

Actions and Status of Improvement Related to Each Program Outcome (for all of your programs) for your most recent assessment cycle:

NOTE: in the fall of 2012, three faculty from the department participated in a workshop project with AIR to map Program Outcomes across the curriculum. One outcome of the project was an understanding of the need to revisit program outcomes

Program Name: AAS in Architectural Technology

Program Outcome #1:

Graduates from the AAS degree program are competent for entry-level employment in the architectural field, having a breadth of knowledge in topics including construction documents, computer applications, design and programmatic planning, architectural history, and environmental systems.

Assessment Data Collection Time Period, Course(s) Used and Faculty Involved in Data Collection

Sample: A Locally Developed Exam (LDE) was conducted during Fall 2011 for students enrolled in six sections of EDU 4202 (n=200). The LDE was developed by the department assessment committee consisting of Professor Smith, Professor Li, and Professor Doe. Data collection was overseen by Professor Doe and all faculty who administered the exam provided the exam data and samples of student work to Professor Doe. Professor Doe completed the data analysis and disseminated the results to the assessment committee members, and the department chair.

Course Reviews were conducted for ARCH 1130 Building Technology I and ARCH 1230 Building Technology II to assess the students skills and knowledge in construction documents and computer applications. The following sections participated in the review: ARCH 1130: 9545, 9546, 9547, 9548, 9549 (approx 100 students total) ARCH 1230: 9570, 9572, 9574, 9576, 4128 (approx 90 students total). The Course Review Committee including Profs Maldonado, Edwards, Aptekar, and Conzelmann. With Professor Montgomery (Course Coordinator) coordinating the effort, each professor collected samples of a range of student drawing assignments (3-4 per project, 6 projects typical for each course) Samples were reviewed initially in April 2012 by review committee with initial feedback. This was followed by a formal presentation and review by full time faculty with comments and discussion in May 2012. Review committee issued a final review report with recommendations for improvement.

Additional statements would be added for additional instruments used, but the focus is on the program-level outcomes.

Action: (The action item that is being implemented to improve PO#)

Sample: After reviewing assessment results, faculty determined that they need to ensure that students perform a thorough analysis of experimental data, including identification of trends.

The review committee recommended a number of adjustments to the course to improve the skill and knowledge of construction documents and computer applications. These included: revising the drawing format to reflect industry standard format, coordinating assignments so that each assignment is one part of a construction documentation process, focusing case study for BTECH I on wood frame construction to improve clarity of teaching structural principles. The Ford Foundation was recommended as a case study subject for BTECH II. The use of digital software was recommended to focus equally on 2 dimensional and 3 dimensional drawings and models.

Rationale: (Based on the findings from the results of the assessment relating to PO#)

Sample: Faculty feedback from the assessment report form was obtained during the meeting held on January 28, 2012. All department faculty were in attendance and discussed the possible methods that may be used to increase student achievement. There was consensus among the faculty to engage in the implementation of the action(s) stated.

Faculty feedback from the Course Review Committee report was obtained during the faculty meeting held on May 31, 2012. A majority of department full time faculty were in attendance and discussed possible methods to increase student achievement in construction documents and computer applications. There was clear consensus among the faculty to implement the actions stated above.

Populate this area with the statistics to support your rationale (e.g., ___% of the students who took the locally developed exam met or exceeded the department standard for this program outcome) .

Status of implementation: (Current status of how this action is implemented relating to PO#)

Sample: Since Fall 2012, faculty have introduced lectures on the topics of measurement methods and experiment design along with in-class exercises for EDU 3155 and EDU 4202. In these courses, faculty discuss quantities used to assess trends in data. For instance, faculty emphasize how to express central tendencies and variation of a data set and how polynomial fit is utilized to determine the best fit for a data set. In-class exercises further reinforce this subject area.

Since Spring 2012, the actions have been implemented. The assignment format was adjusted to reflect industry standard format. The assignments are coordinated to sequence one to the next, with the resulting drawing set reflected a more complete documentation of the case study. The BTECH I major case study was changed to a wood frame structure. The Ford Foundation was introduced as a new case study in the BTECH II course. The focus of the digital drawing shifted to equally emphasize 2-dimensional and 3-dimensional drawing and modeling.

Re-Assessment: (The data collection used to evaluate your improvement action(s) for PO#)

Sample: Students in EDU 4202 will be assessed during Fall 2014 to determine the effectiveness of the improvement strategies implemented. All sections will be included in the sampling design using a locally developed exam with a test blueprint. Professor Smith will work with the office of Assessment and Institutional Research to develop a scannable and collect all of the data for the sections of the course offering in the fall. The expected sample size will be approximately 200 students. Exemplars of student work will be maintained on the department computer and a copy shared with the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research as a back-up for the assessment documentation.

