School of Architecture and Architectural Engineering / CEAT

Bachelors of Architecture / BArch

Assessment Report Form 2016-2017

Date of Report: 9/11/2017

Name of Person Submitting Report: Tom Spector

A. Program Information:

Assessment Coordinator's Name: Tom Spector

Assessment Coordinator's Email Address: tom.spector@okstate.edu

Number of students enrolled in the program 2016-2017: 170

Number of students graduated in 2016-2017: 31

B. Program Mission Statement

In the box below, provide the mission statement for the program.

The mission statement, educational objectives, and goals for program should guide the assessment process. The mission statement should align with department, college, and institutional mission statements.

The School of Architecture prepares future architects and architectural engineers to make vital contributions to humanity through the creation of architecture. The School focuses its unique combination of accredited programs in architecture and architectural engineering to prepare and inspire students for the professional leadership roles and responsibilities required to shape the physical environment and to have a positive impact on the social, economic and cultural qualities of life in Oklahoma and the entire international context.

The School of Architecture endeavors to instill in each individual a sensitivity to human needs, a genuine concern for quality, integrity and high ideals, a positive attitude for life-long learning, and an appreciation for one's own self-esteem.

The "concept" for our school and the focus of our studios is to mirror the societal responsibilities of our profession and to promote a thoughtfully designed response to the environmental needs of our culture.

The range of design concerns, from the scale and needs of a single individual to the collective interaction of thousands, are studied and responded to in a project to project sequence throughout the five year undergraduate program.

An emphasis on providing a service to the university and the public enhances the design studio experience, and provides an opportunity for each student to make a contribution to their community, their state and nation.

C. University Assessment Funds

Were university assessment funds used by the department/program for assessment activities? ☒Yes ☐No

If university assessment funds were used by the department or program, describe how university assessment funds were used and the contribution the funds had on the assessment process. Funding requests for the next academic year have a separate process and should not be included here.

Assessment funds payed a per diem for invited guest jurors—practitioners to travel to Stillwater.

D. Student Learning Outcomes

On the pages that follow, list the Student Learning Outcomes associated with the program identified in this assessment form.

D1) Student Learning Outcome #1: Ability to solve architectural problems (creative problem solving)

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:

For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.

Architectural design in a complex synthetic activity. A number of courses progressively inculcate architectural design skills and the knowledge necessary to complete a design. The Studio sequence (Arch 1216,2116,2216,3116,3216,4116,4216, 5116) is a prime location for this learning but other coursed feed into it as well: (Arch2263 Systems, 3263 Materials, and the Structures sequence Arch 3323 Steel, 3223 Timbers and 4123 Concrete).

The course we have identified as the capstone is Arch 4216 Comprehensive Design Studio. An invited jury of practicing professionals assessed the fourth year students in Arch 4216 on two occasions during the semester: at schematic design juries in February and again at the Design Development juries in April. They review and assess the entire class's work. The professionals were asked to assess student proficiency at Learning Outcome 1. The question assigned for this score was:

- Student ability to integrate a variety of systems in solving architectural problems.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?

39 in comprehensive design studio

+ 6 students each from 8 studio courses. (48 students)

+ 9 fifth year student portfolios

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

All students in comprehensive design studio.

3 high pass and 3 low pass students from each studio course.

All students who submitted a portfolio for the Caudill Fellow Traveling Scholarship Prize

Assessment Methods

Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

☒Survey	☐Satisfaction Survey	☐Internship
☒Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	☐Benchmarking	☐Interviews
☐Analysis of written artifacts	☐Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	☐Performance or jury
☐Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	☐Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	☐Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.)
☒Oral presentation	☒Capstone project	☐Review of student research
☒Course project		☒Other (please specify): portfolio

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.

Visiting professionals who attended two juried presentations from each student rated each student's project according to their impressions in relation to the phase of the project.

Visiting accreditation team evaluated this outcome across the curriculum but concentrated on Arch 4116, fourth year design studio. The accreditation team evaluated the following: A4. Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two and three-dimensional design.

The members of the School of Architecture Professional Advisory Committee evaluated each portfolio.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☒Yes ☐No

For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.
We consider a composite average of 3.5 or better to indicate adequate performance for the students as a whole in comprehensive studio. A score between 3.5 and 3 merits concern and monitoring. A score below 3 merits action.
A finding of "condition MET" by the accreditation team.
An average grade of 3.5 or better from the PAC. A score between 3.5 and 3 merits concern and monitoring. A score below 3 merits action.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 1.
Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.
The combined score from juror evaluations for the two juries (February and April) was 4.04
The accreditation team found the condition was met.
The average score from the PAC portfolio evaluation was 4.26

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?
The results indicate no areas of concern for this learning outcome.

