PUBLIC INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PERFORMANCE (2019)

School of Landscape Architecture & Planning | College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture

Our two-year **Master of Science in Urban Planning Program** (MS Urban Planning) at the University of Arizona is accredited by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB). The MS Urban Planning Program was last accredited in 2016 for a period of 5 years. The Planning Accreditation Board (http://www.planningaccreditationboard.org), which oversees accreditation for all planning degree programs in North America, requires that each program tracks and publishes key indicators of program performance. This information is intended to help potential students make informed application decisions.

Student Achievement: Indirect Assessment

(Survey of MS Urban Planning Graduates)

2018-19 graduates that feel "confident" to "extremely confident" in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=12)
Planning Skills	
Written Communication	100%
Oral Communication	100%
Graphic Communication	100%
Data Collection and Analysis	75%
Geospatial Technology	67%
Comprehensive Plan Making	67%
Working in Multi-Disciplinary Teams	75%
Leadership Skills	100%
Equity	83%

2018-19 graduates that feel "confident" to "extremely confident" in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=11)
Planning Topic	
Purpose and Meaning of Planning	100%
Planning Theory	82%
Planning Law	82%
Human Settlements	100%
History of Planning	73%
The Future	100%
Global Dimensions of Planning	82%
Values and Ethics	
Professional Ethics & Responsibility	82%
Governance & Participation	91%
Planning in Arid Regions	72%
Planning with Diverse Communities	64%
Sustainability & Environmental Quality	82%
Growth & Development	82%
Social Justice	73%

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Student Achievement: Direct Assessment *(Evaluation of Student Skills/Work)*

This assessment measures the skills demonstrated by students in PLG 611 Projects in Urban Planning, a second year capstone studio course.

The scores are based on a three-point scale:

3 - Exceeds requirements

2 - Meets requirements

1 - Unsatisfactory

The rubrics used for this assessment can be found on page 3.

	2019 Class Average Scores
Communication	
Written	2.67
Oral	2.83
Graphic	2.67
Planning Tools	
Analysis	2.42
Data	2.42
Software	2.50
Key Planning Elements	
Comprehensive plan making	2.50
Field area proficiency	2.58
Equity	2.92
Ethics	2.92
Teamwork and Project Management	
Project planning and results	2.42
Team management and mechanics	2.33
Team interaction	2.33

Other Program Information and Outcomes

2019-20 Tuition and Fees	
In-State Residents, per full-time academic year	$11,400
Out-of-State Residents, per full-time academic year	$22,400
International Students, per full-time academic year	$22,400
Program fees (in addition to tuition above)	$4,000

Student Retention Rate	Percent
Percentage of students who began studies in fall 2018 and continued into fall 2019	90%

Student Graduation Rate	Percent
Percentage of students graduating within 4 years, entering class of 2015	90%

Number of Degrees Awarded	
Number of degrees awarded for the 2018-2019 academic year	13

AICP Certification Percentage	Percent
Percentage of master's graduates taking the AICP exam within 5 years who pass: graduating class of 2014	100%

*Since 2010, 26 University of Arizona graduates have passed the AICP exam.

Employment	Percent
Percentage of graduates obtaining professional planning, planning-related or other positions within 12 months of graduation, graduating class of 2018	100%

Rubric for Assessing Planning Projects MS Urban Planning Capstone (PLG 611) - Communication

Dimensions	Written	Oral	Graphical
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Writing is clear, concise and essentially error-free. The document is clearly of professional quality. Writing flows smoothly with logic and clear transitions.	Student presents clear transitions and summary information at appropriate points during the presentation. Visuals are especially well-designed and rely on graphic images in addition to word charts and tables of numbers.	Students use of visuals exceeds basic requirements by clearly being of professional quality and expertly communicating complex ideas in support of textual or verbal descriptions. Graphic styles are consistent and complementary throughout a document or presentation.
2 - Meets Requirements	There are some grammatical or mechanical errors in the paper, but these errors did not interfere with the reader's understanding. Style, format and documentation of sources follow convention. Sequencing of ideas and transitions between paragraphs and sections is adequate, but could be improved.	Student provides a "road map" for the presentation and develops his/her topic in a way that is easy to follow. Any visuals used are clear and reinforce the presenter's message	Visuals are used appropriately to complement written and oral presentation. Visuals are clear, legible, and fit seamlessly into the paper or presentation.
1 - Unsatisfactory	Paper contains multiple errors in writing mechanics. Writing doesn't follow conventional style/ format. The writer's purpose isn't fully achieved, and parts of the assignment may not be fulfilled. The use of research and sources is inadequate.	Student neither communicates a clear structure or "road map" for the presentation nor provides an introduction that helps the audience anticipate the content and flow of the presentation.	Visuals are presented out of context or in ways that are not integrated seamlessly into the content of the document or presentation. Graphics are confusing and not easily legible to readers on first glance.

