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A Plan to Correct is required in cases when the NAAB board determines that the program is not in compliance with one or more of the Conditions for Accreditation, either at the time continuing accreditation is granted or as a result of a Special Report review. Programs with a Plan to Correct will have two years to demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation noted to be out of compliance. Programs submitting a Plan to Correct will be required to provide a narrative response with supporting documentation and evidence of compliance for each Condition noted to be out of compliance.

**Review of the Process.** The Accreditation Review Committee (ARC) reviewers will make one of the following recommendations to be acted upon by the board:

- In the event a program has demonstrated compliance with all the Conditions for Accreditation previously noted to be out of compliance, accept the Plan to Correct and approve the program for the remainder of the term of accreditation.
- In the event a program has not demonstrated compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation previously noted to be out of compliance, defer action and require a revised Plan to Correct to address all remaining areas of non-compliance. (Submission timelines are December 15 and June 30.)
- In the event a program’s Plan to Correct does not demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation within two years, continue the Plan to Correct, place the program on notice for a period not to exceed one (1) year, and inform the institution’s Chief Academic Officer.
- In the event a program’s Plan to Correct does not demonstrate compliance with Conditions for Accreditation within one (1) year of notice, place the program on probation for a period not to exceed one (1) year, require a focused visit on remaining areas of noncompliance within six months, and inform the institution’s Chief Academic Officer. All accreditation decisions to place a program on probation will be made public on the NAAB website.

Decisions by the NAAB board regarding the program’s Plan to Correct are not subject to reconsideration or appeal.

**Instructions**
1. Type all responses in the designated text areas. Add additional rows as needed to include all conditions not met.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format.

**Deadline and Submission**
Programs determined to be out of compliance with one or more Conditions for Accreditation identified at the spring board meeting will be required to submit a Plan to Correct on or before December 15 of the same year.

Programs determined to be out of compliance with one or more Conditions for Accreditation identified at the fall board meeting will be required to submit a Plan to Correct on or before June 30 of the following year.

Programs that fail to submit a Plan to Correct by the deadline will be placed on Administrative Probation, after notice.

All Plans to Correct should be sent to accreditation@naab.org on or before the appropriate deadline.
### Conditions Not Met

List the number and title of each condition that must be addressed in the Plan to Correct.

### Corrective Actions

Provide a narrative describing the corrective actions that have been taken and those that are planned but not yet implemented. For all actions taken, provide supporting evidence as described under the relevant Condition in the 2020 Conditions and 2020 Guidelines for the Accreditation Process.

### Timeline

List the timeline for all corrective actions, including actual or planned start and completion dates.

| SC.5 - Design Synthesis: B.Arch. and M.Arch. | Program Narrative: SC.5 student learning outcomes (SLOs) are being assessed over two consecutive years in order to ensure compliance. Listed below are the six steps that the school is following in the assessment process. The report following the end of this document is the first assessment report produced in fall 2022. | Start: February 2022
Completion: May 2024 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong> In spring 2022, the School of Architecture Curriculum Committee established an ad hoc committee to study and make recommendations on the B Arch and M Arch studio scope and sequence respectively. The charge of the committee is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to review the SLOs assigned to each studio course with the goal of increasing the effectiveness of the studio sequence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to coordinate the impact of the Curriculum Committee’s recently revised technology sequence (to be implemented in 2024) on the design studio sequence in both programs. The revised technology sequence includes increased learning material at the conceptual level for structural and building systems courses, along with increased assignments at the upper-level courses to examine the measurable impact of environmental design strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to evaluate the impact of assigning the SLOs of both SC.5 (Design Synthesis) and SC.6 (Building Integration) to the same course (Arch 5001-B Arch, Arch 7006-M Arch, at the mastering/refining level). And to Consider reassigning the SLOs of SC.5 and SC.6 to two separate design courses, respectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong> Following the newly developed assessment process (described in the APR), students’ projects were collected in spring 2022 semester that are designated for the assessment of SC.5. As indicated in the submitted NAAB matrix, these courses are Arch 3002 and Arch 5001 for the B Arch program; Arch 7004 and Arch 7006 for the M Arch program. In addition to student projects, data was gathered from graduating students exit surveys and student course surveys. The latter survey included the following design studio courses: Arch 2001, 2002, 3001, 3002,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conditions Not Met
List the number and title of each condition that must be addressed in the Plan to Correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrective Actions</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Provide a narrative describing the corrective actions that have been taken and those that are planned but not yet implemented. For all actions taken, provide supporting evidence as described under the relevant Condition in the 2020 Conditions and 2020 Guidelines for the Accreditation Process.</em></td>
<td><em>List the timeline for all corrective actions, including actual or planned start and completion dates.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4002, 5000, 5001 for the B Arch and Arch 7001, 7002, 7003, 7004, 7005, 7006 for the M Arch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: During fall 2022, the projects and surveys were assessed by a selected panel of architecture faculty for meeting SC.5 SLOs. The recommendations for improvement developed by the faculty panel were forwarded to the school Curriculum Committee for final approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: The Curriculum Committee developed the final recommendations for improvement that integrates the assessment report of the faculty panel and the above-mentioned design sequence ad hoc committee recommendations. The Curriculum Committee discussed the recommended changes with the faculty at large at the end-of-fall faculty retreat in December 2022.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: The implementation of the changes to the design courses with particular emphasis on the above four courses to meet the SC.5 SLOs occurred during the spring 2023 semester when the designated four courses were offered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Student projects of the four courses were collected by the end of spring 2023 for the next round of assessment in 2023-2024 (repeat steps 2 to 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting Evidence:**
See the two fall 2022 assessment reports following this document.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022, BArch in Architecture pages 14 to 19.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022, MArch in Architecture pages 13 to 17.

### SC.6 - Building Integration: B.Arch. and M.Arch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Narrative:</th>
<th>Start: February 2022 Completion: May 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC.6 student learning outcomes (SLOs) are being assessed over two consecutive years in order to ensure compliance. Listed below are the six steps that the school is following in the assessment process. The reports following the end of this document is the first assessment reports produced in fall 2022.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: The School of Architecture Curriculum Committee established an ad hoc committee to study and make recommendations on the B Arch and M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arch studio scope and sequence respectively. The charge of the committee is:

- to review the SLOs assigned to each studio course with the goal of increasing the effectiveness of the studio sequence.
- to coordinate the impact of the Curriculum Committee’s recently revised technology sequence (to be implemented in 2024) on the design studio sequence in both programs. The revised technology sequence includes increased learning material at the conceptual level for structural and building systems courses, along with increased assignments at the upper-level courses to examine the measurable impact of environmental design strategies.
- to evaluate the impact of assigning the SLOs of both SC.5 (Design Synthesis) and SC.6 (Building Integration) to the same course (Arch 5001-B Arch, Arch 7006-M Arch, at the mastering/refining level). And to Consider reassigning the SLOs of SC.5 and SC.6 to two separate design courses, respectively.

Step 2: Following the newly developed assessment process (described in the APR), students’ projects were collected in spring 2022 semester that are designated for the assessment of SC.6. As indicated in the submitted NAAB matrix, these courses are Arch 3002 and Arch 5001 for the B Arch program; Arch 7004 and Arch 7006 for the M Arch program. In addition to student projects, data was gathered from graduating students exit survey.

Step 3: During fall 2022, the projects and surveys were assessed by a selected panel of architecture faculty for meeting SC.6 SLOs. The recommendations for improvement developed by the faculty panel were forwarded to the school Curriculum Committee for final approval.

Step 4: The Curriculum Committee developed the final recommendations for improvement that integrates the assessment report of the faculty panel and the above-mentioned design sequence ad hoc committee recommendations. The Curriculum Committee discussed the recommended changes with the faculty at large at the end-of-fall faculty retreat in December 2022.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions Not Met</th>
<th>Corrective Actions</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the number and title of each condition that must be addressed in the Plan to Correct.</td>
<td>Provide a narrative describing the corrective actions that have been taken and those that are planned but not yet implemented. For all actions taken, provide supporting evidence as described under the relevant Condition in the 2020 Conditions and 2020 Guidelines for the Accreditation Process.</td>
<td>List the timeline for all corrective actions, including actual or planned start and completion dates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 5: The implementation of the changes to the design courses with particular emphasis on the above four courses to meet the SC.6 SLOs occurred during the spring 2023 semester when the designated four courses were offered.

Step 6: Student projects of the four courses were collected by the end of spring 2023 for the next round of assessment in 2023-2024 (repeat steps 2 to 5).

**Supporting Evidence:**
See the two fall 2022 assessment reports following this document.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022, BArch in Architecture pages 19, 10, 21.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022, MArch in Architecture pages 17 to 19.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022
BArch in Architecture

Mission
The School of Architecture is a leader in building exemplary professional expertise and rigorous scholarship on the built environment through diverse perspectives, knowledge integration and applied research emerging from the Mississippi delta and engaging global environments.

