

PUBLIC INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PERFORMANCE (2023)

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 2022 for a period of 7 years, effective January 1, 2023 -December 31, 2029. 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)

2022-23 graduates that feel “confident” to “extremely confident” in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=16)
Written Communication	100%
Oral Communication	100%
Graphic Communication	88%
Data Collection and Analysis	94%
Digital Media/Software Proficiency	94%
Team Management and Mechanics	100%
Project Planning and Results	100%

2022-23 graduates that feel “confident” to “extremely confident” in their skills/knowledge of:	Percent (n=16)
Planning Analysis	88%
Integrated Planning	80%
Professional Ethics and Responsibility	82%
Equity, Diversity and Social Justice	87%
Sustainable Strategies in Planning	88%

Student Achievement: Direct Assessment

(Evaluation of Student Skills/Work)

This assessment measures the skills demonstrated by students in PLG 611: Projects in Regional Planning

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.

2023 Class Average Scores			
Communication		Planning Tools	
Written	2.68	Analysis	2.71
Oral	2.76	Data	2.78
Graphic	2.67	Software	2.66
Key Planning Elements		Teamwork and Project Management	
Integrated Planning	2.71	Project planning and results	2.55
Field area proficiency	2.78	Team management and mechanics	2.59
Equity	2.74		
Ethics	2.74		

Other Program Information and Outcomes

2023-24 Tuition and Fees	
In-State Residents, per full-time academic year	\$12,718
<i>Note: Residents from 16 participating Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) states and territories are eligible for Arizona resident tuition pricing.</i>	
Out-of-State Residents, per full-time academic year	\$32,290
International Students, per full-time academic year	\$32,290
Annual Program Fees (in addition to tuition above)	\$3,000

Student Retention Rate	Percent
Percentage of students who began studies in fall 2022 and continued into fall 2023	100%

Student Graduation Rate	Percent
Percentage of students graduating within 4 years (entering class of 2019)	100%

Number of Degrees Awarded	
Number of degrees awarded for the 2022-2023 academic year	16

AICP Certification	Percent
Percentage of master's graduates taking the AICP exam* within 3 years of graduation who pass (graduating class of 2019)	100%

Employment	Percent
Percentage of graduates obtaining professional planning, planning-related or other positions within 12 months of graduation, graduating class of 2022	95%

Learning Assessment Rubrics

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

Dimensions	Written	Oral	Graphical
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Writing is clear, concise and essentially error-free. The document is clearly of professional quality. Writing flows smoothly with logic and clear transitions.	Student meets #2 plus 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 demonstrating concise and easy-to-understand graphical presentation of material, where appropriate. Visuals are clear, legible, and depict information accurately.
2 - Meets Requirements	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 may not be fully clear or legible, or it may be difficult to determine if information is used accurately or not.
1 - Unsatisfactory	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.	The graphical work has no main idea. It is unclear and/or illegible, and/or it may not depict information accurately.

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

Dimensions	Analysis	Data	Software
3 - Exceeds Requirements	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.
2 - Meets Requirements	Going beyond simply presenting information, student is 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.
1 - Unsatisfactory	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	Integrated Planning	Field Area Proficiency	Equity	Ethics
3 - Exceeds Requirements	Student proactively makes connections between different areas of planning and is able to track and address multiple planning elements at the same time. This may correspond with comprehensive planning processes or other interdisciplinary planning projects.	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.
2 - Meets Requirements	Student has sufficient understanding of the ways different planning element fit together into an integrated 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.
1 - Unsatisfactory	Student has minimal understanding of the ways different planning elements fit together into an integrated 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
3 - Exceeds Requirements	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.
2 - Meets Requirements	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).
1 - Unsatisfactory	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.