ACCE Program Student Learning Outcomes - Construction Management

.measure

Oral Communications

1. Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline

Measure

Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for oral presentations was 3.5.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met
Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Oral Presentations: Fall 2012 - Spring 2013

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of oral communication into the curriculum

CM 3000 Construction Safety
CM 4200 Construction Administration
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of
times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using a response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: \( \geq 5 \) course outcomes mapped to SLO
Response Ratio: \(< 1.0\) negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: \( \geq 10 \) course outcomes mapped to SLO
Response Ratio: \(< 0.5\) negative/positive responses

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
At the end of each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for Oral Presentations: Fall 2012 - Spring 2013

Summary of Findings:
Five course outcomes were mapped to Oral Presentations with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative responses, all course targets were being met or exceeding expectations).

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No history established yet for measuring Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
**Measure**

**AIC AC Level I Exam**

**OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM**

**Details/Description:**
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Communication Skill.

**Acceptable Target:**
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

**Ideal Target:**
Scores higher than the national averages.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each semester

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

**for AIC AC Level I Exam**

**Summary of Findings:**
Fall 2013 - Area score for Communication Skills was 19.02 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 20.96

Spring 2014 - Area score for Communication Skills was 18.85 and was noted as an area weakness.
weakness. National average was 20.2

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Moving Away

**Recommendations:**
Increase writing assignments in class while helping the graduating seniors relearn the technical aspects of writing.

**Reflections/Notes:**
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**

**in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan**

---

**Integrate CxC into the Curriculum**

**Action details:**
Communication across the Curriculum (CxC) is available to the Department and needs to be explored for implementation into the CM curriculum. Faculty need to be trained and courses identified, and a plan in place to facilitate the integration.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
First faculty meeting for Fall 2014 begin the planning process. Identification of faculty, courses, and process to be complete by semester's end. Begin implementation of implementation plan beginning Spring 2015.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Seeking to have implementation plan in place with courses and faculty CxC certified by the university.

---

**Status**
for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

---

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**Budget approval required?**
(describe):
n/a

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
High

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Measure

**Course Writing Assignments**

**DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**
Courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction written communication within the curriculum:

- **CM 4202 Construction Enterprise**

  Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using a the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
At the end of each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Findings

**for Course Writing Assignments**

**Summary of Findings:**
Two course outcomes were mapped to Oral Presentations with a 1.667 ratio of negative to
positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Increase writing assignments in the CM curriculum

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**Integrate CxC into the Curriculum**

**Action details:**
Communication across the Curriculum (CxC) is available to the Department and needs to be explored for implementation into the CM curriculum. Faculty need to be trained and courses identified, and a plan in place to facilitate the integration.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
First faculty meeting for Fall 2014 begin the planning process. Identification of faculty, courses, and process to be complete by semester’s end. Begin implementation of implementation plan beginning Spring 2015.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Seeking to have implementation plan in place with courses and faculty CxC certified by the university.

**Budget approval required?**
Measure

Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for written communications was 3.61

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :

Reflections/Notes :
No historical data to assess Ideal target,
Substantiating Evidence:
- Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Integrate CxC into the Curriculum

Action details:
Communication across the Curriculum (CxC) is available to the Department and needs to be explored for implementation into the CM curriculum. Faculty need to be trained and courses identified, and a plan in place to facilitate the integration.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
First faculty meeting for Fall 2014 begin the planning process. Identification of faculty, courses, and process to be complete by semester’s end. Begin implementation of implementation plan beginning Spring 2015.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
Seeking to have implementation plan in place with courses and faculty CxC certified by the university.

Budget approval required?
(describe):
n/a

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
High

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam
PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum. A writing component is assessed for SLO Written Communications.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the writing component

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the writing component

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Exam

**Summary of Findings:**
N/A

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Reflections/Notes:**
The current exam only assesses course outcomes.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**Integrate CxC into the Curriculum**

**Action details:**
Communication across the Curriculum (CxC) is available to the Department and needs to be explored for implementation into the CM curriculum. Faculty need to be

**Status**
for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Team Building

4. Apply construction management skills as an effective member of a multi-disciplinary team.

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure

Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Team Building within the curriculum:

CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using a the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: $> 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
At the end of each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for Course Assessments and or Exams

**Summary of Findings:**
Six course outcomes were mapped to Team Building with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative responses, all course targets were being met or exceeding expectations).