Reporting Cycle 2022
BArch in Architecture Learning Outcomes

PC.2 Design MET

How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC2.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO (Student Learning Outcome) below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td>MET Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5 year B.Arch program (40 total students), of which 9 students answered SLO PC2.1. Giving us a response rate of 22.5%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC2.2R (Arch 5000 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 5000) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC2.2: Engage and experiment with interdisciplinary design.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - [See Outcome Actions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Course Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT DESIGN STUDIO: ARCH 5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5000 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaching:</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>All students enrolled in Arch 5000 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.2. Of the 57 students enrolled in this course, 33 responded. Giving us a response rate of 57.9%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We met our target with 97% of students evaluating that Arch 5000 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC2.3B (Arch 3002 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC2.3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - [See Outcome Actions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Course Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No specific action, see the general outcome actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3002 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PC2.3 Engage and experiment with multi-scalar (from human to ecological) spatial analysis and design intention.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH DESIGN VII: ARCH 3002
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3002 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.3.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 3002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.3. Of the 43 students enrolled in this course, 14 responded. We had a response rate of 32.6%.

We met our target with 79% of students evaluating that Arch 3002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.3.

PC2.3R (Arch 4002 Course Evaluation)
All students in the following course (ARCH 4002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

PC2.3 Engage and experiment with multi-scalar (from human to ecological) spatial analysis and design intention
Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH DESIGN VIII: ARCH 4002
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4002 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.3.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 4002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.3. Of the 38 students enrolled in this course, 8 responded. We had a response rate of 21.1%.

We met our target with 88% of students evaluating that Arch 4002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.3.

PC2.4R (Arch 4002 Course Evaluation)
All students in the following course (ARCH 4002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

PC2.4: Understand the ability of design actions to create positive change in communities and the environment
Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH DESIGN VIII: ARCH 4002
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.4.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 4002 were asked to evaluate how well these courses meet requirement of PC2.4. Of the 24 students enrolled in this course, 8 responded. We had a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 88% of students evaluating that Arch 4002 meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.4.

PC2.5B (Arch 3002 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 3002) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding."

Analysis
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
Meeting," **Approaching," or "Not Approaching." PC2.5: Integrate multi-scalar understanding of design.

**Direct - Other**

**ARCH DESIGN VI: ARCH 3002**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

**Analysis**

18 examples from the following course (Arch 3002) was evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 84% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

**PC2.5R (Arch 5001 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." PC2.5: Integrate multi-scalar understanding of design.

**Direct - Other**

**COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 47% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

**Revise Curriculum**

IN PROGRESS

ARCH5001 involves so much content and deliverables that properly balancing the emphasis on each of them is complicated, but considering the score obtained, it would be pertinent to review the approaches of the exercise in order to guide the student towards the integration of the various scales in the most advanced stages of the project. This could be said for all studios/courses where PC.2 is measured. There seems to be proof that when the project brief is framed explicitly and is framed by the notion of design across multiple scales, and is purposely carried out through sequential phase-based exercises, the final project results yield more explicit integration of scales.

**General Outcome Actions**

**ACTIONS**

**Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]**

IN PROGRESS

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty ASSessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measures review by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above at "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

**Other - [Observations on Arch 3002, and Arch 5001]**

IN PROGRESS

The results show that, at least in general terms, the target score/threshold has been reached for PC2 Design. All the results had significate samples, the smallest one being PC2.3 with 21.1% of the total students. PC2.1, assessed through the exit survey, scores particularly high with a significate sample of students. The lowest bases are observed in PC2.3, evaluated in ARCH3002 with an average result of 3 [79%], and PC2.5, evaluated in ARCH5001 with an average result of 2.7 [47%]. The latter is the only indicator below the 3-point target [75%]. In this sense, although it is true that the exercise proposed by ARCH5001 has an intrinsic integration of the different variables in the design, the review of the selected student work observed that they tend to forget about the integration of different scales to the extent that they concentrate on the development of their holistic building design proposals. On the other hand, the work that the students carried out in ARCH3002 increased an effort to integrate urban scales in their proposals that were not always achieved. This fact seems to be linked to the level of learning that the student has at this level, where various complex variables are introduced, some for the first time.

**Gather Additional Data**

IN PROGRESS

It would be interesting to know more about the opinion of graduating students. For example, a sample of these students could be chosen for an interview to allow them to develop their answers and learn more about their opinion. This process would allow us to know their thoughts behind the 3.9 [100%], which is the highest value in the table.

**Revise Benchmark / Target**

IN PROGRESS
It would be important to define means to measure or identify projects that achieve integration through design. This could be thought of as a universal term, but it can be too generic. Constructing a more specific definition of such integration could facilitate its evaluation, but above all its conscious inclusion in school courses.

Other - [Maintain Assessment Strategy]

This evaluation system presents a diversified perspective between courses, students, professors, etc., which becomes a complete and effective vision of the situation.

Adopt or Expand Technologies

GIS has been introduced more and more through various Studios and courses. This technology seems to speak directly to the notion of multiple scales (especially regional) that, where appropriate, could continue to further instill this push towards integration – not only in terms of design concept and narrative but also graphics.

Collaborate with another Department / Unit / Program

There are ongoing desires to find more opportunities to align with Landscape and/or ID. The question of design across scales seems to be an appropriate entry point to push for collaboration, as each of these Schools within the College represent different scales and approaches to scale. Whether this unfolds in the form of the All-School Workshop? or in actual collaborative cross-discipline Studios (pushing more inclusion in the optional studio tracks?) could be practical ways to introduce this.

Conclusion

With the exception of results obtained in ARCH5001 student work review, the scores are directly proportional to the level of the course. That is, level 3000 courses have the lowest results, level 4000 courses have average mid-level results, and ARCH5000, as well as the exit survey, have the highest results. This behavior seems to indicate that integration through design across multiple scales improves in relation to student's development during the course. In this way, it would be logical to think that moving through a series of linked exercises is important for the student to be able to effectively integrate all the variables and scales that the design requires. Likewise, it could be concluded that the complexity of the integration exercise matches and reflects the level of difficulty that the student must face according to the curriculum year in which they are. Given the results (or at least the selected student work in question), the score obtained by ARCH5001 could be considered atypical. In any case, the results obtained by this evaluation should be considered favorable and it would be logical to think that the current curriculum and the structural variables that it proposes bring us closer to the desired results.

SC.1 Health, Safety and Welfare in the Built Environment

How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC1.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>MET Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO (Student Learning Outcome) below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td>Exceeding: 100%</td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.1: Understand the way the built environment impact human wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC1.2 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." | Exceeding: 71% |
| SC1.2: Understand the ability of spatial design to create positive change for communities. | | Other - [Increase response rate] |
| Indirect - Survey | Meeting: 29% | Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation. |
| | | Also see the general outcome actions. |
### SC1.3 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B.Arch program (40 total students), of which 7 students answered SLO SC1.2. We had a response rate of 17.5%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicated that the LSU School of Architecture was Meeting or Exceeding the requirements of SC1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5 year B.Arch program (40 total students), of which 7 students answered SLO SC1.2. We had a response rate of 17.5%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicated that the LSU School of Architecture was Meeting or Exceeding the requirements of SC1.2.

### SC1.4E (Arch 3007 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3007) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3007 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total: 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 3007 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 53 students enrolled in this course, 20 responded. Giving us a response rate of 37.7%.

We did not meet our target with only 70% of students evaluating that Arch 3007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

### SC1.4E (Arch 3008 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total: 41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 3008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 53 students enrolled in this course, 20 responded. Giving us a response rate of 37.7%.

We did not meet our target with only 70% of students evaluating that Arch 3007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

### Other - [Increase Response Rate]

**IN PROGRESS**

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.

### Other - [See Outcome Actions]

**IN PROGRESS**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 115 students enrolled in this course, 29 responded. Giving us a response rate of 25.2%.

We met our target with 79% of students evaluating that Arch 3008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

SC1.4B (Arch 4007 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 4007) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

HIST OF ARCH III: ARCH 4007

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4007 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 4007 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 49 students enrolled in this course, 25 responded. Giving us a response rate of 51.0%.

We met our target with 80% of students evaluating that Arch 4007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.4B (Arch 4062 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 4062) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

URBAN DESIGN/PLANNING: ARCH 4062

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4062 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 4062 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 84 students enrolled in this course, 24 responded. Giving us a response rate of 28.6%.

We met our target with 96% of students evaluating that Arch 4062 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.4R (Arch 5005 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 5005) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005

MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 5005 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 195 students enrolled in this course, 109 responded. Giving us a response rate of 56.1%.

We met our target with 96% of students evaluating that Arch 5005 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5005 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 5005 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 33 students enrolled in this course, 9 responded. Giving us a response rate of 27.3%.

We met our target with 77% of students evaluating that Arch 5005 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeding: 71%
Meeting: 29%
Not Approaching: 4%

Met Total: 77%
Not Met Total: 22%

SC1.5B (Arch 4062 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 4062) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.5: Ability to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to promote socially-conscious design.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
URBAN DESIGN/PLANNING: ARCH 4062

Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4062 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.5.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 4062 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.5. Of the 84 students enrolled in this course, 24 responded. Giving us a response rate of 28.6%.

