

**URBP 298B Planning Report Rubric Used to Assess PLOs 1, 2, and 4
(Threshold to meet SLO is “good”)**

CRITERIA	Excel- lent	Good	Mar- ginal	Unaccept- able	NA	Rat- ing	Weight	
Outcome 1. Demonstrates ability to conceptualize problems from complex, real world situations so the problems are meaningful to clients, and are research worthy (maximum score: 12)								0
1. Are the research questions and/or goals well defined and clearly stated?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
2. Does the author demonstrate in-depth familiarity with relevant literature on the subject?	4	3	2	1			1.5	0
3. Is the methodology appropriate to answer the research question(s)?	4	3	2	1			1	0
Outcome 2. Demonstrates ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize information from multiple sources (maximum score: 16)								0
4. Is the data collected sufficient in quality and depth to answer the research question?	4	3	2	1			1.5	0
5. Is the analysis direct, competent, and appropriate?	4	3	2	1			1.5	0
6. Are the conclusions sophisticated and based on the results of the analysis, as a logical extension of the findings?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
7. Does the author show how his/her analysis and findings fit into the larger context of the literature and current professional practice?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
Outcome 3. Demonstrates ability to communicate effectively in writing and by expressing concepts in visual terms (maximum score: 12)								0
8. Is the material logically organized , so that a reader can easily follow the writer’s train of thought?	4	3	2	1			1	0
9. Is the writing grammatically correct and free of typos?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
10. Do tables and figures add useful/important information for the reader?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
11. Is the report attractive and professional in appearance?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
12. Are citations included where appropriate, and are footnotes and bibliography properly formatted?	4	3	2	1			0.5	0
Overall Score								0

Excellent: As a supervisor, you would consider this work ready for public distribution without any substantial modification.

Good: As a supervisor, you would consider this work essentially sound, but in need of some refinement before public distribution.

Marginal: As a supervisor, you would conclude that the work contained some worthwhile elements, but required major revisions before public distribution.

Unacceptable: The work needs to be entirely redone.

URBP 201 Collaborative Teamwork Evaluation Rubric (PLO 3)

Criteria	Excellent: Consistently went above and beyond what was necessary. Exceptionally well prepared and cooperative. Always completed agreed-upon assignments by agreed-upon deadlines. An exceptional team member in all aspects.	Good: Consistently did what was necessary. Well prepared and cooperative. Almost always completed agreed-upon tasks by agreed-upon deadlines. A good team member in all aspects.	Satisfactory: Usually did what was necessary. Minimally well prepared and cooperative. Occasionally did not complete agreed upon assignments by agreed upon deadlines. A satisfactory team member in almost all aspects.	Marginal: Sometimes failed to show up or complete agreed upon assignments. Rarely well prepared. A marginal team member.	Unsatisfactory: Consistently failed to show up or complete agreed upon assignments. Unprepared and had virtually no participation in the team's accomplishments. An unsatisfactory team member.
Participated in group discussion or meetings					
Helped keep group focused on the task					
Contributed useful ideas					
Gathered useful data					
Quantity of work done					
Quality of work done					
Completed assigned tasks/deliverables on time					
Effective team leader/facilitator					
Effective team transcriber/note-taker					

Scores are assigned to each student, for each criteria, on a scale of 1 to 5. To meet the department's threshold, students must earn an average score of 4.3 or higher.

URBP 201 Rubric Evaluating Collaborative Engagement with Stakeholders that Incorporates Multicultural and Historical Perspectives (PLO 5)

CRITERIA	EXCEPTIONAL (EXCEEDS THRESHOLD)	GOOD (DEPARTMENT THRESHOLD)	BELOW AVERAGE (BELOW THRESHOLD)
<p>(1)</p> <p><i>List at least two ways that our work in URBP-201 this semester has advanced community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>Also, describe at least one way that we have deliberately incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives of the study neighborhood into the advancement of community priorities.</i></p>	<p>Student exceeded the minimum assignment requirements by, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describing more than two methods that we used in the course to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and more than one way in which we have incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives in this regard. • Exceptional level of detail in articulating and describing these methods, especially when considering the short timeframe given to complete the assignment 	<p>Student met the minimum assignment requirements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describing two methods that we used in the course to advance community priorities through collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and one way in which we have incorporated multicultural and historical perspectives in this regard. • Adequate level of detail in articulating and describing these methods 	<p>The student presented material that was substandard in any or all of the aspects of this assignment; for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not listing at least two methods of collaborative engagement • Not listing one method of incorporating multicultural and historical perspectives • Missing, unclear and vague attempts to address the assignment tasks • Clear evidence that minimal effort was devoted to completing this assignment

Internship Evaluation Rubric (PLO 2a, 2c, and 4)

Rating of Intern/Employee Performance:

Please rate the student's performance on the following criteria on a scale from 1 (very low performance) to 5 (very high performance).

Ability to work effectively on a team

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Ability to compose written reports and memos

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Ability to make an oral presentation

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Ability to interface with the public or clients

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Ability to solve problems and think creatively

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Initiative and ability to work independently

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Knowledge expected of an entry-level employee

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Understanding of professional planning issues

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed

Ability to synthesize planning knowledge and apply it to actual planning problems

1 2 3 4 5 Not assessed