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
As the new ACCE Standard become a reality, this SLO should be reviewed to assure that we are adhering to the intent of the Standards as it relates to multi-disciplinary teams

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Measure**
Industry Survey

**PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Industry Survey*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
The average rating for written communications was 3.78

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Measure**

*Course Assessments and/or Exams*

---

**COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Ethics within the curriculum:

CM 2105 Construction Surveying
CM 2215 Construction Safety
CM 3111 Construction Estimating
CM 4200 Construction Administration

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These
responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using a the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
At the end of each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Findings**
*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

**Summary of Findings:**
Six course outcomes were mapped to Team Building with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative responses, all course targets were being met or exceeding expectations).

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**No Action Necessary**
Action details: Meets or exceeds targets

**Status** for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Measure
Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for ethics was 3.89

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded
**Ideal Target Achievement:** Exceeded

**Recommendations:** None

**Reflections/Notes:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

### Action

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle*(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

---

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

### Measure

*Senior Exit Exam*

---

**PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM**

**Details/Description:**
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

**Acceptable Target:**
Average 70% passing the related component

**Ideal Target:**
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
N/A

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
The current exam only assesses course outcomes

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Methods, Materials, and Equipment

6. Analyze methods, materials, and equipment used to construct projects.

Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor’s Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Materials, Methods, and Project Modeling and Visualization.

Acceptable Target:
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Materials, Methods, and Project Modeling and Visualization was 19.23 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 20.15. Spring 2014 - Area score for Communication Skills was 18.94 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 20.48.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
Continue to monitor each graduating class as internal assessments reflect positive learning.

Reflections/Notes:
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.
**Substantiating Evidence:**

- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

**COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**

Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Methods, Materials, and Equipment within the curriculum:

- CM 2101 Construction Materials, Methods, and Equipment
- CM 2102 Construction Equipment
- CM 2103 Materials and Methods II
- CM 3111 Construction Estimating
- CM 3502 Construction and Civil Materials
- CM 3503 Soils in Construction
- CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using a the response ratio and mapping frequency.
Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
At the end of each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Course Assessments and or Exams

Summary of Findings:
Eighteen course outcomes were mapped to Team Building with a 0.61 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary
Status for No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Completed

Budget Status:
**Measure**  
*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**  
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**  
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**  
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**  
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**  
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Findings**  
*for Industry Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**  
The average rating for materials, methods, and equipment was 3.68

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**  
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**  

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013
Project Delivery

7. Understand different methods of project delivery and the roles and responsibilities of all constituencies involved in the design and construction process.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

No Findings Added to Senior Exit Exam

Measure

AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Management Concepts and Project Administration

Acceptable Target:
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each Semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Project Administration was 24.57 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 25.24. Spring 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 25.39 and was NOT noted as an area weakness. National average was 26.25.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None.

Reflections/Notes:
The courses mapped to this outcome have been modified for better topical coverage.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**  
*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action Necessary</td>
<td>Current Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**  
*Course Assessments and or Exams*

**COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**  
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Project Delivery within the curriculum:

CM 1011 Introduction to Construction Management  
CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading  
CM 4221 Construction Project Management  
CM 4211 Construction Contracting  
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.
Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
At the end of each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
_for Course Assessments and or Exams_

---

Summary of Findings:
Twenty course outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 0.848 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

---

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Status:
Measure
Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Project Delivery was 3.68

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Measure  
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:  
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:  
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:  
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):  
Fall 2013
Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
N/A

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**No Action Necessary**

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Construction Documents

8. Analyze construction documents for planning and management of construction processes.

Measure

AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Project Administration and Bidding and Estimating.

Acceptable Target:
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Budgets, Costs, and Cost Control was 21.32 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 23.41. Spring 2014 - Area score for Communication Skills was 21.64 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 23.10

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Slight improvement as compared to the previous semester. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes :
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

Substantiating Evidence:
★ AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
★ AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Action details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan (timeline):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key/Responsible Personnel:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget approval required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(describe):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget request amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Attachments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Construction Documents within the curriculum:

CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading  
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan (timeline):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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At the end of each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
Ten course outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 1.0 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
  
  This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

---

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

---

**Status for No Action Necessary**

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**Measure**

*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Industry Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**
The average rating for Construction Documents was 3.75

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**
[Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)]

---

**Action**
No Action Necessary

Action details: Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required? (describe):

Budget request amount: $0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
### Structures

9. Understand the basic principles of structural behavior.

---

### Measure

**AIC AC Level I Exam**

**Other Level: Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:**
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Engineering Concepts.

