1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging with the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   For this class, ARCH 2600 Architecture Appreciation, an assessment method was developed that benchmarked student’s intelligence concerning Architecture when they initially arrived at the class and compared this data with additional data collected throughout the course of the entire semester. To be clear, the students were given a 50 question test on the first day of class. The test was not about facts and did not count toward their final grade, but was about the tools of visual analysis students would be able to apply to buildings after completion of the class. With the proper instruction students would be able to look at a building and appreciate how culture, place, technology and society have influenced the appearance of buildings all around us. In order to collect subsequent data, the Professors teaching ARCH 2600 embedded these same 50 questions into the 4 tests given throughout the rest of the semester. Responses to the initial test were then able to be directly compared to results from the later tests. In our first report last year, other methods of assessment were included but were not well received by the committee as they did not provide hard data. Although we continue to use other methods of subjective assessment in these classes, we are not including them in this report. To summarize: A benchmark test was given to students at the beginning of class. The test was 50 questions long and meant to measure Architectural Intelligence, not dates and facts. These same test questions were re-distributed throughout subsequent tests. Results from both tests were directly compared.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   ARCH 2600 was offered once in the spring of 2012 to 98 students, in the summer of 2012 to 20 students. 2 sections are currently in session. Data was collected during the spring and summer session via scan sheets. The answers to specific questions could be isolated using the scan sheet data. The data discussed here represents 100% of the students. Again, a benchmark test was given to all students (50 questions): Summer 2012 (20 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 32.7 with a High of 44.0 and Low of 14.0. Spring 2012 (103 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 32.0 with a High of 58.0 and a Low of 0.0 At the end of the Semester the same 50 Questions (re-distributed throughout 4 tests): Summer 2012 (19 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 65.2 with a High of 80.0 and a Low of 46.0. Spring 2012 (98 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 55.0 with a High of 100.0 and a Low of 0.0. This average score does not mean that students failed the class. These questions, were meant to evaluate Architectural Intelligence not the student’s ability to memorize facts, did not count against their grade when given as the benchmark test. Students could have done very well on the subsequent 4 tests without answering these redistributed questions accurately. Please see the attached graphs.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
The faculty heard the comments from the Core Curriculum Committee last year and worked diligently to improve their methods of assessment. They feel they have done that- instituting a form of student intelligence benchmarking and substantially increasing the sample size for evaluation from 10% to 100%. We have not abandoned the subjective assessment methods we reported on last year, because they are still useful in the class, but have not included them in this report. The faculty that teaches ARCH 2600 had the following reaction to the data: they felt it validated their teaching methods. An increase in the average score in each data set suggested that Student’s Architectural Intelligence DOUBLED after taking this class (32.7% to 65.2% and 32% to 55%). Of course there is always room for improvement, but now the faculty feel that they have a new tool to evaluate their effectiveness in the class. With the carefully designed test questions distributed through the year’s tests, they can narrow their focus on specific areas of content (architectural style, regional variation, technological impact on building form, societal changes on building form, or architectural communication).

6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

Changes to the ARCH 2600 assessment structure were made due to the nature of comments received last year from the Core Curriculum Committee. We feel we have addressed last year’s concerns directly- benchmarking and increasing the sample size. We have isolated the content of this report to only include the assessment methods that produce data, as opposed the subjective assessment methods that continue to be used in the class by the faculty.

7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 3.65 (out of 4) I was involved in the writing of this report. I will be the first to admit that there probably needs to be clearer description of the questions chosen, why they contribute to the learning objectives of the class, and how students scored on the individual questions. The presentation of the data in bulk format is detrimental to our understanding of what students are learning and what they are not learning. Perhaps we are not using the tool (data collection and assessment) properly. The report for THEA continues to be our aspirational report for SLO #11. We should adopt suggested measure
1st Learning Objectives Assessment Survey

Summer 2012 Initial Architecture Awareness: “66”

- 20 Students
- Average: 32.7
- Median: 33.0
- Max: 44.0
- Min: 14.0

Spring 2012 Initial Architecture Awareness: “68”

- 103 Students
- Average: 32.0
- Median: 34.0
- Max: 58.0
- Min: 0.0

2nd Learning Objectives Assessment Survey

Summer 2012 Post-Course Architecture Awareness: “132”

- 19 Students
- Average: 65.2
- Median: 66.0
- Max: 80.0
- Min: 46.0

Spring 2012 Post-Course Architecture Awareness: “112”

- 98 Students
- Average: 55.0
- Median: 56.0
- Max: 100.0
- Min: 0.0