The University of Southern Mississippi

Detailed Assessment Report
As of: 9/28/2014 02:16 PM EST
2013-2014 Architectural Engineering Technology BS
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One -Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The University of Southern Mississippi Architectural Engineering Technology (ACT) program provides students with a broad-based education with an emphasis on critical thinking, technical problem-solving ability, and computer applications in addition to a background in architectural design. The ACT program is committed to producing graduates who possess the necessary skills, critical thinking, discipline and work ethics to enter the A/E/C industry fully capable of performing entry-level tasks at the office and in the field.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and

ACT students will have an ability to conduct standard tests and measurements; to conduct, analyze, and interpret experiments; and to apply experimental results to improve processes. (ABET General Criteria 'c')

Related Measures:

M 5:M3.1 -- ABET-GCc -- Assessment Aggregates
Aggregate of assessments for ABET General Criteria 'c'.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students receive a score of 70 (out of 100) or better on assessments supporting ABET General Criteria 'c'.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
94% (112 of 119) of student work samples (projects, exams, quizzes, papers) were scored 70 (out of 100) or better on all assessments supporting ABET General Criteria 'c'. FA13: F-F = 100% (16 of 16); ONL = 100% (22 of 22); SP14: F-F = 100% (45 of 45); ONL = 81% (29 of 36);

M 6:M3.2 -- ABET-GCc -- Exit/Alumni Survey Results
Exit and Alumni Survey results for ABET General Criteria 'c'.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of scores on the evaluation category supporting ABET General Criteria 'c' will have a rating of "satisfactory" or better. Tw 5.86 Gtogh14(r)16(i)

i

M 14:M7.2 -- ABET-GCg -- Exit/Alumni Su rvey Results
Exit and Alumni Survey results for ABET General Criteria 'g'.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of scores on the evaluation category supporting ABET General Criteria 'g' will have a minimum rating of "satisfactory" (3 or higher out of 5).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Average of 7 ratings on the evaluation category supporting 2013-2014 ABET General Criteria 'g' was 3.5. (4 = Very True; 3 = True; 2 = Somewhat True; 1 = Not True)

SLO 8:OBJ08 -- ABET General Criteria h
ACT students will have an understanding of the need for and an ability to engage in self-directed continuing professional development. (ABET General Criteria 'h')

Related Measures:

M 15:M8.1 -- ABET-GCh -- Assessment Aggregates
Aggregate of assessments for ABET General Criteria 'h'.

Source of Evidence: Academic directrteria '0786(o e)22(ng)22(ag)22(e i)35(n)]TJ -0.026 Tc 0.02

Target:

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

ACT 465 Architectural Design IV
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
In this case, 3 of 5 ACT students (60%) are performing at or above 70, which is less than the target level of 80% of total stude...

SLO 13:OBJ13 -- ABET Associate Criteria b
ACT graduates are capable of utilizing modern instruments, methods and techniques to produce A/E documents and presentations. (ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'b')

Related Measures:

M 25:M13.1 -- ABET-ADb -- Assessment Aggregates
Aggregate of assessments for ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'b'.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students receive a score of 70 (out of 100) or better on assessments supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'b'.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
89% (408 of 461) of student work samples (projects, exams, quizzes,

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

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

ACT 465 Architectural Design IV
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
In this case, 3 of 5 ACT students (60%) are performing at or above 70, which is less than the target level of 80% of total stude...

