

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Detailed Assessment Report 2015-2016 Architectural Studies BS

As of: 11/04/2016 12:28 PM CENTRAL

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Architectural Studies BS is to evaluate architectural drawings that measure integrated comprehensive design in the ARCH 409 course, and to succeed with 80% passing rate on each evaluation as a target goal. For the 2015-2016 Academic Year, a goal of 85% passing rate for each measure was targeted.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Site Plan Development

Developing an understanding building orientation, contextual responsiveness, and ADA compliancy through the Site Plan drawing.

Related Measures

M 1: Site Plan / ADA Compliancy / Bldg. Orientation

The evaluation of this Measure was the Site Plan drawing. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Fall 2015, all students were assessed through a rubric that were evaluated by 6 Faculty members and 5 professional Architects. Number of students assessed = 25

The rubric for this Measure was assessed on the "Site Plan" drawing. The achievement in the "competent" and "above competent" level was 85%. Target was met.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Plan Development

Plan Development which is the study of the buildings program, structure, and circulation scored in the 80% with 33 students being reviewed. The plan development needs to be measured for atleast three years to understand its success rate. The first year was under 80% (78%) and this year we scored over the 80%.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Site Plan / ADA Compliancy / Bldg. Orientation |

Outcome/Objective: Site Plan Development

Implementation Description: Additional lectures have been added to the curriculum to enhance the program's success. Lectures on codes has been completed as well as developing a lecture on the plan.

Responsible Person/Group: Thomas Sammons

SLO 2: Architectural Floor Plan Development

Four categories to be assessed on. 1) Structure: that the student understands the integration of structure into a comprehensive project. This was implemented through the design of the architectural plan, but also in a structural diagram showing the framing of a third or fourth story of their building. 2) Egress: the study of egress is evident in the design of the architectural planning. Stairs and hallways were clearly marked as well as windows to be rescued from a bedroom in an apartment. This was supplemented by an egress diagram integrated into the notebook. 3) Accessibility: study accessibility was highlighted in two factors require the students to design an accessible apartment layout in plan as well as require the students to understand refuge in their stairwells. 4) Room Design: students were required to develop well designed apartments and commercial spaces. This was implemented within the general floor plans.

Throughout the course, students are exposed to development lectures on floor plans with emphasis on structure, circulation, building code and egress issues. Another objective is to allow interns and architects to participate more thoroughly in the review process.

Related Measures

M 2: Architectural Floor Plan Development

The evaluation of this Measure was the Floor Plan drawings - Ground Floor, Residential Floor, and one Additional Floor of the student's choice. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Fall 2015, all students were assessed through a rubric that were evaluated by 6 Faculty members and 5 professional Architects. Number of students assessed = 25

The rubric for this Measure was assessed on the "Ground Floor Plan", "Residential Floor Plan", & "Floor Plan (of student's choice)".

The achievement in the "competent" and "above competent" level was 87%.

This Finding was met, 2% greater than targeted.

SLO 3: Systems Integration

Understanding the basic principles of the membrane, materials, and assembly through the study of the Wall Section drawing. Understanding the integration of structural systems through the Structural Diagram drawing.

Related Measures

M 3: Systems Integration

The evaluation of this Measure was the Wall Section and Structural Diagram drawings. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Fall 2015, all students were assessed through a rubric that were evaluated by 6 Faculty members and 5 professional Architects. Number of students assessed = 25

The rubric for this Measure was assessed on the "Structural Plan Diagram" and "Wall Section" drawings.

The achievement in the "competent" and "above competent" level was 83%. This Finding was 2% less than targeted.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Concentrated Study in Earlier Years

This area of concentrations can be improved by the introduction of more concentrated study in earlier year levels. Steady improvement has been observed by the introduction of the wall section, materials, and methods classes 334 and 432. This additional instruction has added to the sophistication of students entering the comprehensive studio with a more general understanding of systems, materials, and assembly. In addition, the better coordination with professionals and interns has expanded the coverage of material and processes evolved in the design of the wall section and building section. Additional lectures accompanying the 401 Studio has also increased the productivity of the detailing and design process at a comprehensive level. Precedents, in the example of previous studio work (fall 2007, fall 2008, and fall 2009), added to the insight of the students and faculty in the production of the wall section and the tectonics of architecture. Additional classes in graphics and technology will also facilitate the speed in which the students are required to complete the overall comprehensive design. Additional lecture and lab time as well as coordination between the profession and the faculty can be devoted to increase our pass rate.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Systems Integration | **Outcome/Objective:**
Systems Integration

Building Envelope

The building envelope is a study of how the membrane is connected to the primary and secondary structure. This includes roof systems, wall systems, and window systems.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Systems Integration | **Outcome/Objective:**
Systems Integration

Implementation Description: Over the past year the building envelope has scored 80% or higher. The School of Architecture continues to develop programs for a consistent envelope design. Third year studio (302) and its companion materials course (432) has just implemented a three-dimensional wall section. This should continue an increased rate of our scores.