We met our target with 96% of students evaluating that Arch 4062 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.5.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeding: 71%
Meeting: 25%
Not Approaching: 4%

Met Total: 96%
Not Met Total: 4%

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.5R (Arch 5001 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 5001) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.5: Ability to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to promote socially-conscious design.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001

Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5001 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.5.

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 5001 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.5. Of the 21 students enrolled in this course, 3 responded. Giving us a response rate of 14.3%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 5001 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.5.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeding: 67%
Meeting: 33%
Not Approaching: 0%

Met Total: 100%
Not Met Total: 0%

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.6E (Arch 3008 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 3008) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.6: Understand the different variables that impact human health and safety in the built Environment.

Direct - Other
ENVIRON CONTROL SYST: ARCH 3008

Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.6.

Analysis
10 examples from the following course (Arch 3008) were evaluated by faculty members.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting: 100%
Not Met Total: 0%
### General Outcome Actions

**SC1.7R (Arch 5001 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.7: Understand construction measures that promote human health, safety and welfare.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

**MET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>SC1.7R (Arch 5001 Student Work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching:</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

13 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 85% of student work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

---

**SC1.7R (Arch 5005 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.7: Understand construction measures that promote human health, safety and welfare.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

**MET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>SC1.7R (Arch 5005 Student Work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 100% of student work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

---

**General Outcome Actions**

**ACTIONS**

**Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]**

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty ASsessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

**Other - [Observations on SC1 Courses]**

With the exception of course evaluations for ARCH 3007 (with 37.7% response) and ARCH 5005 (with 27.3% response), the target scores for SC1.1 have largely been met through both indirect and direct measures. A low percentage of responses in several indirect measures categories, including exit surveys and the ARCH 5001 course evaluation, do not provide a clear assessment of student outcomes, despite their high scores. From course evaluations, it appears that ARCH 4062 is helping students make the clearest connections between health, safety, and welfare in the built environment. Our assessment of direct measures showed that most student work responded to variables that affect human health, safety, and welfare through implementation of relevant design and/or construction measures. We evaluated few projects that met the threshold of "exceeded."

Each course we assessed posed a slightly different challenge. For example, ARCH 5005 projects are group projects, so we must assume that each member of a group achieved the same learning outcome. Four group projects associated with SC1.1 (as specified in the Log) were provided in the ARCH 5005 archive, which made up a sample group of approximately 15 students. We assessed each project as having "met" SC1.1, which put all 15 students in the "met" category. ARCH 5001 was more straightforward, as we could clearly assess individual students' work, but with 9 phases of the assignment, it was unclear where SC1.1 specifically emerged. All work from ARCH 3008, meanwhile, was not available, so we were unable to use typical assessment guidelines. We assessed based on the work given, which equaled 27.8% of undergrads, but we could not follow a single student through multiple projects, due to the limited sample of projects. With regard to ARCH 5005 and ARCH 3008, quizzes and exams were associated with SC1.1, but without individual student outcomes on exam-type assignments, it is difficult to fully assess student work.
Assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to

SC.4 Technical Knowledge

MET

How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

### Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC4.1 (Exit Survey)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Restructure Outcome Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting: 43%</td>
<td>Approaching: 57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 43%</td>
<td>Not Met Total: 57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO (Student Learning Outcome) below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4.1: Understand structural analysis and technology and their contribution to design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC4.2 (Exit Survey)</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Restructure Outcome Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding: 29%</td>
<td>Meeting: 29%</td>
<td>Approaching: 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 58%</td>
<td>Not Met Total: 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4.2: Understand environmental analysis and technology and their contribution to design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The lowest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH5005 (2.78)[77%]. When assessing the direct measures for 5005, we also had trouble "finding" SC1 in the assignment and construction documents. Perhaps, in this case, SC1 is not made explicit enough for students to perceive it in their own work. As assessors, we cross-referenced NAAB guidelines and already have an understanding of the meaning of "health, safety, and welfare in the built environment," but students may not be aware that implementing specific design or construction measures influences these aspects. The highest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH4062 (3.71)[96%]. This course makes explicit the connections between the built environment and human health, safety, and welfare. Students may be responding to how content is shared and what is emphasized in the class, allowing them to evaluate SC1 more clearly at the end of the semester in ARCH4062 versus ARCH5005.

In ARCH5001, we observed many projects that responded to variables that affect human health, safety, and welfare through implementation of relevant design and/or construction measures, but less than 30% of the projects reached the "exceeded" threshold, mainly due to a lack of synthesis in combining health and safety measures with the comprehensive design. Nevertheless, it was clear that students were thinking about human comfort and environmental control systems, as expressed by the "refining courses" description in SoArc's NAAB report.

The lowest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH5005 (2.78)[77%]. When assessing the direct measures for 5005, we also had trouble "finding" SC1 in the assignment and construction documents. Perhaps, in this case, SC1 is not made explicit enough for students to perceive it in their own work. As assessors, we cross-referenced NAAB guidelines and already have an understanding of the meaning of "health, safety, and welfare in the built environment," but students may not be aware that implementing specific design or construction measures influences these aspects. The highest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH4062 (3.71)[96%]. This course makes explicit the connections between the built environment and human health, safety, and welfare. Students may be responding to how content is shared and what is emphasized in the class, allowing them to evaluate SC1 more clearly at the end of the semester in ARCH4062 versus ARCH5005.

In ARCH5001, we observed many projects that responded to variables that affect human health, safety, and welfare through implementation of relevant design and/or construction measures, but less than 30% of the projects reached the "exceeded" threshold, mainly due to a lack of synthesis in combining health and safety measures with the comprehensive project. Nevertheless, it was clear that students were thinking about human comfort and environmental control systems, as expressed by the "refining courses" description in SoArc's NAAB report.

The lowest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH5005 (2.78)[77%]. When assessing the direct measures for 5005, we also had trouble "finding" SC1 in the assignment and construction documents. Perhaps, in this case, SC1 is not made explicit enough for students to perceive it in their own work. As assessors, we cross-referenced NAAB guidelines and already have an understanding of the meaning of "health, safety, and welfare in the built environment," but students may not be aware that implementing specific design or construction measures influences these aspects. The highest scoring course evaluation in SC1 was for ARCH4062 (3.71)[96%]. This course makes explicit the connections between the built environment and human health, safety, and welfare. Students may be responding to how content is shared and what is emphasized in the class, allowing them to evaluate SC1 more clearly at the end of the semester in ARCH4062 versus ARCH5005.
An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5 year B. Arch program (40 total students), of which 7 students answered SLO SC4.2. Giving us a response rate of 17.5%. We did not meet our target with only 58% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.2.

SC4.3 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.3: Understand material assembly and methods of construction and their contribution to design.

Indirect - Survey

Target

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.3.

NOT MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5 year B. Arch program (40 total students), of which 7 students answered SLO SC4.3. Giving us a response rate of 17.5%. We did not meet our target with only 34% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.3.

Restructure Outcome Statement

IN PROGRESS

Revise Language of SLO for greater specificity

Other - [Increase Response Rate]

IN PROGRESS

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.

SC4.4 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.4: Understand the contribution of engineering and social science knowledge to building design.

Indirect - Survey

Target

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.4.

NOT MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5 year B. Arch program (40 total students), of which 7 students answered SLO SC4.4. Giving us a response rate of 17.5%. We did not meet our target with only 57% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.4.

Restructure Outcome Statement

IN PROGRESS

Revise Language of SLO for greater specificity

Other - [Increase Response Rate]

IN PROGRESS

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.

SC4.5B (Arch 3004 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ARCH STRUCT II: ARCH 3004

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3004 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5.

MET

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
All students enrolled in Arch 3004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 52 students enrolled in this course, 26 responded. Giving us a response rate of 50.0%.

We met our target with 96% of students evaluating that Arch 3004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

**SC4.5E (Arch 3007 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 3007) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching.

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ARCHITECTURAL SYSTEMS: ARCH 3007

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3007 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 53%
- Meeting: 37%
- Approaching: 10%
- Not Approaching: 10%

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3007 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 54 students enrolled in this course, 19 responded. Giving us a response rate of 35.2%.

We met our target with 90% of students evaluating that Arch 3007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

**SC4.5E (Arch 3008 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 3008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching.

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ENVIRON CONTROL SYST: ARCH 3008

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 34%
- Meeting: 48%
- Approaching: 10%
- Not Approaching: 7%

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 115 students enrolled in this course, 29 responded. Giving us a response rate of 25.2%.

We met our target with 82% of students evaluating that Arch 3008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

**SC4.5B (Arch 4031 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 4031) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching.

