

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

**Name of the program:** Bachelor of Architecture (B.ARCH) and Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology (B.S.A.T.)  
**Year of assessment report:** AY 2016-17  
**Date Submitted:** June 30, 2017  
**Contact:** Matthias Altwicker ([maltwick@nyit.edu](mailto:maltwick@nyit.edu)), Associate Dean of Academics

**NOTE:**

The two programs are reviewed as a single program during the year of an NAAB accreditation visit. There are only two courses in the B.S.A.T. degree that are not in the B.ARCH degree, making the assessment applicable across both.

**NOTE:**

Supplemental materials and documentation can be found here:

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/yogpcdrjg8y847d/AABQa9QmxLCQ0hjl\\_1Y-m6j3a?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/yogpcdrjg8y847d/AABQa9QmxLCQ0hjl_1Y-m6j3a?dl=0)

The files included are in three folders:

NAAB: Criteria Matrix, Criteria Rubrics, the visiting Team Report, and our self-study.

Oral: includes faculty, juror, and student reviews pertaining to Oral Communication.

Program Assessment: includes Faculty review, Juror (external) review, and Student review.

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

## I. Annual Program Learning Assessment:

- 1. GOALS:** List program learning goals that have been assessed in AY16-17.

The program learning goals assessed in AY16-17 are those directly related to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), Student Performance Criteria. NAAB educational goals to prepare professional architects are defined by the 5 perspectives that inform 27 criteria.

- 2. METHOD:** Describe the method of assessment and attach measurement instruments (e.g., rubric, exam items, scoring guide for a particular task, supervisor evaluation form, standardized assessment tool).

The methods of assessment used are rubrics that define the NAAB criteria. These were subject to both internal and external review by the groups listed below. The measurement instruments were multiple and varied depending on the reviewer, but were determined by each course coordinator

Assessment/Assessor	Type of Review	Type of Assessment
NAAB	review of selected student work (High/Low pass)	met / not met evaluation
Guests	review of student work through public presentations	written comments
Faculty	review of selected student work	written comments
Students	review of course content based on criteria	met / not met evaluation

- 3. ANALYSIS:** Report assessment results per learning criteria (e.g., per row of rubric, subset of test items, components of a learning task).

The NAAB Visiting Team Report (VTR) provides an excellent external analysis of the current state of the SoAD.

Invited external guest reviewers (professionals, academics, alumni, etc.) were overall positive about student work meeting the criteria. These reviews were conducted during the final design studio reviews of both the fall and spring semesters. There were two courses/criteria tended toward a weaker written evaluation: B1 Pre-Design in ARCH 502 and B2 Site Design in ARCH 202.

Student surveys were overwhelmingly supportive of verifying that criteria for the coursework were being met; there was no course under 90% for conditions met. A few criteria, however, were noted often enough to register concern: A7, A8, D1, B10.

- 4. INTERPRETATION:** Provide an interpretation of student strengths and weaknesses for a given program learning outcome.

Student strengths were noted throughout the NAAB VTR. Weaknesses noted in the student surveys mirrored those of the NAAB review in terms of criteria that needed improvement. General comments made by the external guest reviewers (professionals, academics, alumni, etc.) noted the need for better graphic representational skills, although no specific criteria was mentioned.

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

**5. IMPROVEMENTS - PLANNED:** Identify planned actions for improving student achievement of assessed program learning goals.

The NAAB Visiting Team Report provides the SoAD with guidelines for improvements. In general, responses to conditions that are not met should lead to either a strengthening of the topic within the particular course, or having the content reside in an alternative course. The NAAB requires annual reporting of responses to conditions of concern. The NAAB Visiting Team Report indicated concerns in the History /Theory sequence, in particular with two criteria, A7 and A8. As a result, we will address a revision and redesign of the courses in this sequence.

The program is committed to continuous improvement through regular reviews and update of course content across sequences. Planned actions include: redefinition of our coordination efforts; new distinguished faculty hires in specific areas of instruction and specialization; redesign of course content and assignments within a holistic review of the program curriculum; the offering of new knowledge and new skills, particularly in digital and building technology; and the infusion of learning environments with research interests and collaborations between faculty and students.

In addition, internal Strategic Planning and Self-Assessment will support planned improvements. The Strategic Planning Committee, has used a structured process of input from Faculty, alumni, and students to frame a five year plan related to 4 perspectives: Global, Interdisciplinary, Research + Innovation, and Student Activated Experiences. The implementation of this plan in a coordinated effort with the NYIT 2030 2.0 plan and the five NAAB perspectives will begin in the Fall of 2017. Self-Assessment is a continuous process that is based on review and appraisal of student work in relation to course each semester.

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

## II. Summary of Improvements Made in Response to Assessment Results in the past few years:

Year of Assessment Results	Brief Name of Program Learning Goal (e.g., Writing)	Improvements Implemented Based on Assessment Results	Impact of Improvements (report reassessment results if available)
AY13-14	Career-oriented education; NYIT 2030 Planning tie-ins.	Strengthen student overlaps between degrees; strengthen IDP coordination;	A permanent IDP coordinator was hired and workshops were set up on both campuses to inform students of IDP; concentrations for the BSAT were submitted to NYSED.
AY14-15	NAAB Perspectives and Outcomes; NYIT Planning tie-ins.	Coordinators began a process of defining curricular goals according to alignments with NAAB criteria and collecting evidence supporting this.	Reporting on impacts is dependent on who is evaluating. The curriculum took a large step toward compliance with the NAAB which is distinct for improving the curriculum.
AY15-16	NAAB Perspectives and Outcomes	Coordinators focused on curriculum development attuned to matching NAAB criteria requirements.	A successful review from NAAB, with six distinctions.

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

## III. Brief Description of Faculty Engagement in the Current Annual Assessment Report:

Both adjunct and full-time faculty work with the course coordinators and the administrative team to document the review of the current curriculum and its performance. All faculty are thus involved in curriculum development with the goal to obtain the best student learning outcomes. This year, we formalized an existing self-review process, and collected evidence of these processes to show to NAAB. Overall, this sets up a more systemic look at the curriculum we have so we may see where we can make adjustments, improvements, future changes, etc.

This year, we focused on the courses in the studio sequence, with the following list of actions:

- Administration (Dean, Associate Dean, Chairs) identifies parameters and methods for multiple and effective assessment processes.
- Administration (Associate Dean, Chairs) meet regularly during the semester with coordinators to understand the adjustments that are being made to better satisfy student performance criteria, based on the materials evidence collected.
- Coordinators hold exit meetings with their faculty to discuss experiences, with necessary changes being implemented in the late summer with submission of initial course book drafts.
- During final reviews, all faculty and invited external reviewers (a group made up of professionals, professors from other institutions, designers, alumni) are asked to comment via a criteria rubric.
- Course book reviews occur prior to the start of each semester; both adjunct and FT Faculty are asked to comment to the coordinators to share experiences and help with the course development.
- Administration (Dean, Associate Dean, Chairs) and faculty discuss and plan curriculum improvements, adjustments, development, changes based on assessment results.

# NYIT Annual Program Assessment Report, June 2017

## IV. Annual Program Achievement Goals: Please provide examples of readily available *data* on program student achievement

<u>Data</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>BARCH</u>	<u>BSAT</u>
first-year retention rates,	from IRA	84%	82%
six-year graduation rates,	from IRA	90%	48%
average time to degree completion,	from IRA	5.2y	4.8y
student satisfaction survey results,	see NAAB Surveys	88%	88%
% pursuing an advanced degree,	from IRA	20%	20%