Timeline for the Assessment
Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐Each Semester ☒Yearly ☐Every other year

☒Other (please specify): The accreditation team will not return for 8 years. The comprehensive studio juries meet twice during the spring semester.

D2) Student Learning Outcome #2: Ability to communicate ideas effectively

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:
For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.
Students make both verbal and graphic presentations throughout the studio curriculum.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?
39 in comprehensive studio

3 high pass and 3 low pass students from each studio course. (48 total)

9 fifth-year student portfolios

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

invited jurors in comprehensive design studio evaluated all students in the course over two juries.

3 high pass and 3 low pass student work for each studio course was evaluated by the visiting accreditation team.

All students who submitted a portfolio for the Caudill Fellow Traveling Scholarship Prize

Assessment Methods
Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

☒Survey

☒Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)

☒Analysis of written artifacts

☐Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)

☒Oral presentation

☒Course project

☐Satisfaction Survey

☐Benchmarking

☒Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards

☐Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component

☐Capstone project

☐Internship

☐Interviews

☒Performance or jury

☐Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.)

☐Review of student research

☒Other (please specify):

Portfolio review

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.
Professional jurors reviewing student work on two occasions.
Accreditation team 3-day visit.
Professional Advisory Committee members—practicing Alumni at various career stages, reviewed the portfolios at their semi-annual meeting.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☒Yes ☐No
For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.
For the visiting jurors, the goal was a score of 3.5 or better on the survey forms.
For the accreditation team, the goal was "condition met."
For the PAC portfolio evaluation, a score of 3.5 or better.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 2.
Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.
The visiting professional jurors evaluated student presentation according to the following criterion: Student's ability to communicate design ideas. The combined scores over two juries was 4.1.

The visiting accreditation team evaluated the following outcome: A.1: Professional Communication Skills. Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public. The accreditation team found this condition MET.
The PAC portfolio combined average score for this learning outcome was 4.03

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?
The results indicate no areas of concern.

Timeline for the Assessment
Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐Each Semester ☒Yearly ☐Every other year

☒Other (please specify): Accreditation visit is on an 8-year cycle. Comprehensive studio juries occur twice during spring semester. The PAC portfolio review occurs annually.

D3) Student Learning Outcome #3: Understanding the overall architectural design process

Identify opportunities for students to learn this outcome during the 2016-2017 academic year:
For example, include a curriculum map that lists the courses or other learning experiences in which the student learning outcome is taught. Another example is a written narrative that describes how the learning outcome is integrated into the program.
The studio sequence increases in complexity from 1st to 4th years to gradually increase student ability to engage the entire architectural design process. Studio courses are complemented by lecture courses covering specific aspects of building design.

How many students were included in the assessment of this outcome?
39 in comprehensive studio

9 fifth year portfolios

How were students selected to participate in the assessment of this outcome?

the entire 4th year class participates in comprehensive studio.

Students applying for the Caudill Traveling Fellowship Award provided the portfolios. All fifth year students are eligible to apply although not all do.

Assessment Methods
Identify the method(s) used to assess this learning outcome. Check all that apply.

☒Survey

☒Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)

☐Analysis of written artifacts

☐Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)

☒Oral presentation

☒Course project

☐Satisfaction Survey

☐Benchmarking

☐Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards

☐Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component

☐Capstone project

☐Internship

☐Interviews

☒Performance or jury

☐Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.)

☐Review of student research

☒Other (please specify):

Portfolio evaluation

Describe the how the assessment method was implemented, administered, and/or conducted.
An invited jury of practicing professionals assessed the fourth year students in Arch 4216, Comprehensive studio, on two occasions during the semester: at schematic design juries in February and again at the Design Development juries in April. They review and assess the entire class's work. The professionals were asked to assess:

- The students revealed an ability to effectively integrate a variety of spatial and building systems.

The 12 PAC members evaluated the student portfolios at their semi-annual meeting.

Did your department/program faculty have a goal set for this learning outcome? ☒Yes ☐No
For example, "80% of students included in the assessment will receive a 4 on the rubric" or "80% of students included in the assessment will achieve a passing score on the certification exam." If yes, please describe the goal below.
For both the comprehensive studio juries and the PAC portfolio evaluations an average score exceeding 3.5 was set as acceptable. A score between 3 and 3.5 merits concern, and a score below 3 merits committee action.