**Acceptable Target:**

---

### Action

**in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC AC Level I Exam</td>
<td>No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

**Ideal Target:**
Scores higher than the national averages.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each semester

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for AICAC Level I Exam

**Summary of Findings:**
Fall 2013 - Area score for Engineering Concepts was 8.91 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 8.93. Spring 2014 - Area score for Communication Skills was 8.39 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 9.07

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Moving Away

**Recommendations:**
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Slight improvement as compared to the previous semester. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

**Reflections/Notes:**
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools**

**Action details:**
The assessment tools used for the courses related to this SLO need to be evaluated to assure that they are

---

**Status**
for Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**Budget Status:**
appropriate for the higher level program assessment. The 2.69 ratio could indicate a discrepancy in the process.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Review to be complete by the end of Fall 2014. Monitor next assessment cycle scheduled for Summer 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The response ratio declines. Target to be less than 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Structures within the curriculum:

CM 2501 Structural Principles & Practices
CM 3502 Construction and Civil Materials
CM 3504 Applied Structural Design
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
At the end of each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

**Summary of Findings:**
Twenty course outcomes were mapped to Structures with a 2.69 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Need to review internal course measurement tools and course delivery.

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td><strong>for Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment tools used for the</td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses related to this SLO need to</td>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be evaluated to assure that they are</td>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate for the higher level</td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program assessment. The 2.69 ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could indicate a discrepancy in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measure

Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Industry Survey
Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Construction Documents was 3.49

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools

Action details:
The assessment tools used for the courses related to this SLO need to be evaluated to assure that they are appropriate for the higher level program assessment. The 2.69 ratio could indicate a discrepancy in the process.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Review to be complete by the end of Fall 2014. Monitor next assessment cycle scheduled for Summer 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The response ratio declines. Target to be less than 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium
Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
N/A

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes :
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Systems

10. Understand the basic principles of mechanical, electrical and
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Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems within the curriculum:

CM 3401 Plumbing, HVAC & Electrical Systems
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: \(> 5\) course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: \(< 1.0\) negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: \(> 10\) course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: \(< 0.5\) negative/positive response

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

Summary of Findings:
Two course outcomes were mapped to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems\(l\) with a 1.0 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Reinforce or introduce mechanical and electrical in other courses.

Reflections/Notes:
The low mapping frequency is due the limited number of courses teaching the topics. No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

Substantiating Evidence:
### Action

**Add Topical Content**

**Action details:**
Introduce or reinforce mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems into other courses (i.e. CM 1011, 1102 and CM 4202)

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Begin implementation Fall 2014 and reassess SLO Spring 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Evaluation of Action:**
Seeking to increase course outcome mapping frequency to the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems Program SLO.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

n/a

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Measure

**Industry Survey**

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems was 3.29. This is the lowest rating of all 20 SLOs; however, almost 85% of the respondents believed student are average or above in this area.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202
Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Sustainable Construction
11. Understand the basic principles of sustainable construction.

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Sustainable Construction within the curriculum:

CM 2101 Construction Materials, Methods, and Equipment
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year
Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

**Summary of Findings:**
No course outcomes were mapped to Sustainable Construction with no target responses

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Review curriculum and course outcomes for sustainable applications.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Several courses teach sustainable construction concepts. It is possible that the mapping has not been completed for this SLO. No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**
*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

**Action details:**
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):
Measure

Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of >3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM’s accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Sustainable Construction was 3.30. This is the next lowest rating of all 20 SLOs; however, almost 84% of the respondents believed student are average or above in this area.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :
Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

Action details:
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Measure**
AIC AC Level I Exam

 DETAILS/DESCRIPTION:
The American Institute of Constructor’s Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Construction Geomatics

Acceptable Target:
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.
Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**

*for AIC AC Level I Exam*

**Summary of Findings:**

Fall 2013 - Area score for Construction Geomatics was 4.43 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 4.47. Spring 2014 - Area score for Construction Geomatics was 4.28 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 4.59

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

Moving Away

**Recommendations :**

No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

**Reflections/Notes :**

Reflections/Notes : These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- [AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)]
- [AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)]

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

**Reinforce Topic at Senior Level**

**Action details:**

Provide a topical review to graduating senior prior to taking the Senior Exit Exam and the AIC Level I Exam. It is believed that students have learned the topic but it is so early in the curriculum that it is being forgotten by the time they graduate.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

A month before each exam provide a review within CM 4202

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

Instructor

**Evaluation of Action:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>for Reinforce Topic at Senior Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status:</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Surveying within the curriculum:

CM 2105 Construction Surveying
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$ negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Course Assessments and or Exams

Summary of Findings:
Seven course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 1.375 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Need to review internal course measurement tools and course delivery. Possibly review Surveying before student take the senior exams.

