Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Associate in Science_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **David Fernandez, Bruce Silverberg**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Apply fundamental principles of architectural design theory and practice 2. Advance/articulate completed course work towards university transfer into 4 or 5 yearArchitecture programs or related majors 3. Apply the principles of design communication as they apply to architectural project delivery.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Faculty and professional evaluation of student work in cap stone studio design course. 2. Cuesta faculty discussion with university faculty and local industry professionals. 3. Track student transfers into 4 or 5 year university architecture programs and related majors.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in August 2011.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	1. Students meet and often exceed the application of the fundamental principles of design theory and practice. Capstone studio projects demonstrate a proficient use of hierarchy, balance, form and proportion to define space. 2. Cuesta continues its dominant position as the major sending institution for community college transfers into 5 year undergraduate architecture programs. Consistently, approximately 50 percent of Cal Poly's architecture transfer slots have gone to Cuesta students. Last year, 22 Cuesta transfer applicants were accepted into Cal Poly's Architecture Program. Moreover, those students who do successfully transfer have generally performed quite well in their university programs. 3. A high degree of craft and comprehensive visual communication skills are commonly evident in final capstone studio projects. Every semester, industry professional and university faculty from Cal Poly's architecture program participate in reviewing and evaluating student work. Their contribution and input confirms that Cuesta Architecture students are on par with university level work.

5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes recommended at this time.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead faculty, adjunct faculty, Cal Poly faculty and professional industry representatives discuss results and will continue to do so to ensure consistency in program learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 201_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Bruce Silverberg**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X___   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program X Course	1. Define some of the fundamental ways buildings might be understood as architecture. 2. Use a critical framework to analyze and evaluate buildings as works of architecture. 3. Describe, in general terms, the nature of professional life in different types of architecture firms 4. Describe some of the dynamics and issues that have shaped the current market for architectural services. 5. Identify and analyze the relationship between architects and the greater society in which they operate 6. Explain how the various environmental design professions relate to each other.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Student questionnaires administered at toward the end of each of the program's "core" courses 3. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments were completed in May, 2012 1. Direct evaluation was undertaken for four consecutive semesters, from Fall 2010 through Spring 2012, and included a total of 67 students. 2. Thirty-two students submitted properly completed questionnaires at the end of three semesters during the two most recent academic years: 9 in Fall 2010; 14 in Spring 2011; 9 in Spring 2012.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	1. Instructor evaluation of assignments shows a normal distribution of abilities in most course sections, though there can be considerable variability from one semester to another. Requirements for this course are three 1800-word papers and one quiz on terminology. Scores on the quiz consistently reveal a sharp divide between two groups: those who have clearly studied and those who evidently did not. Assigned readings are well written and highly relevant to the course, yet an alarmingly high percentage of students evince little sense that they have done the reading, truly comprehend it, or review what they have read. Here, too, a sharp divide within the class is evident. 2. Data from student questionnaires administered over a three-year period were somewhat inconsistent in both sample size and results. Overall student agreement that they had achieved course outcomes (on a scale of 1 to 5) was considerably higher in sections with higher response

		rates on the online survey, though as with other courses in the program, results can vary markedly from semester to semester, as does the rate of course completion. Survey results from Spring 2012 showed considerable improvement over those from a Spring 2011 assessment: Overall "agreement" with outcomes statements averaged to 3.29 in Spring 2012, versus 3.16 in Spring 2011. These were both up from 2.86 in Fall 2010. One outcome that returned a significantly better result in 2012 pertained to describing "dynamics and issues that have shaped the current market for architectural services." (3.42 in 2012, up from 3.14 the previous year and 2.64 two years ago). This hopefully reflects the considerable work the instructor did during this time to strengthen this aspect of the course.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in this course. The student outcomes survey supplements this assessment and can be useful, but the data are somewhat contaminated by carelessness on the part of some students when completing this self-report online. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture, or its allied fields, an opportunity to compete for a place in highly selective and competitive university programs and professions. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of these professions remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	Many students have problems writing college papers. Although completion of English 156 is listed as an "advisory" for this course, the department should consider changing this to the more advanced English 201. There is nothing in this course that college students aspiring to careers in demanding professions should be unable to do. It is not a remedial course, and no changes are contemplated at this time.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Outcomes for this course have been discussed with the lead instructor for the architecture program.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 205_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Use various modeling materials and tools to accurately, neatly, and legibly represent existing and imagined objects and environments as 3 dimensional objects. 2. Construct proportionally accurate scale models of existing and imagined objects and environments. 3. Employ the basic design concepts of size, shape, surface, material, context, number, variety and relationship to create scaled replicas of existing and imagined objects and environments.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in December, 2011. (10) Ten students sampled in (1) one section. 5 - A 2 - B 2 - C 1 - F
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The top students preformed exceptionally, producing work using an assortment of representational materials and tools to neatly and with a high degree of craft produced 3d representations of objects and environments. All but one student sampled successfully completed the class. Two-thirds (8 students) of the class have been accepted to university undergraduate architecture programs.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one