Provide a summary of the results from the assessment of Learning Outcome 3.
Report student's scores for this assessment, as well as students' strengths and weaknesses relative to this learning outcome.
The combined average score from both juries was 4.08

The average score from the PAC portfolio evaluations was 4.16

What do the results suggest about student achievement of this learning outcome?
The results indicate no areas of concern for this outcome.

Timeline for the Assessment
Indicate the timeline for the assessment of this learning outcome. While outcomes assessment must be conducted every year, not all student learning outcomes for a given program must be assessed every year. If the assessment of a particular learning outcome occurs on cycle or rotation, please describe and provide the rationale for the cycle/rotation below.

☐Each Semester ☒Yearly ☐Every other year

☒Other (please specify): **juries occur twice during the spring semester of each year. The portfolios are submitted annually.**

E. Summary of Assessment Results

Describe the overall results of the program assessment and program faculty members' interpretation of the assessment results.
What did the assessment reveal? What do faculty interpret the results to mean? What do the results suggest about the curriculum, teaching practices, and/or student achievement of the program learning outcomes?
2017 was an accreditation year for the School of Architecture program. The results of the accreditation team report provide a useful outside check on our customary assessment procedures. We were able to map the accreditation team criteria to two of our learning outcomes. The results indicated no areas of concern. We also introduced a new assessment tool this year with the evaluation by the School's Professional Advisory Committee of 9 submitted student portfolios covering the students' work products from across the curriculum. Though the portfolio review is not a comprehensive look, it does cover roughly one-fourth of the students at or near the end of their time at the School of Architecture. Therefore, we believe it helps us develop a retrospective overview of student abilities as they developed over their 5 years in the program. The PAC membership is drawn from practicing alumni at various stages of their careers.
These two sources of data can be reviewed in light of the annual sources of data we regularly receive from comprehensive studio jurors.

F. Dissemination of Results

Describe the individual(s) or committee (e.g., a curriculum committee) responsible for reviewing and interpreting assessment data.
Tom Spector, chair, Jeanne Homer and Steve O'Hara are the assessment committee members who perform the initial review. The department chair then reviews the report.

Describe the process for sharing and discussing assessment results with program faculty.
One faculty meeting per year devotes time to dissemination and discussion of the assessment committee results. At this meeting the committee solicits comments regarding the degree of match between the assessment committee report and informal faculty observations, as well as discussion regarding any changes the entire faculty might agree upon to the assessed learning outcomes.

G. Program Improvements Based on Assessment

Based on the findings of this assessment, what changes are being considered or planned for the program?
Describe the actions that will be taken as a result of the discussion of the assessment evidence.

The assessment committee was heartened by the enthusiastic approval of the program by the accreditation team, which matches the observations solicited by the PAC and the comprehensive studio jurors. Therefore, no changes to the curriculum are contemplated as a result of this report.

Based on the findings of this assessment, what (if any) changes are planned for the assessment process?
For example, are there additional assessment data that may need to be collected? Are changes to the program assessment plan warranted?
The assessment committee is still gathering data on the pass and completion rates of recent alumni on the Architects' Registration Exam. While this source provides clear numerical data, the results so far do not map well with our learning outcomes. Furthermore, the sample size in some years and on some sections of the exam can be too small to be statistically useful. Changes begun in 2016 to the ARE (version 5.0) portend a better fit to our learning outcomes. We will continue to look at these results as a potential source of assessment for at least another year before making a decision.

Describe the process for implementing these changes/planned program improvements.
The assessment committee will continue to monitor developments in the ARE to eventually make a recommendation to the entire faculty. The faculty will have to agree that this source of data is useful and valid to adopt it as an assessment tool.

H. Assessment Tools

Please provide a copy of any assessment tools (questionnaire, scale, interview questions, etc.) **here.**

ARCH 4216/5226

Oklahoma State University
Other Options Pantry and Community Center SD Spring 2017

Student:

Jury Member:

Comments:

ARCH 4216&5226 Comprehensive Design Studio Individual Student Assessment

Students will not see these responses- for OSU assessment only SD_2017

Please circle one number per topic.