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target. It is possible that a simple Surveying review before the Senior Exit Exam and the AIC Exam could be all that is needed to improve student learning in this area.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Reinforce Topic at Senior Level

Action details:
Provide a topical review to graduating senior prior to taking the Senior Exit Exam and the AIC Level I Exam. It is believed that students have learned the topic but it is so early in the curriculum that it is being forgotten by the time they graduate.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
A month before each exam provide a review within CM 4202

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor

Evaluation of Action:
Response ration falls below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:
Measure
Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Surveying was 3.35. This is the third lowest rating of all 20 SLOs; however, almost 89% of the respondents believed student are average or above in this area.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan
**Reinforce Topic at Senior Level**

**Action details:**
Provide a topical review to graduating senior prior to taking the Senior Exit Exam and the AIC Level I Exam. It is believed that students have learned the topic but it is so early in the curriculum that it is being forgotten by the time they graduate.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
A month before each exam provide a review within CM 4202

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Instructor

**Evaluation of Action:**
Response ration falls below 1.0

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Measure**

**Senior Exit Exam**

**PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM**

**Details/Description:**
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

**Acceptable Target:**
Average 70% passing the related component.

**Ideal Target:**
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Fall 2013

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty teaching CM 4202
Estimating

13. Create construction project cost estimates.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes :
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Bidding and Estimating.

Acceptable Target:
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2012

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam
Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Bidding and Estimating was 27.27 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 28.39. Spring 2014 - Area score for Bidding and Estimating was 27.88 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 28.60

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes :
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping

Action details:
The curriculum and delivery needs to be reviewed for related topics SLO mapping need to be verified to appropriate course outcome.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Review needs to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping verification

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
Action is successful if the response ratio is below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00
Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Estimating within the curriculum:

CM 1011 Introduction to Construction Management
CM 3111 Construction Estimating
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: $> 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$ negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Course Assessments and or Exams

Summary of Findings:
Twelve course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 1.389 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met
Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Need to review internal course measurement tools and course delivery.

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

Substantiating Evidence:
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping

Action details:
The curriculum and delivery needs to be reviewed for related topics SLO mapping need to be verified to appropriate course outcome.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Review needs to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping verification

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
Action is successful if the response ratio is below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Industry Survey
PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Estimating was 3.66.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping

Status
for Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping
Action details:
The curriculum and delivery needs to be reviewed for related topics SLO mapping need to be verified to appropriate course outcome.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Review needs to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping verification

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
Action is successful if the response ratio is below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:
Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control and Planning, Scheduling, and Schedule Control.

Acceptable Target:
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Planning, Schedule, and Schedule Control was 27.52 and was noted
as an area weakness; national average: 32.71. Spring 2014 - Area score for Planning, Schedule, and Schedule Control was 28.79 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 32.35

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

**Reflections/Notes:**
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Measure**

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

---

**No Action Necessary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
<td>(describe):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Measure**

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

---

**COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Scheduling within the curriculum:

CM 4111 Construction Scheduling and Cost Control
CM 4221 Construction Project Administration
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$ negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

---

**Findings**
for Course Assessments and or Exams

**Summary of Findings:**
Six course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.909 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan
**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Measure**

*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Industry Survey*
Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Scheduling was 3.59.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.
Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Accounting and Cost Control

15. Understand construction accounting and cost control.

Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor’s Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Planning, Scheduling, and Schedule Control.

Acceptable Target:
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 21.32 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 23.41. Spring 2014 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 21.64 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 23.10

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes:
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not
occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Accounting and Cost Control within the curriculum:

CM 4221 Construction Project Management
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: >= 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: >= 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for Course Assessments and/or Exams

**Summary of Findings:**
Four course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.500 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Need to add course content for this SLO

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

**No Action Necessary**

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Measure

Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Accounting and Cost Control was 3.56.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None
Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202
Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td>for No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>Current Status: Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required? (describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Risk Management

16. Understand construction risk

Printed on: 10/17/2014 04:34:27 PM (EST)
OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Management Concepts.