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ARCH STRUCTURES III: ARCH 4031

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4031 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 58%
- Meeting: 42%
- Not Approaching: 100%

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 4031 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 37 students enrolled in this course, 24 responded. Giving us...
**SC4.6R (Arch 5001 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

**SC4.6: Utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001</td>
<td>75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Total</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 4031 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

**Revise Curriculum**

ARCH 5001 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 5001. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students’ studio projects in 5th-year lecture courses.

---

**SC4.6R (Arch 5005 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

**SC4.6: Utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005</td>
<td>75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Total</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 47% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.

**Revise Measurement / Assessment**

We recommend eliminating ARCH5005 in the SC4.6 evaluation since utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project is covered in ARCH 5001.

---

**SC4.7R (Arch 5001 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

**SC4.7: Utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001</td>
<td>75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Total</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 93% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

**Revise Curriculum**

ARCH 5001 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 5001. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students’ studio projects in 5th-year lecture courses.

---

**SC4.7R (Arch 5005 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

**SC4.7: Utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005</td>
<td>75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Total</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 47% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

---

**Revise Benchmark / Target**

ARCH 5001 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 5001. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students’ studio projects in 5th-year lecture courses.
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.7: Utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other

ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

Analysis

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with 0% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

We recommend eliminating ARCH5005 in the SC4.7 evaluation since environmental analyses are not the expected components of a construction document set. The goal of environmental analyses is to impact the schematic design or design development phases of architectural projects. [Subject is covered in ARCH 5001]

SC4.8 (Arch 5001 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.8: Utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other

COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

Analysis

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 87% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

Revise Curriculum

ARCH 5001 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 5001. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students’ studio projects in 5th-year lecture courses.

SC4.8 (Arch 5005 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.8: Utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other

ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

Analysis

15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

General Outcome Actions

ACTIONS

Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.” Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.
Other - [Observations on SC4 Courses]

The average of the overall SC4 scores was 2.9 (70%). This does not meet the target score/threshold (3.0) (75%). If ARCH 5005 is eliminated in the SC4.7 evaluation as we recommended (see the Recommendation section of this report for further information), the average goes up to 3.1 (75.3%) and meets the target score/threshold (3.0) (75%). The average response rate was 32%.

The exit survey average (2.6) (48%) tends to be lower than the course evaluation average (3.4) (92%) and the student work average (2.7) (70%). The response rate of the exit survey (17.5%) was also lower than the course evaluation average (44%) and the student work average (35%). The average score of SC4.5 (ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings) was 3.4 (92%). The average score of SC4.6 (utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project) was 3.1 (70%). The average score of SC4.7 (utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project) was 1.8 (46.5%). The average score of SC4.8 (utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project) was 3.3 (93.5%). This result shows that students address material assembly techniques better than environmental or structural analyses. In ARCH 5001 comprehensive design studio only, students address structural logic better than other areas.

Revision Curriculum

For students’ balanced understanding of technical knowledge, it is recommended to have more required courses on environmental analyses and material assembly issues. Finally, for all courses, it is recommended to explicitly show the topics area in the assignment briefs.

Gather Additional Data

A focus group discussion at the end of the semester may be helpful to collect students’ opinions.

Adopt or Expand Technologies

Considering the current climate change concerns and the growing interest in green building design, further utilization of building performance simulation tools in the studio would be recommended.

Collaborate with another Department / Unit / Program

Coordinating an interdisciplinary team that consists of designers and engineers with different backgrounds is one of the important roles of a project architect. At least one required interdisciplinary studio may be helpful to prepare for this future role.

Other - [Maintain Assessment Strategy]

Evaluation with three different perspectives (exit survey, course evaluation, student learning outcome) seems to be an effective strategy that allows a balanced assessment of the technical knowledge integration.

Conclusion

In this SC4 survey, it was remarkable that the exit survey average score (2.6) (48%) tends to be lower than the course evaluation average (3.4) (92%) and the student work average (2.7) (70%). Since the exit survey was responded by general students (who may or may not have taken the listed courses), this result may indicate that other unlisted courses do not address enough technical knowledge that includes structural, environmental, and material assembly issues. This assumption would be more convincing if the response rate of the exit survey is higher. According to the survey result related to ARCH 5001 comprehensive design studio, students have a higher score in structure than in other areas on material assembly and environmental analyses. The reason may be the high number of structure courses in the curriculum compared to other areas.

SC.5 Design Synthesis MET

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC5.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>NOT MET</td>
<td>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO (Students Learning Outcome) below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation. Also see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC5.1: Ability to integrate all the following in one design process: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise Language of SLO for greater specificity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td>Meeting: 71% Approaching: 29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Meeting Total: 71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Meet Total: 29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.1. Of the 7 students answering SLO SC5.1, giving us a response rate of 17.5%.

We did not meet our target with only 71% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.1.

### SC5.2E (Arch 2001 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 2001) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.**

**Indirect - Course Evaluation**

**ARCH DESIGN III: ARCH 2001**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 2001 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- **Exceeding:** 39%
- **Meeting:** 52%
- **Approaching:** 9%
- **Not Met Total:** 9%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 2001 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 43 students enrolled in this course, 23 responded. Giving us a response rate of 53.5%. We met our target with 91% of students evaluating that Arch 2001 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Action]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

### SC5.2E (Arch 2002 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 2002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.**

**Indirect - Course Evaluation**

**ARCH DESIGN IV: ARCH 2002**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 2002 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- **Exceeding:** 38%
- **Meeting:** 57%
- **Approaching:** 5%
- **Not Met Total:** 5%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 2002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 39 students enrolled in this course, 21 responded. Giving us a response rate of 53.6%. We met our target with 95% of students evaluating that Arch 2002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Action]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

### SC5.2B (Arch 3001 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3001) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.**

**Indirect - Course Evaluation**

**ARCH DESIGN V: ARCH 3001**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3001 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**NOT MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- **Exceeding:** 25%
- **Meeting:** 42%
- **Not Approaching:** 33%
- **Met Total:** 67%
- **Not Met Total:** 33%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 3001 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 35 students enrolled in this course, 12 responded. Giving us a response rate of 34.3%. We did not meet our target with only 67% of students evaluating that Arch 3001 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Action]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
SC5.2B (Arch 3002 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH DESIGN VI: ARCH 3002

Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3002 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Approaching</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 43 students enrolled in this course, 14 responded. Giving us a response rate of 32.6%.

We met our target with 79% of students evaluating that Arch 3002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

Other - [See Outcome Action]

IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC5.2R (Arch 4002 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 4002) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH DESIGN VIII: ARCH 4002

Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4002 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Approaching</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 4002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 38 students enrolled in this course, 8 responded. Giving us a response rate of 21.1%.

We met our target with 88% of students evaluating that Arch 4002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

Other - [See Outcome Action]

IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC5.2 (Arch 5000 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 5000) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
OPT DESIGN STUDIO: ARCH 5000

Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5000 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

MET
Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Approaching</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 5000 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 53 students enrolled in this course, 34 responded. Giving us a response rate of 63.7%.

We met our target with 97% of students evaluating that Arch 5000 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

Other - [See Outcome Action]

IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
We met our target with 97% of students evaluating that Arch 5000 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**SC5.2R (Arch 5001 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 5001) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

**Indirect - Course Evaluation**

**COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5001 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**MET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 5001 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 21 students enrolled in this course, 3 responded. Giving us a response rate of 14.3%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 5001 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Action]**

**IN PROGRESS**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

**SC5.3B (Arch 3002 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (ARCH 3002) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC5.3: Design project was developed with an integrated approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.

**Direct - Other**

**ARCH DESN VI: ARCH 3002**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**NOT MET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

12 examples from the following course (Arch 3002) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 42% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**Restructure Outcome Statement**

**IN PROGRESS**

We recommend the rephrasing of SC5.3 to “Design project was developed with a synthetic approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.” Replacing “integrated” with “synthetic” clarifies the difference between SC5 and SC6. Synthesis indicates the objective of producing a distinct, indivisible idea, form, entity, that is not reducible to ‘parts’ versus ‘building integration’ that organizes a functional assembly of systems and components.

**SC5.3R (Arch 5001 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (ARCH 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC5.3: Design project was developed with an integrated approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.

**Direct - Other**

**COMP ARCH DESIGN: ARCH 5001**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**NOT MET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

13 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 53% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**Restructure Outcome Statement**

**IN PROGRESS**

We recommend the rephrasing of SC5.3 to “Design project was developed with a synthetic approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.” Replacing “integrated” with “synthetic” clarifies the difference between SC5 and SC6. Synthesis indicates the objective of producing a distinct, indivisible idea, form, entity, that is not reducible to ‘parts’ versus ‘building integration’ that organizes a functional assembly of systems and components.