Student's ability to communicate design ideas

5	4	3	2	1
Required drawings seemed complete, and were easy to read, fully inform-ative, and creatively presented. Verbal presentation followed a logic and explained both building and design process, and evidenced an understanding of the relevant audience.	Required drawings seemed complete, and were easy to read and fully inform-ative. Renderings conveyed detail. Verbal presentation followed a logic and explained both building features and design process.	Required drawings seemed complete. Renderings conveyed only basic information about building. Verbal presentation evidenced a logic to the presentation, but did not explain the student's design process clearly.	Drawings seemed to be lacking in quantity, or necessary inform-ation on drawings was incomplete. Verbal presentation did not have a clear logic.	Required drawings seemed incomplete. Difficult to read. Coordinated poorly. Verbal presentation was disorganized. Student was unable to explain thought process.

Student ability to integrate a variety of systems in solving architectural problems

5	4	3	2	1
Systemic components demonstrate investigation into the student's creative employ. Leading technologies are used. Integration of systems helps elevate the overall design quality.	All systemic components are described, and their integration with spatial and technological concepts has been considered.	All required systemic components are described, but display little attention to how they integrate with one another.	Major systemic components are in evidence, but some are either inappropriate, inadequate or cannot be made to function properly as conceived.	Major systemic components are missing. Student seems not to understand how building components are integrated into a design.

Student understanding of the architectural design process

5	4	3	2	1
Student displays a strong grasp of the parameters for the employ of the chosen systems and materials so that they can be creatively	Student displays a strong grasp of the parameters for the employ of the chosen systems and materials. Choices of systems and	Student's project has encompassed all the major design elements. The overall design is adequate but lacking a concept that can organize the major	Some design elements will not work as intended. The overall design could be built but is not clearly concept-driven.	Student appears unaware or unconcerned with turning the design into a constructible solution. Large design elements will not work as

incorporated. Concern for constructability and durability is in evidence.	materials reinforce a unifying concept.	design decisions towards an artistically unified end.		envisioned, or else are inappropriate to the project. Conceptual basis is severely lacking.

ARCH 4216

Other Options Food Pantry and Teen Community Center Spr 2017

Student:

Jury Member:

Comments:

ARCH 4216 Comprehensive Design Studio Individual Student Assessment

Students will not see these responses- for OSU assessment only DD_2017

Please circle one number per topic.

Student's ability to communicate design ideas

5	4	3	2	1
Thought process and problem analysis are engaged throughout the graphic and verbal presentation.	The graphic and verbal presentation is complete, professional looking, and concept-driven.	The presentation incorporates all requirements professionally.	Drawings seemed to be lacking in quantity, or necessary inform-ation on drawings was incomplete or amateurish. Verbal presentation did not have a clear logic.	Required drawings seemed incomplete. Difficult to read. Coordinated poorly. Verbal presentation was disorganized. Student appeared disengaged from audience.

Student ability to integrate a variety of systems in solving architectural problems

5	4	3	2	1
The design strongly integrates environmental and structural principles into the design's concept, aesthetics, and performance.	The design evidences a unified approach to the integration of technology, function, and artistic goals.	The design presents a realistic building scheme, and systems chosen will work with the design intent.	Major systemic components are in evidence, but some are either inappropriate, inadequate or cannot be made to function properly as conceived.	Major systemic components are missing. Student seems not to understand how building components are integrated into a design.

Student understanding of the architectural design process

5	4	3	2	1
Research brings depth to the understanding of the problem and results in a well-founded approach. Envelope design, interior spaces, and a detail design are well developed.	The student incorporates individual research and analysis into the design. The envelope, interior, and detail design are well considered.	The student solves problems towards the goal of an aesthetically and technically complete design.	The student solves problems, completes components of the design, but his or her project may lack cohesiveness.	Student appears unaware or unconcerned with turning the design into a constructible solution. Large design elements will not work as envisioned, or else are inappropriate to the project. Conceptual basis is severely lacking.

Caudill Portfolio Assessment, School of Architecture PAC, October, 2016

	5-exc	4-good	3-avg	2-poor	1-none
Student 1 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively			X		
Understanding design process		X			
Student 2 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively	X				
Understanding design process		X			
Student 3 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively			X		
Understanding design process	X				
Student 4 –solve architectural problems	X				
Communicate effectively	X				
Understanding design process	X				
Student 5 –solve architectural problems			X		
Communicate effectively			X		
Understanding design process			X		
Student 6 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively			X		
Understanding design process			X		
Student 7 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively	X				
Understanding design process		X			
Student 8 –solve architectural problems		X			
Communicate effectively		X			
Understanding design process	X				
Student 9 –solve architectural problems	X				
Communicate effectively	X				
Understanding design process	X				
Student 10 –solve architectural problems					
Communicate effectively					
Understanding design process					