		class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes recommended at this time.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 221_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Bruce Silverberg**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes_X____   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program X Course	1. Using various "analog" drawing media (i.e. pencils, pens, markers), drafting tools (i.e. triangles, scales, T-square or parallel bar, etc.), drawing techniques (freehand, constructed), and drawing systems (orthographic, paraline and lineal perspective), I can accurately, neatly, and legibly represent, BY HAND, without using a computer, existing and imagined objects and environments on a two-dimensional surface. Construct proportionally accurate scale models of existing and imagined objects and environments. 2. Construct, BY HAND, proportionally accurate one- and two-point lineal perspectives of existing and imagined objects and environments. 3. Create a range of implicitly and explicitly defined shapes, spaces and forms. 4. Employ the basic design concepts of size, shape, surface, material, context, number, variety and relationship (pattern, rhythm, hierarchy, contrast and balance) to create relationships between elements exhibiting an appropriate level of complexity. 5. Generate diverse alternatives and develop final solutions to defined two- and three-dimensional design problems.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Student questionnaires administered at toward the end of each of the Spring `12 semester. 3. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments were completed in May, 2012 1. Direct evaluation was undertaken for four course sections over a two-year period and included 39 students. 2. Twenty students submitted properly completed questionnaires during the two most recent academic years: 4 in Fall 2010; 10 in Spring 2011; 6 in Spring 2012.

4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	1. Qualitative review of student work indicates a wide range of student aptitudes, talents, and work habits. The high end of the class performs very well in virtually every aspect of the course requirements: graphic skill, analytic ability, and creativity. The middle range is deficient in one or more areas, a result that may indicate development that is very lopsided (e.g., good ideas but weak graphic skills or mediocre execution), or poor personal work habits and management skills (missed deadlines, incomplete work, etc.). Work/school balance may also be a factor in some instances. Some students manifest significant cognitive or skills deficits, such as poor reading comprehension. Students in the bottom quartile of the class sometimes recognize that they underperformed due to their own habits or failure to grasp what was expected. Some, especially those with evident potential, are grateful for the opportunity to repeat the course and get things right; while others frankly seem unsuited for this profession. A number of students appear in need of additional work mastering perspective drawing. Most get it when following along during in-class demonstrations but encounter difficulty when working on their own. 2. Results of student questionnaires administered online over the last three academic years indicate generally good satisfaction with overall outcomes (3.6 out of a possible 5.0), but this figure dipped in the most recent assessment (3.05), which was from an unusually weak class. Self-assessment for preparation for transfer to a university architecture program dropped from 3.6 to 2.57; an understanding of basic design concepts from 3.7 to 3.0, generating diverse design alternatives from 3.7 to 3.0, and understanding concepts of implicit and explicit space from 3.8 to 3.14. The architecture program will continue to monitor results in coming semesters, to ascertain whether a low-performing class is an outlier or indicative of long-term trends with respect to both demographics and prior academic preparation.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. The student outcomes survey supplements this assessment and can be useful, but the data are somewhat contaminated by carelessness on the part of some students when completing this self-report online. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, especially in Arch 221, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered. Searching for explanations for an apparent decline in overall performance, one wonders whether exogenous factors may be in play here. Are students now under more economic stress and needing to work more hours at part-time jobs, taking away from time spent on homework? Are more lower-

		functioning students pressed to enter college because other employment options are unavailable to them? This seems manifestly true in some cases, but certainly not all?
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	While no curricular changes are contemplated for this course, each instructor calibrates the pacing of the semester's work to adjust to the composition of their class section from semester to semester. Noting a decline in self-reported mastery of two-point perspective, an additional exercise on this topic will be added to the course, to see if that aspect can improve. Students who lack the basic skills to undertake professional training at the undergraduate level are directed to resources at Cuesta where they can hone these skills before continuing in architecture. Some students lack the maturity to pursue architecture as an undergraduate. Much architectural training in the United States has actually moved to the graduate level, so students in need of a better basic education and less demanding undergraduate experience have many options to pursue this career when they are both academically and attitudinally ready to do so.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead faculty regularly participate in juried studio reviews and routinely discuss what they have observed. The department should consider scheduling a meeting with adjunct faculty, to broaden the discussion of outcomes and consider ways to achieve greater consistency across all sections of those courses taught by both adjunct and full-time instructors.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 222_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis: **Bruce Silverberg**

