

# PUBLIC INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PERFORMANCE (2020)

Master of Science in Urban Planning | School of Landscape Architecture & Planning

1040 N OLIVE RD | 520-621-1004

CAPLA.ARIZONA.EDU

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)*

2019-20 graduates that feel “somewhat confident” to “extremely confident” in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=10)
<b>Planning Skills</b>	
Written Communication	100%
Oral Communication	100%
Graphic Communication	90%
Data Collection and Analysis	100%
Geospatial Technology	90%
Digital Media/Software Proficiency	90%
Working in Multi-Disciplinary Teams	90%
Leadership Skills	90%
Project Planning and Results	100%

2019-20 graduates that feel “somewhat confident” to “extremely confident” in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=10)
<b>Planning Topic</b>	
Purpose and Meaning of Planning	100%
Planning Theory	100%
Planning Law	100%
Human Settlements	90%
History of Planning	100%
The Future	90%
Global Dimensions of Planning	80%
<b>Values and Ethics</b>	
Professional Ethics & Responsibility	100%
Equity, Diversity, and Social Justice	90%
Governance & Participation	100%
Sustainability & Environmental Quality	90%
Growth & Development	100%
Health and the Built Environment	90%

## 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.

	<b>2020 Class Average Scores</b>
<b>Communication</b>	
Written	2.89
Oral	2.78
Graphic	2.78
<b>Planning Tools</b>	
Analysis	3.00
Data	3.00
Software	2.78
<b>Key Planning Elements</b>	
Comprehensive plan making	3.00
Field area proficiency	3.00
Equity	3.00
Ethics	3.00
<b>Teamwork and Project Management</b>	
Project planning and results	2.89
Team management and mechanics	2.67
Team interaction	2.67

## Other Program Information and Outcomes

<b>2020-21 Tuition and Fees</b>	
In-State Residents, per full-time academic year	\$11,938
Out-of-State Residents, per full-time academic year	\$32,065
International Students, per full-time academic year	\$32,065
Program fees (in addition to tuition above)	\$4,300

<b>Student Retention Rate</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Percentage of students who began studies in fall 2019 and continued into fall 2020	83%

<b>Student Graduation Rate</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Percentage of students graduating within 4 years since 2010	87.5%

<b>Number of Degrees Awarded</b>	
Number of degrees awarded for the 2019-2020 academic year	11

<b>AICP Certification</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Percentage of master's graduates taking the AICP exam within 5 years of graduation who pass (graduates 2015 or later)	71%

*\*Since 2010, 54 University of Arizona graduates have passed the AICP exam.*

<b>Employment</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Percentage of graduates obtaining professional planning, planning- related or other positions within 12 months of graduation, graduating class of 2019	100%

## Learning Assessment Rubrics

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

Dimensions	Written	Oral	Graphical
<b>3 - Exceeds Requirements</b>	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.
<b>2 - Meets Requirements</b>	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.
<b>1 - Unsatisfactory</b>	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
<b>3 - Exceeds Requirements</b>	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 to 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.
<b>2 - Meets Requirements</b>	Going beyond simply presenting information, students 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 student's 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.
<b>1 - Unsatisfactory</b>	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
<b>3 - Exceeds Requirements</b>	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.
<b>2 - Meets Requirements</b>	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.
<b>1 - Unsatisfactory</b>	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
<b>3 - Exceeds Requirements</b>	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.
<b>2 - Meets Requirements</b>	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.
<b>1 - Unsatisfactory</b>	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.