**General Outcome Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Met Total: 53% Not Met Total: 46%
**ACTIONS**

**Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]**

IN PROGRESS

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group was given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

**Revise Curriculum**

IN PROGRESS

- Ensure that course assignments are explicit in what regulatory frameworks are being addressed, suspended, etc.
- Inclusion of component systems and their synthesis into the design approach should be emphasized throughout the course.
- Consider the placement of comprehensive studio in an earlier semester more closely linked to structures and environmental systems courses.
- Consider the integration of some or all of the due diligence set with an appropriate course (i.e. structures, environmental systems, or contract documents).
- Ensure that appropriate systems (site, structure, environmental, users) for the design brief are clear and that students are asked to visibly integrate them into the overall design concept.

**Other - [Synthetic Observations & Analysis]**

IN PROGRESS

- All aspects of criteria were unevenly addressed, and with uneven competency
- Synthesis was unevenly achieved - requirements and conditions were often addressed on their own, rather than in full synthetic relation to each other

**Other - [Observation on SC5.1]**

IN PROGRESS

SC5.1 was measured via an exit survey with a 17.5% response rate (7 out of 40) with an average evaluation of 2.71[71%] or between “some” and “quite a bit.” Because of the sample size this data is not a strong indicator.

**Other - [Observations on SC5.3]**

IN PROGRESS

SC5.3 was measured through the evaluation of student work according to the rubric described above.

3002: 12 of 36 (1/3) work samples reviewed with an average score of 2.25[42%]
5001: 13 of 39 (1/3) work samples reviewed with an average score of 2.54[53%]

**Other - [Observations on SC5.2]**

IN PROGRESS

SC5.2 was measured via student responses to course evaluations with the following outcomes:

2001, 53.5% response rate, average score 3.3[91%]
2002, 53.8% response rate, average score 3.33[95%]
3001, 34.3% response rate, average score 2.58[87%]
3002, 32.6% response rate, average score 2.92[79%]
4002, 21.1% response rate, average score 3.5[88%]
5000, 59.6% response rate, average score 3.76[97%]
5001, 14.3% response rate, average score 3.67[100%]

Students appear to have an increasing level of agreement that in the course they were integrating multiple factors including: context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis, into the development of a design project as they progress through the studio sequence. There is a dip in the level of agreement in the third year studio sequence possibly coinciding with the introduction of more complex building systems.

A question can be raised about where the evaluation question is understood to be an evaluation of their performance or the structure of the course and its assignments.

**Revise Measurement / Assessment**

IN PROGRESS

- Student design expectations and where or how they are met needs to be more clearly communicated in the archival documents.
- Make clear what regulatory frameworks and measurable environmental systems are expected to be synthesized in final design presentations.
- Student work sample should include presentation boards and due diligence set to aid in comprehensive assessment.
- The synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design and measurable environmental impacts is a compound student learning objective. The division of it into multiple learning objectives demonstrated in one or more assignments would help evaluate.

**Restructure Outcome Statement**

IN PROGRESS

We recommend revising all sub-criteria of SC.5 to substitute ‘synthesis’ for ‘integrate’.

**Conclusion**
SC.6 Building Integration  NOT MET

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC6.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>NOT MET</td>
<td>Restructure Outcome Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the 5-year B. Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

Indirect - Survey
Target
75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>NOT MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting: 71%</td>
<td>Approaching: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 71%</td>
<td>Not Met Total: 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
We did not meet our target with only 71% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC6.1.

| SC6.2B (Arch 3002 Student Work) | NOT MET | Revise Curriculum |

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 3002) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

Direct - Other
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>NOT MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding: 8%</td>
<td>Meeting: 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 41%</td>
<td>Not Met Total: 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
12 examples from the following course (Arch 3002) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 41% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

| SC6.2R (Arch 5001 Student Work) | NOT MET | Revise Curriculum |

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC6.2: Ability to develop building design that takes into consideration social, ecological, programmatic and technological factors.

Indirect - Survey
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>NOT MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding: 8%</td>
<td>Meeting: 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total: 41%</td>
<td>Not Met Total: 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
12 examples from the following course (Arch 3002) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 41% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.
General Outcome Actions

ACTIONS

Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]  
IN PROGRESS

Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heartedly engaged by the students.

SC6.3 (Arch 5001 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
10 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 40% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

Additional Training
IN PROGRESS

The 5002 course adheres to the ‘Refining’ standard of skill level which reinforces knowledge gained in previous courses. The 5002 course adheres to the ‘Refining’ allow students to practice their advanced design skills. Particular attention needs to be paid to if and how students are recalling previous knowledge and whether adequate practice is evident – there needs to be a formal adoption of supporting exercises that demonstrate these standards while working on the project.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS

One additional recommendation is that it would be helpful to define in more depth, time dedicated to not only recalling knowledge and addressing the required criteria (structural, environmental and life safety) during class instruction, but to define the time needed for post project documentation. In most of the work samples the documentation seemed an afterthought. Documentation is a critical piece in the discipline and more time dedicated to this should be considered.

SC6.3B (Arch 3002 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 3002) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
12 examples from the following course (Arch 3002) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 33% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

Additional Training
IN PROGRESS

The 3002 course adheres to the ‘Broadening’ standard of skill level which reinforces knowledge gained in previous courses. The 5002 course adheres to the ‘Refining’ allow students to practice their advanced design skills. Particular attention needs to be paid to if and how students are recalling previous knowledge and whether adequate practice is evident – there needs to be a formal adoption of supporting exercises that demonstrate these standards while working on the project.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS

One additional recommendation is that it would be helpful to define in more depth, time dedicated to not only recalling knowledge and addressing the required criteria (structural, environmental and life safety) during class instruction, but to define the time needed for post project documentation. In most of the work samples the documentation seemed an afterthought. Documentation is a critical piece in the discipline and more time dedicated to this should be considered.

SC6.3R (Arch 5001 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5001) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
10 examples from the following course (Arch 5001) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 60% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.
The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

Other - [Observations on Arch 3002 and Arch 5001]

**IN PROGRESS**

A target score of 2.3 was achieved by each course with most student work assessments in either the ‘Some’ (C) or ‘Responds’ (B) range. Very few student work samples met the ‘Effectively’ (A) range and zero projects fell in the ‘None’ (F) category.

A target score of 2.5[33%] and 2.88[60%] was achieved by 3002 and 5001 respectively. Most student work assessed landed in the “partially met” range (C) for 3001 while most of the worked assessed for 5001 landed in the “met” range (A). All student work samples demonstrated an attempt; there were no student work samples that landed in the (F) range.

Other - [Conclusion]

**COMPLETE**

Although the scores for both courses were similar, the 3002 work samples were more likely to meet the ‘Broadening’ standard compared to the 5001 samples meeting the higher ‘Refining’ standard. Holistically it was difficult to find any single project that addressed all four of the SC6.2 criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) at a similar level of success. Social appeared to be addressed the least measurable, demonstrated only with descriptive text and renderings. Ecological was similarly cursory, relying on descriptive text, icons, and diagrams, but very minimal to no measurable analysis. Technological was overall more successfully shown with wall sections, details, and system diagrams. Programmatic was consistently the most successfully met criteria that almost always included detailed plans and often supporting adjacency, public/private, etc. analysis.

**Conclusion**

Though the same criteria are being assessed for both courses the separation of target score gives an indication of the level of which skills met the ‘Broadening’ standard, the target standard for 3002 and the ‘Refining’ standard, the target standard for 5001. The ‘Broadening’ standard of skill level reinforces knowledge gained in previous courses to enable students to understand the integration of multiple building systems in the design process. The ‘Refining’ standard of skill level allows students to practice their advanced design skills in developing a comprehensive approach to building design that integrates environmental, technological, and social systems. In both courses, work samples showed engagement of the SC6.3 criteria (structural, environmental, and life safety systems) but at a minimal level in 3002 and in most cases seeming perfunctory. Structural systems were addressed via building and wall sections but were incomplete and lacked pertinent component annotations to illustrate intent an understanding of the design. There was little to no representation addressing life safety. The work samples lacked inclusion of code plans to address pertinent information such as occupancy types and allowances, accessibility, travel distances, exit strategies and means of egress etc. Technology of materials which is a measure in the standard of “Broadening” seemed to be the most widely addressed.
SLAR: Assessment Cycle 2022
MArch in Architecture

Mission
The School of Architecture is a leader in building exemplary professional expertise and rigorous scholarship on the built environment through diverse perspectives, knowledge integration and applied research emerging from the Mississippi delta and engaging global environments.

Reporting Cycle 2022
MArch in Architecture Learning Outcomes

PC.2 Design  MET
How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC2.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC2.1: Understand the way design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO PC2.1. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.1.

PC2.2R (Arch 5000 Course Evaluation) | | |
| All students in the following course (ARCH 5000) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." | | |
| PC2.2: Engage and experiment with interdisciplinary design. | | |
| **Target** | 75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5000 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.2. | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>Other - [See Outcome Actions]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>No specific action, see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 5000 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.2. Of the 57 students enrolled in this course, 33 responded. Giving us a response rate of 57.9%.

We met our target with 97% of students evaluating that Arch 5000 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.2.