M 30:M15.2 -- ABET-ADd -- Exit/Alumni Survey Results
Exit and Alumni Survey results for ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd'TJ 2 49pB(T)11(5(at(d)4Tc 0 Tw 9.957 0 Td ( )Tj 0.009 2(0,)4( )]TJ 06(amo[(i)14c0 Td

M 35:M18.1 -- ABET-ADg -- Assessment Aggregates
Aggregate of assessments for ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g'.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students receive a score of 70 (out of 100) or better on assessments supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g'.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
88% (111 of 126) of student work samples (projects, exams, quizzes, papers) were scored 70 (out of 100) or better on all assessments supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g'. FA13: F-F = 100% (12 of 12); ONL = 0% (0 of 0); SP14: F-F = 87% (99 of 114); ONL = 0% (0 of 0);

M 36:M18.2 -- ABET-ADg -- Exit/Alumni Survey Results
Exit and Alumni Survey results for ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g'.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of scores on the evaluation category supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g' will have a minimum rating of "satisfactory" (3 or higher out of 5).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Average of 7 ratings on the evaluation category supporting 2013-2014 ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'g' was 3.2. (4 = Very True; 3 = True; 2 = Somewhat True; 1 = Not True)

SLO 19:OBJ19 -- ABET Associate Criteria h
ACT graduates are capable of utilizing codes, contracts and specifications in design, construction and inspection activities. (ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'h')

Related Measures:

M 37:M19.1 -- ABET-ADh -- Assessment Aggregates
Aggregate of assessments for ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'h'.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students receive a score of 70 (out of 100) or better on assessments supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'h'.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
89% (377 of 424) of student work samples (projects, exams, quizzes, papers) were scored 70 (out of 100) or better on all assessments supporting ABET Associate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'h'. FA13: F-

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of scores on the evaluation category supporting ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'c' will have a minimum rating of "satisfactory" (3 or higher out of 5).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Average of 7 ratings on the evaluation category supporting 2013-2014 ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'c' was 3.3. (4 = Very True; 3 = True; 2 = Somewhat True; 1 = Not True)

SLO 24:OBJ24 -- ABET BS Criteria d

ACT graduates are capable of applying principles of construction law and ethics in architectural practice. (ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd')

Related Measures:

M 47:M24.1 -- ABET-BSd -- Assessment Aggregates

Aggregate of assessments for ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd'.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students receive a score of 70 (out of 100) or better on assessments supporting ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd'.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
92% (258 of 281) of student work samples (projects, exams, quizzes, papers) were scored 70 (out of 100) or better on all assessments supporting ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd'. FA13: F-F = 98% (115 of 117); ONL = 0% (0 of 0); SP14: F-F = 84% (74 of 88); ONL = 91% (69 of 76);

M 48:M24.2 -- ABET-BSd -- Exit/Alumni Survey Results

Exit and Alumni Survey results for ABET Baccalaureate Degree Program Specific Criteria 'd'.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of scores on the evaluation category supporting ABET Baccalaureate

contracts and specifications; electrical and mechanical systems, environmental control

Related Measures:

instructor, Investigate instructor's teaching performance;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Crosby

not conducting external evals

fall ACT 400--Marginal external evaluations; spring ACT 400--Inadequate external evaluations--instructor did not implement external evaluations; in consideration of other courses taught by this instructor, Investigate instructor's teaching performance;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Crosby

review teaching performance

ACT 336 and ACT 465 -- Performance below target; Investigate instructor's teaching performance; ACT 338 -- This is a drop from 88% the prior offering; Inadequate; in consideration of other courses taught by this instructor, Investigate instructor's teaching performance;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Respo nsible Person/Group: Crosby/Kitchens

teaching performance review

ACT 336 and ACT 363--Inadequate scores; in consideration of other courses taught by this instructor, Investigate instructor's teaching performance;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Impl ementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Crosby

teaching performance review

Instructor inappropriately moved the oral presentation to Senior Project II in violation of the QEP guidelines; Instructor will either be removed from this course or the Senior Project II will be converted to the capstone course; Instructor will either be removed from this course or the Senior Project II will be converted to the capstone course;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation St atus: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Crosby

teaching performance review

Provide more examples of expected outcomes; require instructor to take QEP training (QEP committee has not allowed this instructor to take the training for the last two years); in consideration of other courses taught by this adjunct, Investigate instructor's teaching performance and adherence to the course objectives;

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Crosby

writing and speaking centers

No action required but plan to introduce students to USM's Writing and Speaking Centers to sustain performance and target improvement for all students. Also plan to incorporate more peer evaluation early in the presentation and research paper development.

