

Program:	Urban & Regional Planning, MUP			
Cycle:	2016-2017			
Mission Statement:	To educate and train professional urban planners and researchers to become leaders in developing and applying participatory, evidence-based urban policy and planning practice solutions that move students, and local communities in Texas, in particular, toward a sustainable future.			
Outcome/Objective	Measure	Target	Finding	Action Plan
Outcome 1: Employ tools for attention, formation, strategic decision-making, team building, and organizational/community motivation	<p>Measure 1: At the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Employ tools for attention, formation, strategic decision-making, team building, and organizational/community motivation To measure each outcome, the rubric (uploaded) will be used to rate students in each area according to the level of achievement below. Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the LEADERSHIP item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.	<p>Target: Partially Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Leadership in 2017 was 3.70, continuing the trend downward from previous years. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, but 45.45% received scores 4.0 or better, just below the target of 50%. Since the second part of the target was not met, this target overall is partially met.</p>	Based on the finding that 45% of students received scores of 4.0 or better, changes will be implemented in Plan Making (PLAN 665) and Applied Planning (PLAN 665) to incorporate leadership training. A specialty course in emphasizing public service leadership will be developed and implemented within the next three years.
Outcome 2: Analyze local conditions to develop a valid fact basis	<p>Measure 2: Beginning in 2014-2015, at the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Analyze local conditions to develop a valid fact basis Rubric for measuring this learning outcome: Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the INQUIRY SKILLS item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.	<p>Target: Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Inquiry Skills in 2017 was 3.95, slightly lower than last year. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, and 54.55% received scores 4.0 or better.</p>	<i>No affiliated Action Plan</i>
Outcome 3: Identify, create, and employ theories, concepts, tools, and strategies that lead to a sustainable built, human, and natural environment	<p>Measure 3: Beginning in 2014-2015, at the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Identify, create, and employ theories, concepts, tools, and strategies that lead to a sustainable built, human, and natural environment Rubric for measuring this learning outcome: Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the PLANNING KNOWLEDGE item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.	<p>Target: Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Planning Knowledge in 2017 was 3.92, a slight decrease from previous years. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, and 52.38% received scores 4.0 or better.</p>	<i>No affiliated Action Plan</i>

<p>Outcome 4: Employ a transparent, inclusive process, including consideration of issues related to diversity and social justice, to facilitate coordination among government agencies and private sector organizations</p>	<p>Measure 4: Beginning in 2014-2015, at the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Employ a transparent, inclusive process, including consideration of issues related to diversity and social justice, to facilitate coordination among government agencies and private sector organizations</p> <p>Rubric for measuring this learning outcome: Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	<p>90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the PLANNING PROCESS item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.</p>	<p>Target: Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Planning Process in 2017 was 3.83, a decrease from previous years. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, and 54.55% received scores 4.0 or better.</p>	
<p>Outcome 5: Evaluate the success of plans and programs</p>	<p>Measure 5: Beginning in 2014-2015, at the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Evaluate the success of plans and programs</p> <p>Rubric for measuring this learning outcome: Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	<p>90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the PLAN ASSESSMENT item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.</p>	<p>Target: Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Plan Assessment in 2017 was 3.88, a slight decrease from last year. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, and 54.55% received scores 4.0 or better.</p>	<p><i>No affiliated Action Plan</i></p>
<p>Outcome 6: Communicate and educate through written, visual, and oral channels to achieve these objectives</p>	<p>Beginning in 2014-2015, at the time of the portfolio review, members of the graduate committee will assess the students' ability to: Communicate and educate through written, visual, and oral channels to achieve these objectives</p> <p>Rubric for measuring this learning outcome: Weak = Work quality unacceptable Adequate = Mastery sufficient to successfully complete stage Moderate = Mastery consistently demonstrated, with some areas of excellence Strong = Mastery demonstrated with several areas of excellence; commensurate with junior level professionals Excellent = Mastery demonstrated with excellence; commensurate with mid-career or senior professionals</p>	<p>90% of graduating students should score a 2.5 or better on the rubric; 50% should score a 4.0 or better on the COMMUNICATION SKILLS item of the PORTFOLIO RUBRIC. Targets were determined based on American Planning Association accreditation criteria.</p>	<p>Target: Met For 2016-2017, just over 20 portfolios were reviewed using the rubric. The scores from each committee member were averaged for each student. The overall average for Communication Skills in 2017 was 3.98, a slight decrease from previous years. 100% of portfolios received 2.5 or greater on Leadership, and 68.18% received scores 4.0 or better.</p>	<p><i>No affiliated Action Plan</i></p>

<p>(Analysis Question #1) Consider the Findings and the Action Plan(s) established this cycle. How did the program/unit identify these next steps for action? Why does the program/unit believe this Action Plan(s) should improve future assessment results?</p>	<p>Because we did not fully meet the target for leadership, we chose to focus on improving that area in the next year. The assessment coordinator, the program coordinator, and the department head discussed possible actions, and the program coordinator also discussed the proposed changes with faculty. The immediate change is to add lectures and assignments that enhance students' leadership skills to two core courses. In Plan Making (PLAN 665), relevant theory of leadership skills will be added to the lecture regarding visioning and scenario building process which formulate a policy framework. Students will apply the skills in their required assignment, Vision and Policy Framework. In Applied Planning (PLAN 662), exercises that enhance leadership skills will be added before and during the course project implementation. In addition, a new course, tentatively named as Leadership in Public Services, is currently being developed. A new faculty member with expertise and career experience in public service joined the program for the 17-18 year, but it will take some time to develop the course, get it approved, etc. The course is expected to be offered within the next two-three years. We see this plan as improving future results because it includes both a short term solution by making some changes to courses students already take and also a long term solution by enhancing and strengthening our course offerings in the area of leadership.</p>
<p>(Analysis Question #2) Provide an update for completed or ongoing action plans from the previous year(s). Discuss any successes, challenges, and/or obstacles the program/unit has experienced while implementing the Action Plan(s). Address whether or not the program/unit has seen any improvement in assessment results for the targeted Outcome(s) the Action Plan(s) were designed to address and why the action plan may/may not have resulted in improvements.</p>	<p>Last year's action plan had to do with identifying areas for curricular change to improve students' skills and knowledge in the areas of planning and plan assessment. As an update to that plan, changes were made in PLAN 665 and PLAN 662. In PLAN 665, lectures that help students better understand the planning process were included in Visions of Sustainable Urban form, Visioning and scenario building: Formulating a policy framework, and Introduction to Part IV and Exercise 2. Undeserved communities were chosen for the service-learning projects of PLAN 662. In PLAN 662, students were introduced to exercises that helped them assess the socio-economic impacts of their planning decisions, with a particular emphasis on environmental justice. These changes were implemented for the 16-17 year, and both targets related to planning were met, as they were the previous year. Through the assessment plan we will continue to track students' planning knowledge so that we can observe trends over time to get a better sense of the impact of the changes.</p>