

Program Assessment: Annual Report

Program(s): Master of Science Urban Planning and Development
Department: School of Social Work
College/School: College of Public Health and Social Justice
Date: June 28, 2019
Primary Assessment Contact: Sarah Coffin, Program Director – sarah.coffin@slu.edu

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

PLO 1 - Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history, theory, economics, administration, law, and politics of planning and apply that knowledge to the problems of planning systems.
PLO 5 - Students will demonstrate culturally competent practice in their engagement with local communities

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

We collected final capstone projects. We do not yet have an assessment tool for UPD 5900 and we have not yet had a student process through our new internship protocol. We have not had any graduating students ready for the exit survey. We expect to collect our first data points in May, 2019, to be assessed during the next cycle.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

We only had one artifact to examine this year. It was sent to the 8 members of the assessment team in March, with instructions on how to conduct the assessment using the rubrics for the two PLOs to be assessed. Each member of the program committee examined the capstone artifacts independently, providing a written assessment based on the rubrics developed for the assessment plan. These were sent to the program director prior to the May meeting where we discussed our findings. We then met and discussed our findings and plans for any necessary changes to both the program and assessment process.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

For PLO #1, all 8 members of the assessment team agreed that all of the artifacts examined met or exceeded expectations with an average overall score for the rubric of 2.938 out of 4 possible points. This suggests that students are able to demonstrate their knowledge of history, theory, administration, law, and politics of planning and could apply that knowledge to planning systems. Student knowledge of planning theories, planning history, and politics all scored 2.625 on the rubric. Student knowledge of legal and administrative planning issues scored the highest at 3.

Even though the score for the politics component of the rubric was the same as the scores for planning theories and history, all 8 members thought the weakest component of that learning outcome involved student knowledge of political influences.

For PLO #5, all 8 members of the assessment team agreed that all of the artifacts examined met or exceeded expectations with an average overall score for the rubric of 2.906 out of 4 possible points. This suggests that students are able to demonstrate culturally competent practice in their engagement with local communities. Student cultural self-awareness and student attitudes toward cultural competence both scored 2.875 on the rubric, and verbal and non-verbal communication scored 2.625. Team members agreed that an additional artifact that assessed student presentations was needed to better assess this component of the PLO. Student knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks scored the highest at 3.25.

The committee agreed that more artifacts are needed to be able to comprehensively assess the learning outcomes in the future. Those artifacts will be in place and ready for analysis next year when we conduct our next assessment

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

The findings from PLO #1 generated a discussion about whether students might benefit from more instruction on policy advocacy and policy process. Given that we did not assess all artifacts for this first round, we plan to observe for the next round of assessment.

The findings from PLO #5 generated a discussion about whether students are fully instructed on the components of Ignatian spirituality and those tenets can guide students in their engagement with the community. All agreed that an additional artifact that measured competence related to oral presentations was needed.

A more general discussion generated concerns about how students proofread their work. What kinds of resources do students have access to when they are finalizing big projects like a capstone. The graduate writing center does not offer proofreading services so students who cannot afford to hire someone must rely on friends and family.

There was also discussion about international students and how they are supported through the program. Given that the focus is very localized to St Louis, there is concern that international students might find it difficult to connect with the material. A suggestion was made to pair international students with a local mentor early on in the program to help them engage with the program and the region.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

N/A This is our first assessment

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

PLO 1 Rubric: Students will demonstrate knowledge of history, theory, administration, law and politics of planning & apply that knowledge to the problems of planning systems.

Measure of Learning Outcome	Excels expectations 4 pts	Above expectations 3 pts	Meets expectations 2 pts	Needs improvement 1 pt	
Students will demonstrate their knowledge of planning theories and their application to the problems of planning systems	Demonstrates clear and specific application of planning theories to the problems of planning systems, documenting how planning theories help us understand the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project.	Correctly connects general planning theories to the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project Number of team members – 5 Total Score = 15	Establishes general connections to planning theories and demonstrates application to problems of planning systems Number of team members – 3 Total Score = 6	General application of planning theory to the problems of planning systems can be seen in document	21/8 = 2.625
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of planning systems and how they inform the problems of planning systems over time.	Demonstrates clear and specific application of historical planning systems to current planning systems, documenting how planning history helps us understand the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project.	Correctly connects general historical planning systems to the current planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project Number of team members – 5 Total Score = 15	Establishes general connections to planning history and demonstrates application to problems of planning systems Number of team members – 3 Total Score = 6	Only general application of planning history to the problems of planning systems can be seen in document	21/8 = 2.625
Students will demonstrate an understanding for how legal and administrative planning frameworks inform the problems of planning systems.	Demonstrates clear and specific application of legal and administrative planning frameworks to the problems of planning systems, documenting how legal and administrative planning frameworks help us address the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project. Number of team members – 1 Total Score = 4	Correctly connects legal and administrative planning frameworks to the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project Number of team members - 5	Establishes general connections to legal and administrative planning frameworks and demonstrates application to problems of planning systems Number of team members – 2 Total Score = 4	Only general application of legal and administrative planning frameworks to the problems of planning systems can be seen in document	24/8 = 3.000
Students will demonstrate and understanding for how politics influences the problems of planning systems.	Demonstrates clear and specific knowledge of how politics influences the problems of planning systems, documenting how the politics of specific planning problems have informed planning outcomes, as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project. Number of team members – 1 Total Score = 4	Correctly connects general ways in which politics influences the problems of planning systems as evidenced by the planning problem being addressed in the project Number of team members – 3 Total Score = 9	Establishes general connections to political influences on planning systems and demonstrates application to problems within those planning systems Number of team members – 4 Total Score = 8	Only general discussion of how politics influences the problems of planning systems can be seen in document	21/8 = 2.625
					2.938

PLO 5¹: Students will demonstrate culturally competent practice in their engagement with local communities

Measure of Learning Outcome	Excels expectations 4 pts	Above expectations 3 pts	Meets expectations 2 pts	Needs improvement 1 pt	
Cultural Self-Awareness	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity. Number of team members – 3 Total Score = 12	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures. Number of team members – 1 Total Score = 3	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures. Number of team members – 4 Total Score = 8	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	2.875
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices. Number of team members – 2 Total Score = 8	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices. Number of team members – 6 Total Score = 18	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	3.250
Verbal and nonverbal communication	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences. Number of team members – 5 Total Score = 15	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding. Number of team members – 3 Total Score = 6	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	2.625
Attitudes	Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions. Number of team members – 7 Total Score = 21	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures. Number of team members – 1 Total Score = 2	States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.	2.875
					2.906

¹Adapted from Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>