

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: November 30, 2021
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 3 - Students will analyze ethical implications of planning practice.
PLO 4 - Students will employ clear and concise oral and written communication.

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

We collected final capstone projects, evaluations of capstone presentations, studio reports for UPD 5900, and the employer evaluations and student reflection essays for UPD 5910 - Internship.
There are no Madrid students in the program

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.

This is our first assessment since COVID and since the decision by the APRC to restructure the UPD program. The future of the program is still uncertain, but we know we will be moving into a new college. We are not sure in what form our program will emerge but we were advised that restructuring will likely mean an end to the current program structure. That means that we will most likely be developing a new assessment plan once the details of the new form of the program begin to emerge. In the meantime, we will continue to assess the program using the current plan. As such, we no longer have a full assessment committee. My colleague, Bob Lewis, and I independently examined the capstone artifacts based on the rubrics developed for the assessment plan. We followed the independent assessment with a face-to-face meeting to discuss 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 3 we realized that while the AICP code of ethics was discussed in a few sessions in a few classes throughout the curriculum, there were no reinforcement mechanisms for these concepts in class assignments.
For PLO 4 we noticed that students seem to improve over the course of the program. Artifacts from the studio class (UPD 5900) demonstrated more limited communication abilities, while artifacts from the capstone class demonstrated markedly improved communication skills. The studio course is taken during the student's second semester while the capstone is taken during their last semester.

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?

For PLO 3 we plan to require that assignment components that assess this skill be incorporated into assignments across the curriculum. Students are introduced to the concepts in the first class they take during their program but it has never been assessed. We note that ethics is a skill that needs to be scaffolded. We plan to do that in the remaining classes. We are additionally identifying areas where we can incorporate Ignatian values per the previous assessment from 2019.

For PLO 4 we plan to add peer writing critiques to the curriculum into the studio class (UPD 5900) to strengthen those communication skills.

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?*)

We have not yet added the additional assessment for oral communication. We are waiting to see what the outcome will be for the program. We imagine we will need to create a new assessment plan. We will develop the rubric at that time.

Likewise, we are still working out how Ignatian spirituality can be added to the curriculum. We are identifying areas where Ignatian content can be incorporated into the current curriculum.

We were able to close the loop with international students, pairing them with local UPD mentors. Unfortunately, COVID interrupted those efforts so we do not know how those early efforts impacted international student experiences as several left during COVID to finish the program in their home countries. Going forward we plan to setup new international students with local mentors once our program is back up and running. As of right now we have no international students

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

PLO 3¹: Students will analyze ethical implications of planning practice.

Learning Outcome	Excels Expectations 4 pts	Exceeds Expectations 3 pts	Above Expectations 2 pts	Benchmark 1 pt	
Ethical Self-Awareness	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs as they related to the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) code of ethics and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs as they relate to the AICP Code of Ethics.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs as they relate to the AICP Code of Ethics.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs as they relate to the AICP Code of Ethics but not both. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 2	2/2 = 1
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student names the specific AICP code(s), can present the gist of said code(s), and accurately explains the details of the code(s) used.	Student can name the major AICP code(s) she/he uses, can present the gist of said code(s), & attempts to explain the details of the code(s) used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can cite general AICP code of ethics and is only able to present the gist of the named code.	Student only names the major AICP codes. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 2	2/2 = 1
Ethical Issue Recognition	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context & can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues. # of team members: 1 Total Score: 3	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues. # of team members: 1 Total Score: 2	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.	5/2 = 2.5
Application of ethical perspectives/concepts	Student can establish clear and specific connections to the AICP Code of Ethics, citing sections and ways the code applies to the planning project. Provides detailed discussion of how ethical situations might be handled in the future.	In addition to a general connection to the AICP Code of Ethics, makes specific connections to elements within the code that apply to the planning problem being analyzed.	Establishes general connections to AICP Code of Ethics and discusses how the Code applies to the planning problem being analyzed.	Makes reference to AICP Code of Ethics in final document and discusses how ethics apply to the planning problem being analyzed. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 2	2/2 = 1
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts based on the AICP Code of Ethics, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts based on the AICP Code of Ethics, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts based on the AICP Code of Ethics but does not respond to them.	Student states a position based on the AICP Code of Ethics but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 2	2/2 = 1
					1.3

¹ Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/ethical-reasoning-value-rubric>

PLO 4²: Students will employ clear and concise oral and written communication.

Learning Outcome	Excels Expectations 4pts	Exceeds Expectations 3 pts	Above Expectations 2 pts	Benchmark 1 pt	
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). # of team members: 1 Total Score: 3	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). # of team members: 1 Total Score: 2	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	5/2 = 2.5
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 6	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	6/2 = 3
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices # of team members: 2 Total Score: 6	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.	6/2 = 3
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 6	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.	6/2 = 3
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors. # of team members: 2 Total Score: 6	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	6/2 = 3
					2.9

² Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Written Communication VALUE Rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/written-communication>