PC2.3B (Arch 7004 Course Evaluation) | | |
| All students in the following course (ARCH 7004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>Other - [See Outcome Actions]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>No specific action, see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Proficiency
0% | 100% | 76% | 21% | 3% | 97% | 3% |
PC2.3 Engage and experiment with multi-scalar (from human to ecological) spatial analysis and design intention.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7004 met or exceeded the requirements of PC2.3.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 7004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.3. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 4 responded. Giving us a response rate of 80%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.3.

PC2.4B (Arch 7004 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 7004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

PC2.4: Understand the ability of design actions to create positive change in communities and the environment

Indirect - Course Evaluation

GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.4.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 7004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of PC2.4. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 4 responded. Giving us a response rate of 80%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of PC2.4.

PC2.5B (Arch 7004 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

PC2.5: Integrate multi-scalar understanding of design.

Direct - Other

GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

Analysis

6 examples from the following course (Arch 7004) was evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.

PC2.5R (Arch 7006 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

PC2.5: Integrate multi-scalar understanding of design.

Direct - Other

GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006

Target

Other - [See Outcome Actions]

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

Analysis

We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of PC2.5.
General Outcome Actions

**ACTIONS**

**Other - [Observations on PC2]**

In general terms, the overall evaluation presents a very positive result for PC2 Design. All the courses evaluated through the different means obtained an average greater than 3.75%, and four of the six obtained 3.75% or 3.8(100%). Still, it is important to note that PC2.1 has a small sample of students (the Graduate program in general is a smaller sample size). The lowest score was obtained by PC2.5 in ARCH7006. What is clear from the student work reviewed (and from teaching experience at the Graduate level) is the perhaps expected disparity between students with undergraduate Built Environment (allied discipline) backgrounds and those without. Some students are being introduced to and expected to grasp new language and multiple facets of design and technical discourse for the first time, while others have been versed in this language for awhile. The level of design integration and holistic narratives seems to align with the experience level of students (even after 2-3 years within the program).

**Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]**

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty ASSessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

**Revise Curriculum**

Similar to ARCH5001, ARCH7006 involves the production of so much content and deliverables that properly balancing the emphasis on each of them is challenging. Considering the average score obtained, it would be pertinent to review the approaches of exercise/design briefs in order to guide the student towards the integration of the various scales in the most advanced stages of the project. Like the Undergraduate work, there seems to be proof that when the project assignment explicitly references and is framed by the notion of design across multiple scales (achieved through various phases), the final projects yield more explicit integration of scales. We should also continue to think on how we address the disparity between student experiences upon entering the Graduate program.

**Gather Additional Data**

Collect information on how PC2 is being considered in the analyzed courses in order to reinforce measures that go in the right direction. This could coincide with considerations regarding project briefs and guidelines.

**Adopt or Expand Technologies**

GIS has been introduced more and more through various Studios and courses. This technology seems to speak directly to the notion of multiple scales (especially regional) that, where appropriate, could continue to further instill this push towards integration – not only in terms of design concept and narrative but also graphics.

**Collaborate with another Department / Unit / Program**

See Undergraduate recommendation regarding potential collaboration with Landscape and/or ID.

"There are ongoing desires to find more opportunities to align with Landscape and/or ID. The question of design across scales seems to be an appropriate entry point to push for collaboration, as each of these Schools within the College represent different scales and approaches to scale. Whether this unfolds in the form of the All-School Workshop? or in actual collaborative cross-discipline Studios (pushing more inclusion in the optional studio tracks?) could be practical ways to introduce this."

**Other - [Maintain Assessment Strategy]**

This evaluation system presents a diversified perspective between courses, students, professors, etc., which becomes a complete and effective vision of the situation.

**Conclusion**

The results obtained seem to indicate that the school and the selected courses are complying favorably with the requirements of PC2 Design. See observation point above re: student experience level capacity. With a small sample size, results could arguably sway and vary based on cohort experience levels.

SC.1 Health, Safety and Welfare in the Built Environment MET
How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC1.1 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>MET Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Exceeding]</td>
<td>[Meeting]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Also see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.1.</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.1: Understand the way the built environment impact human wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.2 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>MET Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Other - [Increase response rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Meeting]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Also see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.2.</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.2: Understand the ability of spatial design to create positive change for communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.3 (Exit Survey)</td>
<td>MET Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>Other - [Increase Response Rate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Exceeding]</td>
<td>[Meeting]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Also see the general outcome actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.3.</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of &quot;Exceeding,&quot; &quot;Meeting,&quot; &quot;Approaching,&quot; or &quot;Not Approaching.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1.3: Ability to develop holistic interdisciplinary design approach centered on human welfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exceeding:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SC1.4E (Arch 3007 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3007) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCHITECTURAL SYSTEMS: ARCH 3007
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3007 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3007 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 53 students enrolled in this course, 20 responded. Giving us a response rate of 37.7%.

We did not meet our target with only 70% of students evaluating that Arch 3007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.4E (Arch 3008 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ENVIRON CONTROL SYSTEM: ARCH 3008
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 115 students enrolled in this course, 29 responded. Giving us a response rate of 25.2%.

We met our target with 79% of students evaluating that Arch 3008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC1.4R (Arch 5005 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 5005) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC1.4: Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 5005 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 5005 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 33 students enrolled in this course, 9 responded. Giving us a response rate of 27.3%.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
We met our target with 77% of students evaluating that Arch 5005 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

**SC1.4B (Arch 7008 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 7008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.4:** Understand the impact of design on human health, safety and welfare.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

CONTEMPORARY ARCH: ARCH 7008

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.4.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 67%
- Meeting: 33%
- Not Met Total: 0%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.4. Of the 9 students enrolled in this course, 6 responded. Giving us a response rate of 66.7%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.4.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

**SC1.5B (Arch 7004 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 7004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.5:** Ability to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to promote socially-conscious design.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7004 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.5.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 75%
- Meeting: 25%
- Not Met Total: 0%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.5. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 4 responded. Giving us a response rate of 80%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.5.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

**SC1.5R (Arch 7006 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 7006) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.5:** Ability to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to promote socially-conscious design.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7006 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.5.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 75%
- Meeting: 25%
- Not Met Total: 0%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7006 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.5. Of the 9 students enrolled in this course, 8 responded. Giving us a response rate of 88.9%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7006 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.5.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
All students in the following course (ARCH 7008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.5: Ability to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to promote socially-conscious design.**

**Indirect - Course Evaluation**

**CONTEMPORARY ARCH: ARCH 7008**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC1.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC1.5. Of the 9 students enrolled in this course, 6 responded. Giving us a response rate of 66.7%.

We met our target with 84% of students evaluating that Arch 7008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC1.5.

---

**SC1.6E (Arch 3008 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 3008) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.6: Understand the different variables that impact human health and safety in the built Environment.**

**Direct - Other**

**ENVIRON CONTROL SYST: ARCH 3008**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.6.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

2 examples from the following course (Arch 3008) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.6.

---

**SC1.7R (Arch 7006 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC1.7: Understand construction measures that promote human health, safety and welfare.**

**Direct - Other**

**GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Met Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 80% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC1.7.

---

**General Outcome Actions**

**ACTIONS**

**Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

**IN PROGRESS**

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty ASSeessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0.
assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to meet the requirements of SC4.1.

SC 4 Technical Knowledge MET

How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to meet the requirements of SC4.1.

MEASURES

SC4.1 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.1: Understand structural analysis and technology and their contribution to design.

Indirect - Survey

Target

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.1.

SC4.2 (Exit Survey)

MET Overall Proficiency

Other - [Increase Response Rate]

IN PROGRESS

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.

Analysis

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (8 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC4.1. Giving us a response rate of 25.0%

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.1.

Other - [Increase Response Rate]
An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC4.2: Understand environmental analysis and technology and their contribution to design.**

**Indirect - Survey**

**Target**

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.2.

**Analysis**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC4.2. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.2.

**SC4.3 (Exit Survey)**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC4.3: Understand material assembly and methods of construction and their contribution to design.**

**Indirect - Survey**

**Target**

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.3.

**Analysis**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC4.3. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.3.

**SC4.4 (Exit Survey)**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**SC4.4: Understand the contribution of engineering and social science knowledge to building design.**

**Indirect - Survey**

**Target**

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.4.

**Analysis**

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC4.4. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.4.

**SC4.5B (Arch 3004 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 3004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

**Overall Proficiency**

**Not Approaching**

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ARCH STRUCT II: ARCH 3004

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3004 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 52 students enrolled in this course, 26 responded. Giving us a response rate of 50.0%.

We met our target with 96% of students evaluating that Arch 3004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

SC4.5E (Arch 3007 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3007) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ARCHITECTURAL SYSTEMS: ARCH 3007

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3007 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3007 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 54 students enrolled in this course, 19 responded. Giving us a response rate of 35.2%.

We met our target with 90% of students evaluating that Arch 3007 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

SC4.5E (Arch 3008 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 3008) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

ENVIRON CONTROL SYST: ARCH 3008

Target

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 3008 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

Analysis

All students enrolled in Arch 3008 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 115 students enrolled in this course, 29 responded. Giving us a response rate of 25.2%.