The Course Review Committee will conduct a followup review of ARCH 1130 and ARCH 1230 on a regular cycle, starting in Spring 2014. A rubric will be developed to assess the student work for evidence of the breadth of knowledge of construction documents and computer applications. Examples of student work will be collected and reviewed by the Course Review Committee and the scores from the rubric collected in a scannable format consistent with the formats of the office of Assessment and Institutional Research. The analysis of the review results will be studied by the Review Committee and presented to the full time faculty for comment and discussion on further adjustments to the course.

Program Outcome #2:

The AAS degree graduate is well versed in visual and written presentation, critical thinking and methods of effective communication at different levels as well as a basic broad understanding of history, math, science and the humanities.

Assessment Data Collection Time Period, Course(s) Used and Faculty Involved in Data Collection

Sample: A Locally Developed Exam (LDE) was conducted during Fall 2011 for students enrolled in six sections of EDU 4202 (n=200). The LDE was developed by the department assessment committee consisting of Professor Smith, Professor Li, and Professor Doe. Data collection was overseen by Professor Doe and all faculty who administered the exam provided the exam data and samples of student work to Professor Doe. Professor Doe completed the data analysis and disseminated the results to the assessment committee members, and the department chair.

During the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters, we conducted an assessment of students' reading and writing skills as well as critical thinking and communication skills. The following courses and sections participated in this assessment: ARCH 2411 Design IV: 9636 (approx 18 students), ARCH 1230 Building Technology II: 9570, 9572, 9574 (35 students total). The assessments were conducted using rubrics developed by faculty from various departments to measure the same skills college wide. The data for the ARCH 2411 and ARCH 1230 assessments was collected by Professor Montgomery and submitted to the office of Assessment and Institutional Research for compilation and reporting.

Additional statements would be added for additional instruments used, but the focus is on the program-level outcomes.

Action: (The action item that is being implemented to improve PO#)

Sample: After reviewing assessment results, faculty determined that they need to ensure that students perform a thorough analysis of experimental data, including identification of trends.

After reviewing the assessment results, faculty discussed the poor results as well as the potential shortcomings of the assignments used as a vehicle for the assessment. A new assignment was developed as a vehicle for a new round of assessment with the intention of gathering more accurate / focused data. In addition, the faculty discussed the need to scaffold and support learning strategies in the curriculum to improve the reading, writing, critical thinking, and communication skills of the students. This effort is in progress for partial implementation in Fall 2013.

Rationale: (Based on the findings from the results of the assessment relating to PO#)

Sample: Faculty feedback from the assessment report form was obtained during the meeting held on January 28, 2012. All department faculty were in attendance and discussed the possible methods that may be used to increase student achievement. There was consensus among the faculty to engage in the implementation of the action(s) stated.

The results of the assessment were reviewed in the course coordination meetings for the ARCH 1230 Building Technology II faculty in Sept 2012 and Jan 2013. The results of the reading assessment were particularly low (8.6% meeting or exceeding college standard for Comprehension, 14.3% for Context, 5.8% for Analysis, and 11.4% for Interpretation.) There was consensus among the course faculty to revise the assessment vehicle to improve the quality of the data collection.

Populate this area with the statistics to support your rationale (e.g., ___% of the students who took the locally developed exam met or exceeded the department standard for this program outcome) .

Status of implementation: (Current status of how this action is implemented relating to PO#)

Sample: Since Fall 2012, faculty have introduced lectures on the topics of measurement methods and experiment design along with in-class exercises for EDU 3155 and EDU 4202. In these courses, faculty discuss quantities used to assess trends in data. For instance, faculty emphasize how to express central tendencies and variation of a data set and how polynomial fit is utilized to determine the best fit for a data set. In-class exercises further reinforce this subject area.

Since Spring 2012, the actions were implemented, with the development of a new assignment intended to improve the quality of the data collection. The faculty of ARCH 1230 discussed scaffolding and support strategies to address the poor performance of the students with the goal of implementation in the Fall 2013.

Re-Assessment: (The data collection used to evaluate your improvement action(s) for PO#)

Sample: Students in EDU 4202 will be assessed during Fall 2014 to determine the effectiveness of the improvement strategies implemented. All sections will be included in the sampling design using a locally developed exam with a test blueprint. Professor Smith will work with the office of Assessment and Institutional Research to develop a scannable and collect all of the data for the sections of the course offering in the fall. The expected sample size will be approximately 200 students. Exemplars of student work will be maintained on the department computer and a copy shared with the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research as a back-up for the assessment documentation.