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X___   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program X Course	1. Employ with greater effectiveness and subtlety the principles, concepts, methods, and skills introduced and developed in Arch 221. 2. Construct, BY HAND, proportionally accurate one- and two-point lineal perspectives of existing and imagined objects and environments. 3. Employ a variety of graphic techniques (i.e. bubble diagram, area diagram, matrix, network) to visually represent quantitative and qualitative information. Employ the basic design concepts of size, shape, surface, material, context, number, variety and relationship (pattern, rhythm, hierarchy, contrast and balance) to create relationships between elements exhibiting an appropriate level of complexity. 4. Employ drawing systems and conventions (orthographic, plan oblique, and lineal perspective) to communicate design intentions and conceptual information, using manual (hand) drawing and drafting techniques. 5. Use words and drawings to systematically gather, represent, refine, and present a range of information from natural and/or man-made sites or environments in verbal, diagrammatic, sketch and/or photographic form.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Student questionnaires administered at the end of the Spring `12 semester. 3. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments were completed in May 2012. 1. Direct evaluation was undertaken for two course sections over a two-year period and included 15 students. 2. Sixteen students submitted properly completed questionnaires during the two most recent academic years: 6 in Spring 2011; 10 in Spring 2012.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	1. Qualitative review of student work indicates a wide range of student aptitudes, talents, and work habits. The high end of the class performs very well in virtually every aspect of the course requirements: graphic skill, analytic ability, and creativity. The middle range is deficient in one or more areas, a result that may indicate development that is very lopsided (e.g., good ideas but weak graphic skills or mediocre execution), inconsistency among the various sections of the

		prerequisite Arch 221 course, or poor personal work habits and management skills (missed deadlines, incomplete work, etc.). Work/school balance may also be a factor in some instances. Some students manifest significant cognitive or skills deficits, such as poor reading comprehension.
		Students in the bottom quartile of the class sometimes recognize that they underperformed due to their own habits or failure to grasp what was expected. Some, especially those with evident potential, are grateful for the opportunity to repeat the course and get things right; while others seem frankly unsuited for this profession.
		2. Results of student questionnaires administered online indicate above average overall satisfaction, 3.61 out of 5. The highest score registered agreement that the course helped prepare for university transfer (3.9), followed by continued development of skills and understanding of concepts (3.8), representing analytic information graphically (3.6), and analyzing specific works of architecture (3.4).
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. The student outcomes survey supplements this assessment and can be useful, but the data are somewhat contaminated by carelessness on the part of some students when completing this self-report online.
		Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No major changes are contemplated at this time.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead faculty regularly participate in juried studio reviews and routinely discuss what they have observed. The department should consider scheduling a meeting with adjunct faculty, to broaden the discussion of outcomes and consider ways to achieve greater consistency across all sections of those courses taught by both adjunct and full-time instructors.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 230_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Use computer hardware and software configurations to visually communicate building design information. 2. Employ digital file cataloging and storage procedures. 3. Employ computer aid drafting and building information modeling tools to create digital presentations and construction documents and details. 4. Create digital 3-D models using realistic applications of construction materials.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in May, 2012. (13) Thirteen students sampled in (1) one section.
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The top students preformed exceptionally, producing work using computer aided drafting tools to visually communicate and coordinate orthographic drawings, images and details. All students sampled successfully completed the class.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of	No changes recommended at this time.

	Improvements	
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 232_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Use computer hardware and software configurations to visually communicate building design information. 2. Employ digital file cataloging and storage procedures. 3. Employ computer aid drafting and building information modeling tools to create digital presentations. 4. Create digital 3-D models using realistic applications of construction materials.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in May, 2011. (18) Eighteen students sampled in (1) one section. Grades: 5 A's, 7 B's, 4 C's, 1 D, 1 F
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The 5 students preformed exceptionally, producing work using bit map editing and computer aided drafting tools to visually communicate and coordinate orthographic perspective drawings, images and details. All but 2 students sampled successfully completed the class.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of	No changes recommended at this time.

