

Assessment, Improvement, Measurement (AIM) Report: 04/03/2013**Plan Year:** 2011-2012**Unit:** Architectural Technology**Coordinator(s):** Thomas Rogers, Karman Wheeler, William Franklin**Reviewer:** William Franklin

| Objective or Outcome | Measure(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|
| | Measure Text | Achievement Target | Results | Achievement Target Result | Use of Findings/Next Steps |
| SLO 1 - Students will prepare commercial construction drawings that meet industry standards utilizing a newly developed checklist that includes all major project components (ACH 250 class) with additional tasks and requirements. | Newly expanded checklist that includes all major components of an assigned project. | The percentage of drawings turned in by each students will increase 25% from the beginning of the semester to the end as a result of utilizing the checklist. A 25% increase will be noted in at least 75% of the students. | The wording of the Assessment was perhaps not well crafted to lead to an appropriate response to Review of Results. A 25% increase implies that there was going to be significant change noted from one submission to the next and that the number of drawings required was to be a constant. Since the number of required drawings increased with each submission and since the possibility of incomplete submissions increased as a result, perhaps the more important stat was in noting whether or not the percentage of drawings submitted increased with each submission. There were a total of five students in the class. A checklist was distributed to students for each major submission. For the first submission, only four drawings were required. For the final submission, 30 drawings were required. So it was easier for a student to submit all drawings in the beginning. There were a total of four major submissions. The third and fourth (final) submissions were the most similar in regards to the number of required drawings - 29 and | Met | From the first use of the checklist, students reported that it greatly helped them in putting together their submissions. With each subsequent submission I was asked if I was going to provide a checklist. As the semester developed, I expanded the types of items included on the checklist to include other aspects of submissions such as the required content of a particular drawing - in addition to the required drawing list. This allowed the students to know on what items to place emphasis. It also became a way of communicating the grade for the submission. The student was required to submit the checklist with the submission. I reported the grade on it and returned the checklist to the student. I will continue to use and develop the checklist not only in the ACH 250 class but in other related |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---------------|---|
| | | | 30 respectively. An increase in the percentage of drawings submitted was noted with each student in regards to the third and fourth submissions. The range was from 0.2% to 22%. | | classes. In 2012-2013 new program coordinator will work with faculty to develop new assessments. |
| SLO 2 - Students will be able to build a virtual 3D model. | In ACH 150 - Evaluate the project utilizing the software to build the model, pulling it apart to identify the correct level of detail and being made correctly (infrastructure or detail of the model). Seventy-five percent of the students will score a 3.0 or higher on this component of the project. | Seventy-five percent of the students will score a 3.0 or higher | 71.5% of the students (5 out of 7) scored a 3 or higher on model. | Partially Met | The 1st two improvements listed (the critical path schedule and the small 1-story model) were implemented in the Fall 2011 semester, but the change in pre-requisite (to make ACH 195 a pre-req.) is a change we are just now making which would apply starting in 2012-2013 school year. (Note: In 2012-2013 the new program coordinator will work with faculty to develop new outcomes) |
| SLO 3 - Students will be able to identify key sustainable features, design and construction and understand how to integrate them into their own design. | In the Mechan. Elec Class - Four components of their project will be evaluated using a four point scale: 1. Substance - The substance of the sustainability of the project. 2. Graphic design of the presentation of the project. 3. Oral presentation 4. Organization | All students will score 75% or higher. | "For ACH 275 Spring 2012, the overall class performance for the semester: 11 out of 12 scored 80% or higher, with 6 of 12 scoring 90% or higher. On the sustainability presentation project specifically: 11 out of 12 scored 80% or higher, with 8 of 12 scoring 90% or higher. Of the 11 students who did the presentation, the overall average = 92% with low=83 and high=100. " | Met | "Two specific strategies were implemented from analysis of the previous years review that helped students achieve this high success rate. They were: 1. Provided clear written outline of the project requirements with breakdown or explanation for each grading criteria. 2. Showed the class examples of similar past projects at various "grade" levels to clearly demonstrate excellent/good (A/B) quality, as well as average/poor (C/D) quality. The carry forward from this would |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | apply to any class or project in that the better we clarify the specific areas of evaluation and the better we can give examples providing goals and expectations for success the better chance of achieving that success. (Note: New program coordinator will work with faculty to develop new outcomes in 2012-2013.)" |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|