We met our target with 82% of students evaluating that Arch 3008 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

SC4.5B (Arch 4031 Course Evaluation)

All students in the following course (ARCH 4031) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

Analysis

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.
SC4.5: Ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings.

Indirect - Course Evaluation
ARCH STRUCTURES III: ARCH 4031
Target
75% of students will evaluate that Arch 4031 met or exceeded the requirements of SC4.5

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 4031 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC4.5. Of the 37 students enrolled in this course, 24 responded. Giving us a response rate of 64.9%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 4031 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC4.5.

SC4.6R (Arch 5005 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC4.6: Utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other
ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.

Analysis
15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 47% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.

Revise Measurement / Assessment
IN PROGRESS
We recommend eliminating ARCH5005 in the SC4.6 evaluation since utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project is covered in ARCH 7006.

SC4.6R (Arch 7006 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC4.6: Utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other
GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.

Analysis
5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members.

We met our target with 80% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.6.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS
ARCH 7006 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/lessons (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 7006. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students’ studio projects in 3rd-year graduate courses. Finally, for all courses, it is recommended to explicitly show the topics area in the assignment briefs.

SC4.7R (Arch 5005 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.”

SC4.7: Utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project.

Direct - Other
ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

Analysis
We recommend eliminating ARCH5005 in the SC4.7 evaluation since utilize environmental analyses in the development of the design project is covered in ARCH 7600.
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

Analysis
15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.
We did not meet our target with 0% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS
ARCH 7006 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 7006. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students' studio projects in 3rd-year graduate courses. Finally, for all courses, it is recommended to explicitly show the topics area in the assignment briefs.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

General Outcome Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC4.7R (Arch 7006 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."
SC4.7: Utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project.
Direct - Other
GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

MET
Overall Proficiency
Exceeding: 40%
Meeting: 60%
Met Total: 100%

Analysis
5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members.
We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.7.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS
ARCH 7006 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 7006. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students' studio projects in 3rd-year graduate courses. Finally, for all courses, it is recommended to explicitly show the topics area in the assignment briefs.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

General Outcome Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC4.8R (Arch 5005 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 5005) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."
SC4.8: Utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project.
Direct - Other
ADV ARCH TECHNIQUES: ARCH 5005
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

MET
Overall Proficiency
Exceeding: 40%
Meeting: 60%
Met Total: 100%

Analysis
15 examples from the following course (Arch 5005) were evaluated by faculty members.
We met our target with 100% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

Revise Curriculum
IN PROGRESS
ARCH 7006 addresses too many topics within one semester. It would be recommended to extend the duration of the comprehensive design studio to 1 year or have additional courses/sessions (addressing different areas of the studio project) that can support ARCH 7006. Examples can be zoning/building code analysis, wall section drawing, and building performance simulation assignments regarding students' studio projects in 3rd-year graduate courses. Finally, for all courses, it is recommended to explicitly show the topics area in the assignment briefs.

Other - [See Outcome Actions]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

General Outcome Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Proficiency</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC4.8R (Arch 7006 Student Work)
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."
SC4.8: Utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project.
Direct - Other
GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006
Target
75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.

NOT MET
Overall Proficiency
Exceeding: 40%
Meeting: 60%
Approaching: 40%

Analysis
5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members.
We met our target with 60% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC4.8.
conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

**SC.5 Design Synthesis**

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

### Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group was given two spreadsheets of BArch and MArch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4.3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.” Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

### Other - [Observations on SC4]

The average of the overall SC4 scores was 3.0 [82.5%]. This score meets the target score/threshold (3.0) [75%]. If ARCH 5005 is eliminated in the SC4.7 evaluation as we recommended (see the Recommendation section of this report for further information), the average goes up to 3.3 [85.8%]. The average response rate was 50%. The exit survey average was 3.4 [100%], and the course evaluation average was again 3.4 [92.8%]. The student work average tends to be lower than other test criteria (2.6 [64.5%]), but if ARCH 5005 is eliminated in the SC4.7 evaluation, the score goes up to 3.1 [77.4%]. The response rate of the exit survey (33.3%) was lower than the course evaluation average (44%) and the student work average (66%). The average score of SC4.5 (ability to analyze building technology criteria to assess and understand its impact on buildings) was 3.4 [92%]. The average score of SC4.6 (utilize sound structural analysis in the development of the design project) was 2.9 [63%]. The average score of SC4.7 (utilize sound environmental analysis in the development of the design project) was 1.8 [50%]. The average score of SC4.8 (utilize sound material assembly techniques in the development of the design project) was 3.1 [80%]. This result shows that students address material assembly techniques better than environmental or structural analyses. In ARCH 7006 comprehensive design studio only, students address environmental analyses better than other areas.

### Conclusion

In this SC4 survey, it was remarkable that the exit survey, course evaluation average scores were equal (3.4) [100%] and higher than the student work average score. Since the exit survey was responded by general students (who may or may not have taken the listed courses), this result may indicate that other unlisted courses also address technical knowledge effectively that includes structural, environmental, and material assembly issues. This assumption would be more convincing if the response rate of the exit survey is higher. According to the survey result related to ARCH 7006 comprehensive design studio only, students address environmental analyses better than other areas.

### SC.5 Design Synthesis

**MET**

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site
conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

### Other - [InCREASE RESPONSE RATE]

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.
Target
75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.1.

Analysis
An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC5.1. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.1.

SC5.2E (Arch 7001 Course Evaluation)

MET Overall Proficiency

- Exceeding: 40%
- Meeting: 60%

Overall Proficiency

0% 100%
Exceeding: 40%
Meeting: 60%
Met Total: 100%
Not Met Total:

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 7001 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 5 responded. Giving us a response rate of 100%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7001 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

Other - [See Outcome Action]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC5.2B (Arch 7002 Course Evaluation)

MET Overall Proficiency

- Exceeding: 60%
- Meeting: 40%

Overall Proficiency

0% 100%
Exceeding: 60%
Meeting: 40%
Met Total: 100%
Not Met Total:

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 7002 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 5 responded. Giving us a response rate of 100%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7002 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

Other - [See Outcome Action]
IN PROGRESS
No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

SC5.2B (Arch 7003 Course Evaluation)

MET Overall Proficiency

- Exceeding: 50%
- Meeting: 50%

Overall Proficiency

0% 100%
Exceeding: 50%
Meeting: 50%
Met Total: 100%
Not Met Total:

Analysis
All students enrolled in Arch 7003 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the
13 students enrolled in this course, 10 responded. Giving us a response rate of 76.9%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7003 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**SC5.2B (Arch 7004 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 7004) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7004 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 75%
- Meeting: 25%
- Met Total: 100%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7004 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 5 students enrolled in this course, 4 responded. Giving us a response rate of 80%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7004 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Actions]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

---

**SC5.2R (Arch 7006 Course Evaluation)**

All students in the following course (ARCH 7006) were asked to evaluate how well the LSU School of Architecture met the criteria of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.2: Integrate multiple factors (context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis) in developing the design project.

Indirect - Course Evaluation

**GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006**

**Target**

75% of students will evaluate that Arch 7006 met or exceeded the requirements of SC5.2.

**MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Exceeding: 88%
- Meeting: 12%
- Met Total: 100%

**Analysis**

All students enrolled in Arch 7006 were asked to evaluate how well this course met the requirements of SC5.2. Of the 9 students enrolled in this course, 8 responded. Giving us a response rate of 88.9%.

We met our target with 100% of students evaluating that Arch 7006 was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC5.2.

**Other - [See Outcome Action]**

IN PROGRESS

No specific action, see the general outcome actions.

---

**SC5.3B (Arch 7004 Student Work)**

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.3: Design project was developed with an integrated approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**NOT MET**

**Overall Proficiency**

- Meeting: 31%
- Approaching: 38%
- Not Approaching: 31%

**Analysis**

13 examples from the following course (Arch 7004) were evaluated by faculty members. We did not met our target with only 31% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

**Other - [Restructure course learning objectives and outcomes]**

IN PROGRESS

Introduce SC5.3 requirements and conditions earlier in the design studio sequence parallel with project complexity and emerging-level design synthesis. This will prepare students to broaden and refine their knowledge and engagement with requirements and conditions along with their abilities to synthesize them effectively in design in ARCH 7003, 7004, and 7006.
SC5.3R (Arch 7006 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC5.3: Design project was developed with an integrated approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.

**Direct - Other**

**GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006**

**Target**

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

---

### NOT MET Overall Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Not Approaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members.

We did not meet our target with only 40% of students' work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC5.3.

---

### General Outcome Actions

**ACTIONS**

#### Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group was given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4,3,2,1,0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching." Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

#### Other - [Observations on SC5.1]

SC5.1 was measured via an exit survey with a 33% response rate (2 out of 6) with an average evaluation of 3.5[100%] or between “very much” and “quite a bit.” Because of the sample size this data is not a strong indicator.

