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Session Outline

• Introduction
• Context
• Focus on student learning at program level
• Review and analysis of planning programs’ definition of learning outcomes
• View from the PAB
• Experience of Iowa State University
• Summing up and thoughts about “meeting the challenge”
• Questions, answers, and discussion
Convenor’s Perspective

• 39 years as faculty member in Planning
• 14 years as university liaison with regional accreditation agencies (SACS, WASC)
• 11 years overseeing specialized/professional accreditation and program reviews
Purpose

Accreditation is a means of providing formal recognition that a program indeed measures up to the profession's high educational standards and is therefore qualified to train its future practitioners.

The accreditation program also seeks to:
• Provide assurances to prospective students, employers, and the public-at-large regarding the basic quality of accredited programs;
• Provide schools with an incentive for careful and thorough self-examination, and with constructive recommendations for improvement;
• Provide schools with information on trends and innovations in planning education, using knowledge gained through the ongoing accreditation review process;
• Assist planning faculty and administrators in achieving institutional support for their programs;
• Provide a vehicle for engaging practitioners and academicians in joint and ongoing deliberations regarding the roles, content, and effectiveness of planning education;
• Aid in the process of preparing planners for membership in the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), and assist AICP in evaluating the qualifications of applicants for certification.
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Measuring the Quality of Learning: From Inputs to Outputs in Planning Education
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Regional & Specialized/Professional Accreditation in Transition
Early Nineties - Present

Inputs → Outcomes
Teacher-centered → Learner-centered
Compliance → Improvement → Improvement & Accountability
Summative → Formative → Both
Drivers for Accountability

- Federal & state politicians (both parties)
- US Department of Education
- Media
- Public at large

- It’s the right thing to do ......??
Outcomes

• Student learning: the heart of the matter
• Productivity (retention, graduation, time-to-degree, etc.)
• Other expectations of a professional program (contributions to the profession, service to the community, etc.)
Assessment Cycle at Program Level

- Define programmatic learning outcomes/objectives
- Ensure alignment with learning outcomes/objectives at other levels (e.g., university, course)
- Seek evidence of achievement (e.g., define performance indicators; seek data)
- Use results for improvement and accountability
Acceptable Evidence of Learning at the Program Level

• Indirect, e.g., student surveys, alumni surveys, exit interviews, etc.

• Direct, e.g., review of student work in projects, theses, internships, etc.; imbedded questions in coursework; comprehensive exams; etc.
  – intentional
  – not grades

• Direct measures essential; multiple methods preferred
Have We Taken the First Step?
Planning Programs’ Definition of Learning Outcomes

Methodology

• Simple question to all departments housing ACSP- accredited planning programs
  – Does your program have student learning objectives or outcomes identified and approved (by your faculty) at the degree program level? Yes/No
  – Separate answers if more than one planning program
  – If answer is “yes,” send copy(ies)

• Analysis
  – Frequencies
  – Adaptation of WASC rubric applied to content
# Adaptation of WASC Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive List</td>
<td>List of outcomes problematic, e.g., very incomplete, inappropriate, disorganized.</td>
<td>List includes reasonable outcomes but not specify expectations for program as a whole.</td>
<td>List is well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on key knowledge, skills and values.</td>
<td>List is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessable Outcomes</td>
<td>Outcome statements not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning.</td>
<td>Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.</td>
<td>Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate their learning.</td>
<td>Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements such as rubrics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Findings to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions surveyed</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions reporting learning outcomes defined</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions providing copies of learning outcomes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Analysis of Programmatic Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions sending learning outcomes</th>
<th>Pre-initial</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asking Too Much?

• Not asking more of ourselves than we would expect of our students
  – Evidence-driven decision-making
• No need to assess against all learning objectives every year
  – Assessment plan
• Minimize workload, e.g.,
  – Build on existing practices
  – Use sampling techniques
• Make a good-faith effort