Responsible Person/Group: Thomas Sammons

SLO 4: Building Envelope / Tectonics

Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural and environmental (MEP) systems into the building design. Understanding the basic principles of the building's membrane (vapor barrier), materials, and assembly through the study of the wall section.

Related Measures**M 4: Building Envelope / Tectonics**

The evaluation of this Measure was the Wall Section drawing and two Building Sections (transverse + longitudinal). The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Fall 2015, all students were assessed through a rubric that were evaluated by 6 Faculty members and 5 professional Architects. Number of students assessed = 25

The rubric for this Measure was assessed on the "Wall Section", "Transverse Building Section", & "Longitudinal Building Section".

The achievement in the "competent" and "above competent" level was 88%.

This Finding was met, 3% greater than targeted.

SLO 5: Program / Building Composition / Proportion

Coordinating information in a completed binder supporting context/surroundings,

sustainability, systems, and tectonics.

Evidence of translation of thesis into the built environment; Exploration and inventory of spatial adjacency strategies in plan and section; development of specific uses and equipment requirements.

Development of the building's facade and activated digital perspective rendering.

Related Measures

M 5: Exterior / Place

The evaluation of this Measure was the exterior Elevation drawings and digital perspective rendering. Student's developed an understanding of building composition, proportion, and how architecture is activated with program / people. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Partially Met

Fall 2015, all students were assessed through a rubric that were evaluated by 6 Faculty members and 5 professional Architects. Number of students assessed = 25

The rubric for this Measure was assessed on two "Exterior Elevation" drawings. The achievement in the "competent" and "above competent" level was 84%. This Finding was not met by 1% less than targeted.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Elevation Development

Measure 5 "Building Composition & Proportion" was 1% less than targeted. The course will be altered to begin the development of this drawing earlier in the semester for additional critiques. More lectures on elevation drawing conventions will also be established.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Exterior / Place | **Outcome/Objective:** Program / Building Composition / Proportion

SLO 6: Principles of Sustainability

Understand the principles of sustainability design natural and built resources creating a healthy building

Related Measures

M 6: Principles of Sustainability

The evaluation of this Measure was the Site Plan and Wall Section drawings, and notebook information. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

not assessed the 2015-2016 year.

SLO 7: Notebook Development

Coordinating information in a completed binder supporting context/surroundings, sustainability, systems, and tectonics.

Related Measures

M 7: Notebook

The evaluation of this Measure was the student's Notebook compiled with cut sheets of information regarding existing site conditions, integrated building systems, materiality, precedents, and sustainability. The rubric scored 'below competent' skill level, 'competent' skill level, and 'above competent' / mastery level.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 85% on the rubric is defined as either 'competent' or 'above competent'.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

not assessed this 2015-2016 year.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Monitor Yearly Levels

With reevaluation happening every other year, monitoring of these year levels should reveal if these scores remain above our 80% projected for success.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Notebook | **Outcome/Objective:** Notebook Development

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?

During the end of the Spring semester, the Faculty Retreat utilizes discussions of assessment findings. During this meeting, results of the assessment are reported, and brainstorming sessions on ways to improve our targets and findings.

Identify which action plans [created in prior cycle(s)] were implemented in this current cycle. For each of these implemented plans, were there any measurable or perceivable

effects? How, if at all, did the findings appear to be affected by the implemented action plan?

Last year's Action Plan did not surface into the course assessment. In response to the 2015-2016 year, potentially, by altering the semester schedule to allow for more time of Elevation development it may adversely affect other assessed areas.

What has the unit learned from the current assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?

Last year, our targets are well met over 80% in each assessed Measure. For the 2015-2016 academic year, we increased our target to 85% from 80% "competent" and "above competent" rubrics. Therefore, we could assess our students at a higher level of skill / professionalism. This seemed to work well, with only one Finding 1% below the newly set goal. Modifications to the course will continue to develop.