The assessment is being conducted again this semester, Spring 2013, with a new assignment as an assessment vehicle. The data will be collected by Profs. Montgomery and Mishara and submitted to the office of Assessment and Institutional Research for compilation and reporting. The participated course+sections are: ARCH 1230 Building Technology II: 9570, 9572, 9574, 9575, 9576, 4128 (approx 108 students total) In the Fall 2013 scaffolding and learning strategy support will be provided to address poor student performance.

Program Outcome #3:

AAS degree graduates are uniquely qualified to bridge the span between the technological and pragmatic needs of the architectural related fields in a way which incorporates a variety of approaches and draws upon a diverse understanding of methods employed to solve problems and serve client needs.

Assessment Data Collection Time Period, Course(s) Used and Faculty Involved in Data Collection

Sample: A Locally Developed Exam (LDE) was conducted during Fall 2011 for students enrolled in six sections of EDU 4202 (n=200). The LDE was developed by the department assessment committee consisting of Professor Smith, Professor Li, and Professor Doe. Data collection was overseen by Professor Doe and all faculty who administered the exam provided the exam data and samples of student work to Professor Doe. Professor Doe completed the data analysis and disseminated the results to the assessment committee members, and the department chair.

An assessment was conducted during the Spring 2012 semester to review the technological and pragmatic skills of the students as well as their problem solving skills. This assessment took place as a course review of ARCH 1110 Architectural Design I: Foundations and ARCH 1191 Visual Studies I. This Course Review Committee was led by Prof. Bouratoglou, Prof. Vaidya, and Prof. Valdez. The committee reviewed student work across a number of sections: ARCH 1110: 9500, 9502, 9504, 9505, 9508, 4100, 4102 as well as ARCH 1191: 9550, 9552, 9554, 9556, 9558, 4124, 4125. This assessment reviewed the work of approx 160 students. The review and assessment was documented in a report of May 2012 that was presented to the full time faculty for comment and discussion.

Additional statements would be added for additional instruments used, but the focus is on the program-level outcomes.

Action: (The action item that is being implemented to improve PO#)

Sample: After reviewing assessment results, faculty determined that they need to ensure that students perform a thorough analysis of experimental data, including identification of trends.

The review committee recommended a number of adjustments to the course to improve the technological and pragmatic skills of the students as well as their problem solving skills. These included: adjusting the number of assignments and the content of the assignments, improving the coordination between the teaching of design skills and the technological visualization skills, focusing attention on a few key digital visualization skills.

Rationale: (Based on the findings from the results of the assessment relating to PO#)

Sample: Faculty feedback from the assessment report form was obtained during the meeting held on January 28, 2012. All department faculty were in attendance and discussed the possible methods that may be used to increase student achievement. There was consensus among the faculty to engage in the implementation of the action(s) stated.

Faculty feedback from the Course Review Committee report was obtained during the faculty meeting held on May 31, 2012. A majority of department full time faculty were in attendance and discussed possible methods to increase student achievement in technological and pragmatic skills of the students as well as their problem solving skills. There was clear consensus among the faculty to implement the actions stated above.

Populate this area with the statistics to support your rationale (e.g., ___% of the students who took the locally developed exam met or exceeded the department standard for this program outcome) .

Status of implementation: (Current status of how this action is implemented relating to PO#)

Sample: Since Fall 2012, faculty have introduced lectures on the topics of measurement methods and experiment design along with in-class exercises for EDU 3155 and EDU 4202. In these courses, faculty discuss quantities used to assess trends in data. For instance, faculty emphasize how to express central tendencies and variation of a data set and how polynomial fit is utilized to determine the best fit for a data set. In-class exercises further reinforce this subject area.

Since Fall 2012, the faculty have adjusted the course outlines and assignments to reflect the findings of the Course Review Committee. The courses have been taught with these changes for two semesters so far.

Re-Assessment: (The data collection used to evaluate your improvement action(s) for PO#)

Sample: Students in EDU 4202 will be assessed during Fall 2014 to determine the effectiveness of the improvement strategies implemented. All sections will be included in the sampling design using a locally developed exam with a test blueprint. Professor Smith will work with the office of Assessment and Institutional Research to develop a scannable and collect all of the data for the sections of the course offering in the fall. The expected sample size will be approximately 200 students. Exemplars of student work will be maintained on the department computer and a copy shared with the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research as a back-up for the assessment documentation.

The Course Review Committee will conduct a followup review of ARCH 1110 and ARCH 1191 on a regular cycle, starting in Spring 2014. A rubric will be developed to assess the student work for evidence of student achievement in technological and pragmatic skills of the students as well as their problem solving skills. Examples of student work will be collected and reviewed by the Course Review Committee and the scores from the rubric collected in a scannable format consistent with the formats of the office of Assessment and Institutional Research. The analysis of the review results will be studied by the Review Committee and presented to the full time faculty for comment and discussion on further adjustments to the course.