Rubric for Assessing Planning Projects MS Urban Planning Capstone (PLG 611) - Planning Tools

Dimensions	Analysis	Data	Software
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Student shows clear mastery and understanding of complex relationships between different sets of data and different elements of planning. Conclusions drawn from analysis are logically sound, and well-supported by evidence.	Student has an excellent understanding of standard planning data sets and is able do such things as create new variables and incorporate other less common data sets where appropriate.	Student demonstrates a mastery of software, including an ability to help other students who may be less proficient.
2 - Meets Requirements	Going beyond simply presenting information, student are able to analyze and synthesize complex information in a logically sound manner. Conclusions are well-supported by evidence.	Student displays familiarity with standard planning related data sets, including how to access them and how to make appropriate use of them for decision making. Data sets may vary depending on students field area, but should include U.S. Census data, standard GIS databases, and local and county data sets.	Students demonstrate proficiency in software commonly used by planners and taught in the MS Urban Planning program. These include, but are not limited to, ArcGIS Microsoft Excel, and Adobe Creative Suite.
1 - Unsatisfactory	Student confuses description with analysis and merely presents information.	Student is not able to use standard data sets to answer basic planning related questions about demographic and economic characteristics.	Student lacks proficiency in ArcGIS, Microsoft Excel or Adobe Creative Suite and is unable to use these software packages in a way that contributes to the overall project.

Rubric for Assessing Planning Projects MS Urban Planning Capstone (PLG 611) - Key Planning Elements

Dimensions	Comprehensive Plan Making	Field Area Proficiency	Equity	Ethics
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Student proactively makes connections between different areas of planning and is able to track and address multiple planning elements at the same time.	Student demonstrates a mastery of their chosen field area by taking a lead in elements of the project related to their field area and by teaching students from other field areas about their expertise.	Student considers equity in all decisions, consistently brings equity into group conversations, and thinks of creative solutions to equity related challenges of the project.	Student performs in a manner consistent with AICP code of ethics and proactively works to hold fellow students and the overall project to this standard.
2 - Meets Requirements	Student has sufficient understanding of the ways different planning element fit together into a comprehensive planning framework and demonstrates an ability to make connections between planning decisions in one area and outcomes in another.	Student demonstrates a sufficient understanding of their chosen field area. Demonstrates an ability to apply their field area knowledge and skills to the project at hand. This should be assessed in conjunction with field area appropriate faculty.	Student demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the implications of their planning decisions on social equity and is able to make decisions and craft plans that recognize the plurality of interests in a community context.	Student contributes to project in a manner consistent with the American Institute of Certified Planners code of ethics.
1 - Unsatisfactory	Student has minimal understanding of the ways different planning element fit together into a comprehensive planning framework and is unable to make connections between planning decisions in one area and outcomes in another.	Student does not incorporate skills from their field area into the work of the project or does so in a way that does not convey field area proficiency.	Student has an insufficient understanding of the ways that planning related decisions can disparately impact vulnerable populations.	Student is either unaware of AICP code or acts in a manner inconsistent with ethical principles.

Rubric for Assessing Planning Projects MS Urban Planning Capstone (PLG 611) - Teamwork and Project Management

Dimensions	Project Planning and Results	Team Management and Mechanics	Team Interaction
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Team members clearly understand each member's knowledge and expertise, and effectively utilize each member's skill set. Team agrees upon project focus, establishes written goals and contingency plans. Team's output is integrated and cohesive, of high quality and professional.	Team has a clear statement of expectations for each team member and has mechanisms in place to communicate and check progress. Each team member offers and accepts constructive criticism and feedback. Team is able to resolve conflict effectively through negotiation and compromise. Each team member makes a significant contribution.	Team members actively listen to other members' ideas. Team members are each given discussion time and collaborate together on information and ideas. Discussions and questions are encouraged and alternate viewpoints entertained. Team members show courtesy and respect to other team members. Team members share the leadership role.
2 - Meets Requirements	Team members are aware of each member's knowledge and expertise but do not effectively utilize each member's skill set. Team agrees upon project focus, but does not establish written goals and contingency plans. Team's output is only roughly integrated or of moderate quality and professionalism.	Team has a general statement of expectations for each team member, has basic mechanisms in place to communicate and check progress. Some team members are reluctant to offer or accept constructive criticism and feedback. Decisions are made inconsistently. One team member may contribute more than the other(s).	Team members listen to other members' ideas but may not interact effectively. Team members occasionally discuss and collaborate on information and ideas. Team members are generally courteous and respectful to each other. One member is the agreed upon leader.
1 - Unsatisfactory	Team members are not aware of each member's knowledge and expertise nor do they utilize each member's skill set. Team has difficulty agreeing upon project focus. Team's output is not integrated nor of moderate quality and professional.	Team does not have a statement of expectations for each team member, nor a process in place to communicate and check progress. Team members do not offer or accept constructive criticism and feedback. Decisions are not made or are made inconsistently. One team member controls the project.	Team members struggle to listen to other members' ideas and do not interact effectively. Team members rarely discuss and collaborate on information and ideas. An atmosphere of open communication has not been established. One member is clearly the dominant leader.