I think he did a wonderful job a being a positive and encouraging team leader and I think Student x and I were especially helpful as we helped create covers, logos and edit graphs for the presentation. Student x received low scores because I don't think he helped with any layouts and Student x was very negative in this team. He seemed very frustrated as well, so perhaps there were underlying reasons I didn't know of.
  o So much data work was completed. This team really went above and beyond. Distribution of work was initially even, but a couple people did end up pulling in more work. Some quiet individuals may have felt comfortable to sit back and let the team direct/carry the weight.
o Some aggressive/ineffective communication between some group members = tense environment

o Great team - efficient, flexible and worked well together to power through the work. The only "slowdown", understandably, was related to maps (some errors and last minute revisions made) Otherwise, great group effort and team dynamic

o We didn't really need much discussion outside of class as everyone knew what they were responsible for. I am not aware of the amount of work submitted by each person because I never saw the finished deliverables as a whole. Good group, well-focused, clear responsibilities and exchange of ideas

o I really disliked working in this group. An incompetent leader ran it as a dictatorship. The focus was minimal, the exchange of ideas were spoken and then quickly crushed by the iron fist of the almighty leader. I was extremely frustrated by the lack of direction and collaborative effort. I could have easily followed an idea if it was well thought out and consistent but that was about as opposite of reality as it could have been.

o One important thing to note is that our team basically split off into two, almost entirely separate groups. As such, it is hard for me to completely evaluate the efforts of the other half of the group. Student x was in the sort of difficult position of being the "learner" in the mapping group, but he was very responsive and patient. He was a great map proofer.

o Some (most really) of the conflicts that arose in phase 1 became massively amplified throughout phase 2. The stresses of the interpersonal dynamics of this phase have, honestly, left me feeling scarred. I am choosing to use this as a learning experience, but I feel that Student x's passive-aggressive email missives really soured this class for me. He endlessly criticized our work (especially during presentations) but offered no solutions and managed to do very little work himself. We tried rather extensively to avoid bringing the instructors into the process, but when communication failed we came to you - THANK YOU for stepping in.

o This group was an enlightening experience. However, it was also unsuccessful. My time, respect, and integrity were ruthlessly disregarded, possibly because of personal differences & miscommunication and perhaps to redirect accountability. Despite all the drama, none of the maps created were of professional quality - I personally re-did them during the Presentation phase (phase 3). The tension in the group was apparent from the start, and I feel as if "set myself up" by letting Student x & Student x leave the group.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?

• In Fall, 2010 the instructor of URBP-201 noted:
  o Students might benefit from knowing the criteria with which they will be evaluated, earlier in the semester.
  o Since the work in URBP-201 takes place in three phases, it might be better to have students complete evaluations after each phase while their experience in the phase is fresh in their minds.
  o Instructions for completing the evaluation rubrics should be clearer – some students evaluated themselves (which they were not supposed to do).
  o The qualitative comments that the students add to the evaluation forms appear to be far more useful for assessment purposes than the 1-5 scoring system.
  o The evaluation rubric should be revised to better capture team leader rankings, since almost all students in the class have an opportunity to serve as a team leader across the project’s three phases.
  o Continue with the instructor-led conversations at the beginning and end of the course designed to elicit student concerns, fears, goals, successes related to effective interpersonal and group dynamics. Bolster this by adding one additional discussion on these topics midway through the semester, as a “check in” to gauge effectiveness and to address group dynamic problems earlier in the semester.
**SLO-10**

*Synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to actual planning problems.*

The assessment tool used to measure student learning is:
The "Internship Supervisor’s Evaluation of Student Intern Performance" form that is completed at the end of the internship. The students needed to achieve a score of 3 or better on Question 9, which asks intern supervisors to rank a student on a scale of 1 (very low performance) to 5 (very high performance) on this criterion: “Ability to synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to actual planning problems”.

This SLO was first assessed in:
Spring, 2006

This SLO was most recently assessed in:
Spring, 2007
Fall, 2010

Past changes made to the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning:
Since 100% of students in past reviews met the criteria of synthesizing planning knowledge and applying it to actual planning problems, no changes were warranted.

Evidence of student learning after the change:
No changes to curriculum or pedagogy were instituted (see above). In Fall, 2010 the internship supervisor evaluation forms from Fall, 2008 to Fall, 2010 were collected. 100% of students during this period met the learning objective.

Looking ahead, what further changes might be considered to improve student learning?
Not applicable: students have consistently met this learning objective over the years since data collection began.