Established in Cycle: 2009 -2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Sfharp

.)]TJ)22(0 Tc 0 Tw 5.97819.717 ( )Tj EMC -19.717 Td 52)Tj EMC /P <</MCID 9 >>B18C /CS1 3-1.13 Td 52

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: M1.1 -- ABET-GCa -- Assessment Aggregates | Outcome/Objective: OBJ01 -- ABET General Criteria a
Measure: M11.1 -- ABET-GCk -- Assessment Aggregates | Outcome/Objective: OBJ11 -- ABET General Criteria k
Measure: M12.2 -- ABET-ADa -- Exit/Alumni Survey Results | Outcome/Objective: OBJ12 -- ABET Associate Criteria a
Measure: M15.1 -- ABET-ADd -- Assessment Aggregates | Outcome/Objective: OBJ15 -- ABET Associate Criteria d
Measure: M25.1 -- ABET-BSe -- Assessment Aggregates | Outcome/Objective: OBJ25 -- ABET BS Criteria e

Implementation Description: Sample size too smal l to warrant an action plan at this time--continue to monitor.
Responsible Person/Group: Miranda Grieder

2011-2012 Action Plans

2011-2012 Action Plans School of Construction Architectural Engineering Technology, Construction Engineering Technology, Industrial Engineering Technology FA11 AEC 270 Asheka Rahman, small sample for ACT; just monitor; small difference with target for BCT; just monitor ACT 322 M. Grieder, 3. Hw# 3 (PQ)--8 of 15 ACT students (53%) and 3 of 10 of ID students (30%) are performing at or above 70, which is less than the target level of 80% of total students. The assignment was a pop quiz over already delivered lecture material with the intention of preparing them for the up-coming Exam 1. 6. Exam 1-- In this case, 8 of 15 ACT students (53%) and 5 of 10 of ID students (50%) are performing at or above 70, which is less than the target level of 80% of total students. Instructor intends on making some revisions to remedy this. 7. Exam 2-- In this case, 10 of 15 ACT students (66.67%) are performing at or above 70, which is less than the target level of 80% of total students. Instructor intends on making some revisions to remedy this. AEC 454 J. Hannon, Exercises 1,3,4,5, Exam -- small sample in this case; just monitor BCT 336 J. Hannon, Reports -- I do not know the exact variable(s) responsible for the low percentages. This was instructor's second time to teach the course. This course was face-to-face with an online supplemental. Successful examples are shown and discussed after each report submittal. The course is 8 weeks in length. The reading material may be too dense, but my opinion is that students struggle with reading comprehension and not used to applying learned material. Possible ACTIONS: Increase course length; Decrease course scope (reading material); Remove the reading material from the course (text) and require student research to learn same. Quizzes -- The quizzes are not proctored and taken directly from the course text reading material. AEC 496 D. Kemp, 3. Midterm report, 7. Final oral presentation -- Two of the Architecture students performed poorly on the Midterm and Final reports. Although the instructor provided detailed feedback on the Midterm report, one student i

administration, planning and scheduling; and f. performing standard analysis and design in at least one recognized technical specialty within architectural engineering technology that is appropriate to the goals of the program. Process Background: Faculty mapped each of their course objectives to the ETAC-ABET criteria using a listing of their assessment methods for each objective/criteria. This mapping provided evidence for which courses in the program inventory were supporting any given ETAC-ABET criteria. Additionally the mapping also provided a simple index system for staff to organize supporting materials by criteria for evaluation. ETAC-ABET requires only summative evidence, however this approach easily provides for formative inspection & evaluation of the cur

than the course level in order to assure that ETAC-ABET criteria is being met across all courses in a collaborative and comprehensive manner.