Annual Assessment Report 2020-2021

BS Urban & Regional Planning

Urban & Regional Planning

College of Environmental Design

CONTACT
Name of Program Assessment Lead Gwen Urey
Name of Person Completing Report Gwen Urey

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION Yes

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)
- o Our disciplinary accrediting agency has <u>required</u> learning outcomes, so we use them
- o We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.
- Department Website - provide URL: https://www.cpp.edu/env/urp/degreesadmissions/undergraduate-program.shtml

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2020-2021

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2020-2021.** This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?
- 11+

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2020-2021?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2020-2021

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: Mastery of urban and regional planning knowledge--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing theory, role of planning, planning law, history, and a subfield
- SLO #2: Demonstrated communication and dialogic skills--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing written, oral and graphic forms of communication, clearly discussing planning concepts, listening/interpreting in diverse settings; facilitating and negotiating in planning settings; and leadership and collaboration.
- SLO #3: Demonstrated skills and creativity in research, analysis, and problem solving--4 specific areas are articulated, addressing primary data collection, secondary data collection, analytic skills, and models used for policy analysis
- SLO #4: Demonstrated skills and creativity in design, plan, and policy making--6 specific areas are articulated, addressing aspects of planning practice
- SLO #5: Reflective capacity in ethical and normative reasoning--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing reflective practices, professional ethics, cultural competence, and a commitment to civic engagement

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): **SLO 1: Mastery of urban and regional planning knowledge--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing theory, role of planning, planning law, history, and a subfield**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning	• Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation etc.)	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning	• Alumni survey/interview/focus group that contains self reports on SLO achievement	
• Investigated other pressing issues related to SLO achievement. Please explain: Applied, received, and began work on a curriculum redesign research project to assess how the new "options" are working from students' perspectives.		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	**Criterion Used**	**Goal Met**	**Eye-opening Result**
50 presentations, 124 alumni surveys	mean score for presentations, % agreeing on surveys	yes	each presentation was scored by a faculty member and by a practitioner. Practitioner scores were slightly higher on all criteria.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2: Demonstrated communication and dialogic skills--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing written, oral and graphic forms of communication, clearly discussing planning concepts, listening/interpreting in diverse settings; facilitating and negotiating in planning settings; and leadership and collaboration.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning	• Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation etc.)	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning	• Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self assessment) on their SLO achievement • Alumni survey/interview/focus group that contains self reports on SLO achievement	
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
50 presentations, 124 alumni surveys	mean score for presentations, % agreeing on surveys	yes	each presentation was scored by a faculty member and by a practitioner. Practitioner scores were slightly higher on all criteria.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 3: Demonstrated skills and creativity in research, analysis, and problem solving--4 specific areas are articulated, addressing primary data collection, secondary data collection, analytic skills, and models used for policy analysis

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning		• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning	• Alumni survey/interview/focus group that contains self reports on SLO achievement	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
50 presentations, 124 alumni surveys	mean score for presentations, % agreeing on surveys	yes	survey results showed lower results for semester alumni than quarter alumni for knowledge and skill areas of the curriculum.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 4: Demonstrated skills and creativity in design, plan, and policy making--6 specific areas are articulated, addressing aspects of planning practice

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning	• Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation etc.)	
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning	• Alumni survey/interview/focus group that contains self reports on SLO achievement	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
50 presentations, 124 alumni surveys	mean score for presentations, % agreeing on surveys	yes	each presentation was scored by a faculty member and by a practitioner. Practitioner scores were slightly higher on all criteria.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): **SLO 5: Reflective capacity in ethical and normative reasoning--5 specific areas are articulated, addressing reflective practices, professional ethics, cultural competence, and a commitment to civic engagement**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning	• Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation etc.)	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored and/or analyzed indirect evidence of student learning	• Alumni survey/interview/focus group that contains self reports on SLO achievement	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	**Criterion Used**	**Goal Met**	**Eye-opening Result**
50 presentations, 124 alumni surveys	mean score for presentations, % agreeing on surveys	yes	survey results showed higher results for semester alumni than quarter alumni for cultural competence/community engagement areas of the curriculum.

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2020-2021? Select all that apply.
- Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions are ongoing, etc.)
- Other, please explain: Our curriculum redesign project will finish this year. Our external review is happening right now.

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2020-2021? Select all that apply.
- Program/department faculty as whole
- Students

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2020-2021 so that others may learn from your experiences.
 xx

CPP's GI2025 goals focus on eliminating equity gaps. What plans do you already implement, or would implement to support the campus' diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts? (e.g., planned or current disaggregation of assessment data by race/ethnicity, etc.)
Curriculum review to make course content more anti-racist, and to fill in gaps left by the canon of the urban planning discipline.

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found here. To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan No

Curriculum Matrix Yes

If you would like us to review other assessment documents such as your evidence (e.g., assignment, survey, interview questions, etc.) or scoring rubric, please upload them (Select all that apply)

- Other, please explain: Our self study for our external reviewer, although your interface did not let me upload the "evidence" file.