School of Architecture

Prepared by Steven E. O'Hara **Executive Summary** (full report available upon request)

Degree Program(s) Assessed	Assessment Methods	Number of Individuals Assessed
B.S. Architecture and B.S. Architectural Engineering	Professional Advisory Committee Surveys	18 in-state (7 architectural engineers and 13 architects) and 7 regional
	2004 Alumni Survey	9
	Comprehensive Studio Jury Surveys	**
	Exit Interviews	**
	Student Portfolios	**
	Comprehensive Studio Jury Surveys	**

During the past year the School of Architecture has continued established assessment activities and revised the process of some of these activities. The major activity in the fall of 2003 was the accreditation visit by EAC/ABET. Although the final report is not completed and the results of the report are not public, it could be said that the visit should result in a full accreditation. In addition, comments by the visitors about the assessment process for the School of Architecture were outstanding. They had yet to see a more thought out and comprehensive process of assessment.

The assessment committee for the School of Architecture consists of the committee met on March 25, 2004 to review assessment activities and make recommendations to the School based on their review. The committee also reviewed the timeline of all assessment activities. An outline of the formal assessment activities for the past year and the timeline follows:

Fall 2003 EAC/ABET Accreditation visit and report

During the fall semester at on the undergraduate engineering programs in the College of Engineering Architecture and Technology were visited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). This was the college's first visit under the new accreditation criteria, EC 2000. These criteria require all programs develop and maintain and continuous quality improvement cycle that includes constituent input. Each program must clearly identify educational objectives and develop outcomes and assessment that demonstrate expected results.

Last years assessment report to the Office of University Assessment detailed all of the processes and outcomes presented in the written report to ABET. All of the instruments of assessment used are summarized in the timeline.

Fall 2003 & Spring 2004 Course Assessment for EC 2000 criteria

As part of the ongoing assessment for ABET accreditation the all major courses required in Architectural Engineering Program are evaluated for compliance with the required Outcomes. This course assessment started in fall 2001 semester and has been performed every semester since then. Each of these courses assessed by the faculty are included in the documentation organized by the school's assessment chair and presented to the department head. Any changes to individual courses are at the discretion of the individual faculty member and the department head. The department head presents and issues that require curriculum changes to the faculty for discussion or possible action. The assessments are kept by each faculty member and the assessment chair for future evaluations. The criteria assessed are as follows:

- (a) an ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering.
- (b) an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data.
- (c) an ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs.
- (d) an ability to function on multi-disciplinary teams.
- (e) an ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems.
- (f) an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility.
- (g) an ability to communicate effectively.
- (h) the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context.
- (i) a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning.
- (j) a knowledge of contemporary issues.
- (k) an ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

Fall 2003 Comprehensive Studio Jury Surveys

Students in both the Architecture and Architectural Engineering programs take a comprehensive design and development course. As part of the course, professional architects and engineers are brought in at key points in the design process to jury student presentations. Each student normally gives two oral and graphic presentations of their design to the juror during the semester. Since the fall 1992 semester class the professional jurors have been surveyed to assess the schools achievement of the educational outcomes. The results of these surveys summarized by the assessment chair, presented to the assessment committee for evaluation and used to guide the schools professional school focus. The fall 2003 survey results were very good in almost all areas. Construction cost control and constructability issues still are areas of concern that warrant action (lower than 3.0/5.0) in both programs, while selection of a mechanical system and design of the mechanical system warrant action in the architectural engineering program. Other areas warranted concern and discussion (lower then 3.5/5.0). This has been a trend in the courses over the past several years. To determine if a problem really exists, the surveys for the spring semester were modified. These modifications are discussed later.

Fall 2003 & Spring 2004 Graduating Students Exit Interviews

The School of Architecture has given exit interviews to the graduating students since the spring 2000 semester. In the fall of 2000 the architectural engineering graduates were given surveys to assess the EC 2000 criteria (listed in course assessment). The result of this assessment is review by the assessment committee. For inclusion of NAAB student performance criteria, a survey was added for the architecture graduates in the spring 2004 semester. These changes are discussed in that section. The exit interview results are present to the faculty before the beginning of the next semester during the start of the semester faculty meeting. Any changes to the curriculum or programs are discussed than or in subsequent faculty meetings.

Fall 2003 & Spring 2004 Graduating Students Portfolios

Each year of the past decade 10 graduating students compile complete portfolios of their work documenting their progress throughout the curriculum. These portfolios are reviewed annually by our Professional Advisory Committee and are a critical component of our ongoing assessment. The cost of producing these portfolios is enormous and each student received up to \$400 in support from Assessment funds over the past few years. A formalized assessment survey of each portfolio may be developed in the coming years.

Spring 2003 Assessment Committee Meeting

On March 25, 2004 the assessment committee met to review and evaluated processes for FY 03/04. The fall 2003 Comprehensive Studio Jury Surveys were evaluated and the decision was made to try to reduce the number of questions on the survey. To accomplish this each question on the survey will no only ask to what extent the students in the program are meeting the criteria, but how important the criteria is in regards to the profession of architecture or architectural engineering. This will be done for the spring 2004 surveys.

The results of the fall 2003 graduating student exit interviews were evaluated for the architectural engineering student in regards to EC 2000 outcomes. In addition the chair presented the historical result of previous interview. No changes are recommended as a result of these surveys. The

committee did decide to survey the graduating architectural graduates to evaluate the National Architectural Accreditation Boards (NAAB) for Student Performance Criteria. This survey was developed by the assessment chair and will be included in the spring 2004 exit interviews.

The committee also reviewed the 2002 Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) Survey for revision to be included in the 2004 survey. It was decided not to change any of the criteria evaluated, but to ask the PAC members how important each of the criteria was to the schools professional programs in architecture and architectural engineering.

Finally the assessment committee decided that it was the assessments chairs responsibility to guide the Course Assessment for EC 2000 criteria on a semester basis and to present these assessments to the department head for discussion with the faculty for any changes to the curriculum.

Spring 2004 Professional Advisory Committee Surveys

The Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) is a standing committee that has been in continuous service providing support to our school for over twenty-five years, is today composed of 18 in-state (7 architectural engineers and 13 architects) and 7 regional representatives that meet twice yearly at the school. The PAC provides input on the program objective and curriculum to the department head. A formalized survey of the PAC is prepared by the Assessment committee and scheduled to occur every two years. The first survey was performed in the spring of 2002. The second survey was conducted during May 2004. This survey has been modified to assess the importance of the criteria. The results of the survey will be collated by the assessment chair and presented to the committee during FY 04/05.

Spring 2004 Comprehensive Studio Jury Surveys

Due to changes in the curriculum structure in both the Architecture and Architectural Engineering programs the comprehensive design and development course was moved to the spring semester this fiscal year. The spring 2004 survey of the professional jurors was modified to assess the importance of the criteria. The results of the survey will be collated by the assessment chair and presented to the committee during FY 04/05.

Spring 2004 OSU Telephone Survey

The Oklahoma State University Office of University Assessment performs telephone surveys of OSU alumni. Surveys are scheduled every two years. In the spring of 2002 alumni who received their degrees in 1996 and 2000 were surveyed. In the spring of 2004 alumni who received their degrees in 1998 and 2002 were surveyed. The results of the survey will be collated by the assessment chair and presented to the committee during FY 04/05.