	Improvements	
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 242_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Use represent three-dimensional as two-dimensional orthographic images. 2. Employ architectural drawing conventions and standards to coordinate a set of construction drawings. 3. Create common light wood framing and finish construction details. 4. Apply the principles of site planning and site grading.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in December, 2011. (13) Thirteen students sampled in (1) one section. Grades: 4 A's, 7 B's, 2 C's
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Instructor evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The 4 students preformed exceptionally well, producing work using drafting conventions on par with the expectation of second practice and industry standards.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes recommended at this time.
7	Description or evidence of	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency

	dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology** *Program:* **Architecture** *Date:* **August, 2012** *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 244_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__ No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Effectively research and identify site specific micro climate data 2. Use relevant climate data to complete bioclimatic analysis and implement appropriate passive building strategies. 3. Evaluate thermal comfort and lighting strategies for effectiveness and make appropriate modifications
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in May, 2012. (23) Thirteen students sampled in (1) one section. Grades: A – 2 B – 12 C – 7 D – 2
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. All but two of students performed well and successfully completed the course. The advisory committee suggested incorporating digital energy modeling tools into the class to evaluate and test thermal comfort and lighting strategies.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments, are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered. However, we will consider incorporating digital energy modeling tools to address learning outcome #3

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	Purchase and install digital energy modeling software by Spring 2014. Faculty training on new software, Fall 2013
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 245_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Students a prepared to sit for the LEED Green Associate Credential Exam. 2. Describe and demonstrate the principals of sustainable building design and construction. 3. Identify the LEED Rating Systems 4. Identify National, State and Local legislation that impacts green building design.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in May, 2012. (7) Thirteen students sampled in (1) one section. Grades: A - 4 C – 2 F – 1
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The majority of students performed well and successfully completed the course. All but one passed the mock LEED GA exam.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment. The final exam is a mock LEED G.A. test and the results demonstrate students are meeting the stated outcomes. The sample was rather small and we should consider reevaluating the class this semester.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes at this time but we will reevaluate this course at the end of the Fall 2012 semester.
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary   http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 246_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__X__   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Prepare for the LEED AP BD+C Credential Exam. 2. Describe the environmental impacts of the existing and potential new commercial and institutional built environments. 3. Identify and compare/contrast the various legitimate rating/certifications systems for commercial and institutional green building. 4. Identify and compare/contrast the various legitimate rating/certifications systems for commercial and institutional green building.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in May, 2012. (15) Fifteen students sampled in (1) one section. Grades: A – 4 B – 6 C – 3 D – 1 F – 1
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Evaluation of student work indicates that the majority of students are grasping the defined student learning outcomes. The majority of students performed well and successfully completed the course. All but one passed the mock LEED BD+C credential exam.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	Instructor evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment. The final exam is a mock LEED G.A. test and the results demonstrate students are meeting the stated outcomes. The lab portion of the course involves pairing students with industry professionals working on LEED building certification. The industry partners report that our students were professional, well prepared and contributed to the LEED certification process in a meaningful way. 13 of 15 students logged professional experience time on LEED documentation, thus meeting the requirements to sit for the LEED BD+C Credential exam.

6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes at this time
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead and adjunct faculty and have discussed the results and will continually meet to ensure consistency in the course learning outcomes.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Course_and_Program_Assessment_Summary_F_2011.docx

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___COURES: Arch 248_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes____   No___x___

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Prepare for the LEED AP Homes Credential Exam. 2. Describe the environmental impacts of the existing and potential new commercial and institutional built environments. 3. Identify and compare/contrast the various legitimate rating/certifications systems for residential green building. 4. Identify and compare/contrast the various legitimate rating/certifications systems for residential green building.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Faculty discussion
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	This course will be offer for the first time in October 2012. Assessments are scheduled in Dec 2012
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes at this time
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **August, 2011**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 251_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__x___   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Apply principles and elements of composition in two- and three- dimensional designs and presentations. 2. Manipulate architectural elements to define forms and spaces. 3. Manipulate architectural elements in response to functional issues and constraints. 4. Define in words and diagrams the central concept or parti of a design. 5. Recognize and identify the principles and elements of composition operating in the built environment.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Discussion and review by Cuesta architecture faculty, visiting Cal Poly faculty and invited licensed architects.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in Dec, 2011. (14) Students in (1) one section. A – 5 B – 5 C – 1 D – 1 F - 2
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Cuesta architecture faculty, visiting Cal Poly faculty and invited licensed architects participated in thorough critiques and reviews of student work. The consensus was that 75% of sampled work met the learning objects of the course with top 33% demonstrated an exception command of the course learning outcomes. Six of the top 10 students successfully transferred to into a upper division university architecture program.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university

		program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes are needed
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead Cuesta faculty, Cal Poly faculty and practicing licensed architects a have discussed the results.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Course or Program Assessment Summary

This form can be used to record SLO assessment plans and results for courses or programs. It is recommended that this document be stored on a group drive, or in MyCuesta.