#### Other - [Observations on SC5.2]

SC5.2 was measured via student responses to course evaluations with the following outcomes:

- 7001, 100% response rate, average score 3.4[100%]
- 7002, 100% response rate, average score 3.6[100%]
- 7003, 76.9% response rate, average score 3.9[100%]
- 7004, 85% response rate, average score 3.75[100%]
- 7005, Error in data collection, NA
- 7006, 88.9% response rate, average score 3.88[100%]

Students appear to have an increasing level of agreement that in the course they were integrating multiple factors including: context, building technologies, materiality, research and analysis, into the development of a design project as they progress through the studio sequence. A question can be raised about where the evaluation question is understood to be an evaluation of their performance or the structure of the course and its assignments.

#### Other - [Observations on SC5.3]

SC5.3 was measured through the evaluation of student work according to the rubric described above.

- 7004: 13 of 13 work samples reviewed with an average score of 1.92[31%]
- 7006: 5 of 5 work samples reviewed with an average score of 2.2[40%]

#### Other - [Synthetic Observations & Analysis]

- All aspects of criteria were unevenly addressed, and with uneven competency
- Synthesis was unevenly achieved – requirements and conditions were often addressed on their own, rather than in full synthetic relation to each other
Other - [Restructure course learning objectives and outcomes:]

- Increase levels of project complexity and design synthesis in first and second-year studios, so that they are more prepared for broadening their knowledge and skills ARCH 7003 and 7004, and for refining them in ARCH 7006.
- Introduce SC5.3 requirements and conditions earlier in the design studio sequence parallel with project complexity and emerging-level design synthesis. This will prepare students to broaden and refine their knowledge and engagement with requirements and conditions along with their abilities to synthesize them effectively in design in ARCH 7003, 7004, and 7006.
- Reinforce knowledge of requirements and conditions in ARCH 7003 and 7004 while engaging them synthetically in design to prepare students for refining design synthesis in ARCH 7006.

Revise Curriculum

- Ensure that course assignments are explicit in what regulatory frameworks are being addressed, suspended, etc.
- Inclusion of component systems and their synthesis into the design approach should be emphasized throughout the course.
- Consider the placement of comprehensive studio in an earlier semester more closely linked to structures and environmental systems courses and to serve students as they approach the job market.
- Consider integration of some or all of the due diligence set with an appropriate course (i.e. structures, environmental systems, or contract documents)
- Ensure that appropriate systems (site, structure, environmental, users) for the design brief are clear and that students are asked to visibly integrate them into the overall design concept.

Restructure Outcome Statement

- We recommend the rephrasing of SC5.3 to “Design project was developed with a synthetic approach that included: user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and measurable environmental impacts.” Replacing “integrated” with “synthetic” clarifies the difference between SC5 and SC6. Synthesis indicates the objective of producing a distinct, indivisible idea, form, entity, that is not reducible to ‘parts’ versus ‘building integration’ that organizes a functional assembly of systems and components.
- We recommend revising all sub-criteria of SC.5 to substitute ‘synthesis’ for ‘integrate’.

Revise Measurement / Assessment

- Student design expectations and where or how they are met needs to be more clearly communicated in the archival documents.
- Make clear what regulatory frameworks and measurable environmental systems are expected to be synthesized in final design presentations.
- Student work sample should include presentation boards and due diligence set to aid in comprehensive assessment.
- The synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design and measurable environmental impacts is a compound student learning objective. The division of it into multiple learning objectives demonstrated in one or more assignments would help evaluate.

Conclusion

- Criteria of Design Synthesis is unmet/partially met.

- 7004 – Design synthesis appears to occur at an ‘emerging’ rather than ‘broadening’ level of competency. Project complexity appears challenging to students, and although SC5.3 requirements and conditions are present to varying degrees, responses to them are often isolated and not synthesized fully into a holistic design.

- 7006 – Design synthesis appears to occur at a ‘broadening’ level rather than ‘refining’ level of competency. Project complexity and degree of technical development appears challenging to students, and although SC5.3 requirements and conditions are present to varying degrees, responses to them are often isolated and not synthesized effectively into a holistic design.

SC.6 Building Integration  NOT MET

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

### SC6.1 (Exit Survey)

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program. They were asked to rank how well the LSU School of Architecture met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.1: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

#### Indirect - Survey

**Target**

75% of surveyed students will rank that the LSU School of Architecture met or exceeded the requirements of SC6.1.

---

**RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Met Total:</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

An anonymous exit survey was given to all students graduating from the M.Arch program (6 total students), of which 2 students answered SLO SC6.1. Giving us a response rate of 33.3%.

We met our target with 100% of surveyed students indicating that the LSU School of Architecture was meeting or exceeding the requirements of SC6.1.

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.

Also see the general outcome actions.

---

Other - [Increase Response Rate]

IN PROGRESS

Send exit survey before graduation to increase participation.
Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.2: Ability to develop building design that takes into consideration social, ecological, programmatic and technological factors.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

---

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.2B: (Arch 7004 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.2: Ability to develop building design that takes into consideration social, ecological, programmatic and technological factors.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

---

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

---

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.2R: (Arch 7006 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.2: Ability to develop building design that takes into consideration social, ecological, programmatic and technological factors.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.2.

---

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7004) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.3B: (Arch 7004 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

---

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.3R: (Arch 7006 Student Work)

Faculty members will evaluate student work from the following course (Arch 7006) to determine if it met the requirements of the SLO below on a scale of "Exceeding," "Meeting," "Approaching," or "Not Approaching."

SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

Direct - Other

**GRAD DESN STUDIO IV: ARCH 7004**

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.

---

The four criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) in SC6.2 were seldom addressed at a consistent level in the student work samples. To achieve a more even level of success, it may be useful to separate the topics into different SCs. For example, SC6.2a could cover Social & Program and SC6.2b Ecological & Technological. It would also be helpful to (at least partially) define the topics and learning outcomes to help guide the faculty and students. Post project documentation, although potentially very useful to show that a criterion has been met, appears only half heatedly engaged by the students.
SC6.3: Ability to develop an integrated design process that addresses structural, environmental, life safety systems.

Direct - Other

GRAD DESN STUDIO VI: ARCH 7006

Target

75% of the student work that faculty members evaluate will meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

Analysis

5 examples from the following course (Arch 7006) were evaluated by faculty members. We did not meet our target with 0% of students work having been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirements of SC6.3.

General Outcome Actions

ACTIONS

Other - [Note on Assessment Scale]

IN PROGRESS

The observations, analysis, and recommendations were made by five Faculty Assessment groups that were each assigned one criteria to assess. The FASS group were given two spreadsheets of B.Arch and M.Arch SLO scores, respectively. The spreadsheet included all indirect measures scores (survey and course evaluation). The FASS group then completed the direct measure scores by reviewing student work from the courses associated with each SLO. Both the indirect and direct measures were done on a GPA scale of 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. With the highest score being a 4 and the lowest being a 0, this was converted to the scale above of “Exceeding,” “Meeting,” “Approaching,” or “Not Approaching.” Exceeding is the equivalent of a 4, Meeting is the equivalent of a 3, Approaching is the equivalent of a 2, and Not Approaching is the equivalent of a 1 or 0. Any use of the GPA scale will be followed by the equivalent Met percent. The FASS groups will use the same scale as the assessment program (Watermark) during the next assessment cycle.

Other - [Observations on Arch 7004 and Arch 7006]

IN PROGRESS

A target score of 2.2[38%] was achieved by 7004 and a score of 2.8[60%] by 7006 with most student work assessments in either the ‘Some’ (C) or ‘Responds’ (B) range. Very few student work samples met the ‘Effectively’ (A) range and zero projects fell in the ‘None’ (F) category.

A target score of 1.31[0%] and 2.0[0%] was achieved by 7004 and 7006 respectively. Most student work assessed landed in the “unmet” range (D) for 7004 while all of the worked assessed for 7006 landed in the “partially met” range (C). All student work samples demonstrated an attempt; there were no student work that landed in the (F) range.

Conclusion

Overall scores for both courses were in the ‘Some’ (C) range, the 7004 work samples most often met the ‘Broadening’ standard and the 7006 samples most often met the higher ‘Refining’ standard. Although there were some significant gaps and holistically it was difficult to find any single project that addressed all four of the SC6.2 criteria (Social, Ecological, Programmatic, Technological) at a similar level of success. The 7004 work samples appeared to address most successfully Social, Ecological, and Programmatic factors, and to a degree Technological factors. The 7006 work samples more successfully addressed Programmatic and Technological factors. Though the same criteria were being assessed for both courses the separation of target score indicates the level of which skills met the Broadening standard, the target standard for 7004 and the Refining standard, the target standard for 7006. The 7004 work samples showed very little to no engagement of the SC6.3 criteria (structural, environmental, and life safety systems). The criteria were more readily addressed in the 7006 work samples. Documentation trended more towards inclusion of pertinent information regarding structural environmental and life safety systems, some were however incomplete.