Acceptable Target:
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Project Administration was 24.57 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 25.24. Spring 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 25.39 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 26.25

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:
AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Risk Management within the curriculum:

- CM 1011 Introduction to Construction Management
- CM 4211 Construction Contracting
- CM 4221 Construction Project Management

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: $= > 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$ negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty
**Findings**

*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
Seven course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.667 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

---

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Status** for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Measure
Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Risk Management was 3.40.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary | Status
Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:
**Construction Law**

17. Understand the legal implications of contract, common, and regulatory law to manage a construction project.

---

### Action

in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required? (describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

AIC AC Level I Exam

### OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

**Details/Description:**
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Management Concepts and Project Administration.

**Acceptable Target:**
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

**Ideal Target:**
Scores higher than the national averages.

---

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Reflections/Notes:**
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

Printed on: 10/17/2014 04:34:27 PM (EST)
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2013 - Area score for Management Concepts was 23.07 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 24.92. Spring 2014 - Area score for Management Concepts was 23.85 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 24.98

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
Continue to monitor as the average score continues to rise.

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary
Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Construction Law within the curriculum:

CM 1011 Introduction to Construction Management
CM 4211 Construction Contracting

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Course Assessments and or Exams

Summary of Findings:
Seven course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.778 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**  
*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Industry Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75
Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Construction Law was 3.70.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
 n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes :
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Status
for No Action Necessary
### Measure

**AIC AC Level I Exam**

**OTHER LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM**

**Details/Description:**
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, one being Construction Safety.

**Acceptable Target:**
Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

**Ideal Target:**
Scores higher than the national averages.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each semester

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

### Findings

**for AIC AC Level I Exam**

**Summary of Findings:**
Fall 2013 - Area score for Construction Safety was 14.20 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 15.20. Spring 2014 - Area score for Construction Safety was 13.75 and was...
noted as an area weakness; national average was 15.11

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes:
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

Substantiating Evidence:
AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

| Status for No Action Necessary |
| Current Status:               |
| Completed                     |
| Budget Status:                |
| Additional information:       |
| Next Steps:                   |
| Substantiating Evidence:      |

| Action details:               |
| Meets or exceeds targets     |

| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Key/Responsible Personnel:    |

| Evaluation of Action:         |
| Budget approval required?     |
| (describe):                   |

| Budget request amount:        |
| $0.00                         |

| Priority:                     |

| Supporting Attachments:       |

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER
Details/Description:
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Safety within the curriculum:

CM 2215 Construction Safety
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

Acceptable Target:
Mapping Frequency: $> 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: $> 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$ negative/positive responses.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each academic year

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

Summary of Findings:
Two course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative response recorded).

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
A single course is involved in creating a project safety plan.; therefore a low mapping frequency is expected. No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

Substantiating Evidence:
Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs.
**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action Necessary</th>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td>- for No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>- Current Status: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>- Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td>- Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td>- Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
<td>- Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>- $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**
Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Safety was 3.19. This is the lowest rating of all 20 SLOs; however, almost 78% of the respondents believed student are average or above in this area.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
None

Reflections/Notes:
No historical data to assess student learning

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM
Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes:
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Action details:
Meets or exceeds targets

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Evaluation of Action:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:
Project Controls

19. Understand construction project control processes.

Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Budgeting, Cost, and Cost Control and Project Administration.

Acceptable Target:
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Each semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Summary of Findings: Fall 2013 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 21.32 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 23.41. Spring 2014 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 21.64 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 23.10

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching
**Measure**

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

**COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Project Controls within the curriculum:

- CM 3000 Construction Safety
- CM 4101 Construction Scheduling and Cost Control
- CM 4211 Construction Contracting
- CM 4221 Construction Project Management

---

**Recommendations:**
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

**Reflections/Notes:**
These students are finishing the old curriculum. A true representation of this measure will not occur until the Spring of 2016. This is when the first set of graduates will complete all courses in the new curriculum.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**
CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Course Assessments and or Exams*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
Eleven course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a .0733 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
None

**Reflections/Notes :**
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**

This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*
**Measure**

*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

**Acceptable Target:**
Response average of >3.0

**Ideal Target:**
Response average of > 3.75

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Department Chair

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Industry Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**

---
The average rating for Project Controls was 3.67.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for No Action Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Exit Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

**Ideal Target:**
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Fall 2013

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty teaching CM 4202

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
*for Senior Exit Exam*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
n/a

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**

Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Reflections/Notes:**

Current exam measures only course outcomes.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**
*in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

---

**No Action Necessary**

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Measure
AIC AC Level I Exam

Other Level: Direct - Exam

Details/Description:
The American Institute of Constructor's Associate Construction (AC) Level One exam provides a national comparison to other construction management institutions within the US. It assesses 10 areas, two being Management Concepts and Project Administration.

