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**Background**

The Master’s Program in Urban Land Development (MSULD) at Sacramento State began in fall 2005 as a collaboration, initiated by the College of Business Administration, between this college and the Department of Public Policy and Administration (PPA). The purpose of the program is to bring together the private (decision-making) and public (policy) aspects of real estate development, and to help students, at the master’s level of professional graduate education, develop the skills needed to develop land in California’s metropolitan areas. The program is interdisciplinary and covers all major aspects of the urban land development process including design, feasibility analysis, land use regulation, market and location analysis, and negotiation. Thus, graduates from the program bridge the gap between land use professional with training in fields such as city planning, government, and public policy and those trained in business administration. Graduates from this program understand the constraints and incentives faced by both the private and public sectors when making land use recommendations and decisions. To complete this master’s program, students must take 21 core units (seven courses), 12 elective units (four courses), and three units of culminating experience (one course). Details are below:

**Required Courses (21 units)**

- MBA 232  Seminar in Negotiation, or PPA 270 Collaborative Policy
- MBA 251  Real Estate Finance and Investment
- MBA 253  Seminar in Real Estate Development (MBA 251 , PPA 250)
- PPA 207  Quantitative Methods in Public Policy and Administration
- PPA 220  Applied Economic Analysis I
- PPA 250  California Land Use Policy
- PPA 251/ECON 251  Urban Problems, Economics, & Public Policy, or PPA 252 Sustainable Development and Building Practices

**Elective Courses (Select four of the following: (12 units)**

- CE 261  Transportation Planning
- ECON 241  Applied Econometric Analysis
- ENVS 122  Environmental Impact Analysis: The Procedure and the Statement
- ENVS 128  Environment and the Law
- GEOG 109  Geographic Information Systems
- MBA 220  Financial Management
• MBA 221  Financial Markets
• MBA 231  Personnel Management
• MBA 252  Mortgage Markets: Institutions, Securities, and Strategies
• MBA 295E  Internship in Urban Land Development
• PPA 205  Research in Public Policy and Administration
• PPA 220B  Applied Economic Analysis II (PPA 220A)
• PPA 251/ECON 251  Urban Problems, Economics, & Public Policy
• PPA 252  Sustainable Development and Building Practices
• PPA 271  Collaborative Policy Practices
• PPA 272  Collaborative Governance Advanced Practice
• PPA 284/GOVT 284  Urban Policy
• SOC 210  Urban Sociology

Culminating Experience (3 units)

• MBA 500A/B Thesis/Project, or PPA 500 Thesis/Project

It must be noted that all of these courses serve as core or elective courses for the Master’s Program in Public Policy and Administration, or the Master’s Program in Business Administration with a Real Estate Concentration. Also noteworthy is that in December 2008 the College of Business decided to end their joint sponsorship of the MSULD Program. The Department of Public Policy and Administration offered to administer this program alone if MSULD students had access to the MBA courses described above. The School of Business agreed to this, and that is how the program has continued for the past three years. It is not a large program with only four graduates before 2008, and six since then. Nevertheless, and important to note, it also uses very little additional resources.

1) Please describe your program’s learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

The Master’s Program in Urban Land Development was created by business real estate professors and public policy professors from Sacramento State expressing the need for an interdisciplinary master’s program in urban land redevelopment and recognizing that the courses to offer such a program already existed at Sacramento State. One of the constraints facing the program is a continuing restriction on using new resources to provide it. Thus existing classes imbedded in these two parent master’s programs need to be used to provide it. These classes serve the needs of Master’s in Public Policy and Administration students, and students seeking a Master’s in Business Administration with a Real Estate Concentration. They are thus subject to the learning goals and assessment strategies of these programs. An evaluation of the MSULD learning outcomes and assessment practices is therefore best completed through an examination of these processes in the two “parent” master’s program that comprises it.

2) Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes (“takeaways” concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content
Although the Master’s in Science in Urban Land Development Program has not established any formal learning outcomes. If, as Director of the Program I had to write them down, I would place them closely in line with the a) through e) general outcomes used by the Master’s Program in Public Policy and Administration, with changes to the specific outcomes, under each of these general outcomes, to reflect subject matter differences.

a) Critical Thinking

A “mastery” of urban land development must include the ability to think critically – in an objective and systematic manner – about a challenge facing the topic. This entails the more specific learning objectives of: (1) appropriate problem definition, (2) objective research design and casual inference, (3) implementation considerations, and (4) ethical implications of choices.

b) Integrative Thinking

This involves the ability to take the skills picked up in economics, political science, statistical analysis, negotiation, business finance, and real estate practices, and use them in an integrative and appropriate way to address urban land development challenges. Our graduates achieve such interdisciplinary thinking through the mastery of the following specific learning objectives: (5) microeconomic concepts and analysis, (6) political environment and analysis, (7) techniques of policy analysis, (8) statistical regression analysis, (9) business finance concepts and analysis, (10) real estate practices and institutions, and (11) mediation techniques.

c) Effective Communication for Public and Private Sector Audiences

The effective practice of formulating the development of urban land in a private sector regulated by a democratically created public sector necessarily requires the highly effective communication of what, why, and how you plan to do it. Thus, we insist that our ULD master’s graduates be adept at the following specific learning objectives: (12) report writing, (13) memo writing, (14) presentation of technical information, (15) oral presentation, and (16) effective written presentation.

d) Understanding Professional Role

This is a professional master’s program geared explicitly to those who desire to bridge the gap in urban land development between the private and public sectors. Thus, a requisite learning objective must be the development of an understanding of one’s role in the profession of developing urban land. The achievement of this occurs through the specific learning objectives of: (17) role of public sector in democratic/market system, (18) California policy context, (19) intergovernmental relations, (20) role of policy analysis, (21) fiduciary role of a privately funded land developer, and (22) workplace and role ethics.

e) Practical Application

Holders of this professional master’s degree need also comprehend some essential practical applications for dealing with urban land development concerns. The specific learning objectives related to this includes: (23) influencing the private and public aspects of the urban land

3) For undergraduate programs only, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible.

This is a graduate only program.

4). For each desired outcome indicated in item 2 above, please:

a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured. b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected. c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program. d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome.

Unfortunately, there has been no previous measurement of the achievement of the above listed Master’s of Science in Urban Land Development learning objectives. If it were to be done, it would be best accomplished through three summative measures: (1) a survey of MSULD alumni to assess their opinion both on how well the 32 specific learning objectives listed above fits what they think they need to practice in urban land development in California, and then how well these specific learning objectives have been achieved through their completion of the MSULD degree, (2) a similar survey of potential employers of MSULD graduates to see if these 32 specific learning objectives are appropriate to what they need from such a graduate, and a survey of actual employers of MSULD graduates to see how adept these graduates are at the 32 specific learning objectives in their work environment, and (3) an evaluation of short “white papers” on an urban land development topic completed by entering and finishing students to provide insight into the degree of value added by completing the entire program. Faculty who teach MSULD required courses could then discuss tabulated results at a retreat with an eye toward possibly changing the required courses for the major. But important to note, given the nature of this program, the curriculum or pedagogy of specific PPA or MBA courses are not likely to be changed from MUSULD input alone.

6) Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program’s learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program’s curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.

No, as described above, this has not been done. However, it is something that we will complete next year. The reason for not doing it this year is that the Master’s in Public Policy and Administration Program, also administered by the Department of Public Policy and Administration is going through its own program review.
7) Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization?

   **No, it does not.** However, the two parent programs do adhere to the suggested learning outcomes of their respective accrediting organizations; the college of Business does this formally through accreditation by the AACSB, and the Department of Public Policy informally through NASPPA.

8) Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program’s desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment?

   **None.**