Division: **Engineering Technology**   *Program:*   **Architecture**   *Date:*   **December, 2012**   *v. 3 2012*

Courses in program, or course: ___Course: Arch 252_____

Faculty involved with the assessment and analysis:

Course-to-program outcome mapping document** is completed Yes__x___   No_____

1	Student Learning Outcome Statements □ Program □ Course	1. Apply principles and elements of composition in two- and three- dimensional designs and presentations. 2. Manipulate architectural elements to define forms and spaces. 3. Manipulate architectural elements in response to functional issues and constraints. 4. Define in words and diagrams the central concept or parti of a design. 5. Recognize and identify the principles and elements of composition operating in the built environment.
2	Assessment Methods Plan (identify assessment instruments, scoring rubrics, SLO mapping diagrams)	1. Direct evaluation of course assignments and projects designed to meet stated curricular objectives. 2. Discussion and review by Cuesta architecture faculty, visiting university faculty and invited licensed architects.
3	Assessment Administration Plan (date(s), sample size or selection of course sections, scoring procedures, etc.)	Assessments where completed in December, 2011. (23) Students in (1) one section. A – 10 B – 8 C – 4 D – 1 F - 0
4	Assessment Results Summary (summarize Data)	Cuesta architecture faculty, visiting Cal Poly faculty and invited licensed architects participated in thorough critiques and reviews of student work. The consensus was that 75% of sampled work met the learning objects of the course nearly half demonstrated an exception command of the course learning outcomes. In this sample, 17 students successfully transferred to into a upper division university architecture program.
5	Discussion of Assessment Procedure and Results, and Effectiveness of Previous Improvement Plans	The instructor's evaluation of student work remains the best method for outcomes assessment in largely subjective fields such as architecture. Cuesta's architecture program is, like the College itself, open admission, giving anyone wishing to study architecture an opportunity to compete for a place in a highly selective and competitive university

		program and profession. There can be considerable variation in aptitude and performance from one class section to another, but the demands of the profession remain constant; consequently, while minor adjustments are routinely made to the course every time it is taught, the core demands of these articulated courses cannot and should not be altered.
6	Recommended Changes & Plans for Implementation of Improvements	No changes are needed
7	Description or evidence of dialog among course or program-level faculty about assessment plan and results	Lead Cuesta faculty, Cal Poly faculty and practicing licensed architects a have discussed the results.

**Course and program level outcomes are required by ACCJC to be aligned. Each program needs to complete a program map to show the alignment. See examples of completed CPAS and program mapping documents are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa

Program Assessment Cycle Calendar ARCHITECTURE

CYCLE STAGE	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
SLO Assessment	Arch 205 Arch 232 Arch 242 Arch 251	Arch 201 Arch 221 Arch 222 Arch 230 Arch 244 Arch 245 Arch 246 Arch 252	Arch 248						
Analyze Results & Plan Improvements		Arch 201 Arch 205	Arch 221 Arch 232 Arch 242 Arch 251	Arch 222 Arch 230 Arch 244 Arch 245 Arch 246 Arch 252	Arch 248				
Plan Implementation			Arch 205	Arch 201	Arch 221 Arch 232 Arch 242 Arch 245 Arch 251	Arch 222 Arch 230 Arch 244 Arch 246 Arch 252	Arch 248		
Post-Implementation SLO Assessment					Arch 205	Arch 201	Arch 221 Arch 232 Arch 242	Arch 222 Arch 230 Arch 244	Arch 248

CYCLE STAGE	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
							Arch 245 Arch 251	Arch 246 Arch 252	

Notes for developing the calendar:

Start with realistic goals. The assessment cycle calendar should have reachable timelines, considering faculty workload, classroom time needed for assessment, and the inevitable adjustments and improvements in assessment tools and methodology.

Not all SLOs have to be assessed every semester.

Assessment activities don't need to occur every semester.

All courses, degrees and programs do need to be assessed on a regular cycle.