Acceptable Target:
No being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report.

Ideal Target:
Scores higher than the national averages.

Implementation Plan (Timeline):
Each semester

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise.

Findings
for AIC AC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Summary of Findings: Fall 2013 - Area score for Project Administration was 24.57 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 25.24. Spring 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 25.39 and was NOT noted as an area weakness. National average was 26.25.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None.

Reflections/Notes:
The courses mapped to this outcome have been modified for better topical coverage.
Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam - Fall 2013 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**
*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

**Action details:**
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Medium

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Measure**
*Course Assessments and or Exams*

**COURSE LEVEL: DIRECT - OTHER**

**Details/Description:**
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction Quality Control within the curriculum:

CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either
meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 5 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 10 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5 negative/positive responses

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

_for Course Assessments and or Exams_

**Summary of Findings:**
Two course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with no responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
Review curriculum and course outcomes for sustainable applications.

**Reflections/Notes :**
Several courses teach quality control concepts. It is possible that the mapping has not been completed for this SLO. No historical data to assess Ideal Target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- **Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)**
  
  This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs

---

**Action**

_for 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan_

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
Action details:
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Industry Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM's accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:
Findings
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:
The average rating for Quality Control was 3.39.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
None

Reflections/Notes :
No historical data to assess Ideal Target

Substantiating Evidence:
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

Action details:
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Measure
Senior Exit Exam

PROGRAM LEVEL: DIRECT - EXAM

Details/Description:
Senior in the CM 4202 Construction Enterprise course take an exit exam to assess student learning across the curriculum.

Acceptable Target:
Average 70% passing the related component.

Ideal Target:
Average 85% passing the related component of the exam

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Fall 2013

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Faculty teaching CM 4202

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
n/a

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Reflections/Notes :
Current exam measures only course outcomes.

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams
Several courses have been identified for enhanced integration of construction software within the curriculum:

- CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading
- CM 3111 Construction Estimating
- CM 4101 Construction Scheduling and Cost Control
- CM 4202 Construction Enterprise

Course outcomes are mapped to the Program SLOs and are measured with various assessment tools dependent on instructor and course content. Course targets are established and recorded either meeting or exceeding targets (positive response) or not meeting (negative response). These responses are recorded as a ratio of negative to positive. In addition, the frequency (the number of times the Program SLO is mapped to a course) is also recorded. In essence, the Program SLOs are measured at the course level using the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 5$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 10$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 0.5$

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Each academic year

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Faculty

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for Course Assessments and or Exams

**Summary of Findings:**
Three course outcomes were mapped to Construction Software with 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative responses recorded)

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Need to increase frequency of computer software usage. Review curriculum and course mapping for accuracy.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Computers and related construction software is used throughout the curriculum. It is possible that mapping has yet to be completed. No data to assess Ideal Target.
**Substantiating Evidence:**

Course SLO Summary Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

This report compiles Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 course outcomes as they are mapped to the Programs SLOs.

---

**Action**

*in 2014 Assessment Cycle (F2013/S2014) - Action Plan*

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

**Action details:**
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Medium

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Measure**

*Industry Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Industry Survey is given to employers and alumni. It contains all 20 Program SLOs and asks industry to rate the learning of students on each outcome listed. Responses on a 5 point scale with 1.0 being "strongly disagree" and 5.0 being "strongly agree" on whether or not the student has acquired the learning during their time at LSU.

---
Acceptable Target:
Response average of >3.0

Ideal Target:
Response average of > 3.75

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey to occur every 3 years (twice during CM’s accreditation cycle).

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Department Chair

Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Industry Survey

---

**Summary of Findings:**
The average rating for Construction Software was 3.63.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None

**Reflections/Notes:**
No data to assess Ideal Target

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Industry Survey - Spring 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**
in 2014 Assessment Cycle(F2013/S2014) - Action Plan

---

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

**Action details:**
The curriculum needs to be reviewed for related topics. Those with appropriate content then needs to be mapped to the SLO.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Curriculum review to be completed by Fall 2014 along with SLO mapping.
Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Program Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
The frequency should be above 5 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Medium

Supporting Attachments: