### Measures and Findings

**ACCE Program Student Learning Outcomes - Construction Management**

1. Understand construction accounting and cost control

**Accounting and Cost Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Details/Description</th>
<th>Acceptable Target</th>
<th>Ideal Target</th>
<th>Implementation Plan (timeline)</th>
<th>Key/Responsible Personnel</th>
<th>Supporting Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AIC AC Level I Exam** | 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. | Not being denoted as an area of weakness on the official report. | Scores higher than the national averages. | Each academic year                   | Instructor of record for CM 4202 Construction Enterprise. | Findings for AIC AC Level I Exam

**Summary of Findings:**

- Fall 2014 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 24.8 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 26.42.
- Spring 2015 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 25.57 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 26.72

**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:
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):
Budget request amount: $0.00

Priority:
Low

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 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: = >3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:
Current cycle summary findings: Four course outcomes were mapped to Construction Accounting and Cost Control with 0.60 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle summary of findings: Four course outcomes were mapped with a 0.500 ratio of negative to positive responses. Targets met; however moving away from Ideal Target.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Moving Away

Recommendations :
Continue to observe to see if trend continues.
Reflections/Notes: None

Substantiating Evidence:
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
N/A

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---


**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
End of Fall 2015

**Status**
for Monitor Progress

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

**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

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Exam*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

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

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY
**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Survey

**Summary of Findings:**
100% rated "average" or above; 58.82% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting target and approaching ideal target

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**Monitor Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details:</th>
<th>Status for Monitor Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Risk Management

2. Understand construction risk management.

**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 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 AICAC Level I Exam

---

**Summary of Findings:**

Fall 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 31.53 and was NOT noted as an area weakness; national average: 32.10. Spring 2015 - Area score for Project Administration was 30.19 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 31.91. Targets were met in Fall 2015 but missed slightly in the Spring of 2015

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

Approaching

**Recommendations:**

None; meeting target

**Reflections/Notes:**

None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**

in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

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

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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:
Summary of Findings: 5 course outcomes were mapped to construction risk management with a 0.615 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last assessment cycle summary findings: Seven course outcomes were mapped with a 0.667 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None; meeting targets

Reflections/Notes :
**Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details**

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
None

**SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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:**
Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details

**Findings**  
for Industry Survey

Summary of Findings:  
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:  
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:  
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**  
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:
**Measure**

**Senior Exit Survey**

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**
94.12% rated "average" or above; 55.8% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
**Construction Law**

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

**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:**
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 AICAC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2014 - Area score for Management Concepts was 23.27 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 24.06. Spring 2015 - Area score for Management Concepts was 22.57 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 23.91

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met; Ideal Target Achievement: Approaching

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
Continue to monitor.

Reflections/Notes:
The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Movement toward targets is stagnant as a result. Should see positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016.

Substantiating Evidence:
AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly

Action details:
Review related coursework with instructor then align SLO forms accordingly.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
To be completed by Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Status
for Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly

Current Status:
In Progress

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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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
Summary of Findings:
Nothing was recorded during this cycle by the instructor; however, last cycle 7 course outcomes were mapped to Construction Law with a 0.778 ratio of negative to positive responses. Results were acceptable.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
Review related coursework with instructor then align SLO forms accordingly.

Reflections/Notes:
The distributed SLO forms changed slightly. This could have caused the oversight.

Substantiating Evidence:
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly

Action details:
Review related coursework with instructor then align SLO forms accordingly.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
To be completed by Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
If SLO frequency is greater than 3, then the action would be considered successful.

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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes :**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*
**Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details**

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

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

---

**Action**

**Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly**

**Action details:**
Review related coursework with instructor then align SLO forms accordingly.

**Implementation Plan**
**(timeline):**
To be completed by Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
If SLO frequency is greater than 3, then the action would be considered successful.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
High
Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
94.12% rated "average" or above; 50.0% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None. Targets being met.

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:
Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly

Action details:
Review related coursework with instructor then align SLO forms accordingly.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
To be completed by Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
If SLO frequency is greater than 3, then the action would be considered successful.

Budget approval required?
(describe):
Budget request amount: $0.00
Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

Status
for Review Coursework - Align SLO Accordingly

Current Status:
In Progress

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure
AICAC 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:
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 2014 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 24.80 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 26.42. Spring 2014 - Area score for Budgeting, Costs, and Cost Control was 25.57 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 26.72

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
Continue to monitor.

**Reflections/Notes:**
The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Movement toward targets is stagnant as a result. Should see positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (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):

**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 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
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: $\geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 7$ 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:
There are 14 course outcomes were mapped to Project Controls with a .072 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle summary of findings: 11 course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a .0733 ratio of negative to positive responses.
Acceptable Target Achievement: Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement: Approaching

Recommendations: None. Targets are being met.

Reflections/Notes: This course was recently overhauled with new material added. Should continue to see improvement towards Ideal Target.

Substantiating Evidence:
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (Fall 2014/Spring 2015) - Action Plan*

**No Action Necessary**

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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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:
**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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

### Action
*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Exit Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

## Findings
**for Senior Exit Survey**
Summary of Findings:
97.06% rated "average" or above; 55.08% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None. Targets meeting or approaching

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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
AICAC Level I Exam

5. Understand construction quality assurance and control

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:**
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 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 31.53 and was NOT noted as an area weakness. National average: 32.10. Spring 2015 - Area score for Project Administration was 30.19 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 31.94. Fall 2014 - Area score for Management Concepts was 23.20 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 24.06. Spring 2015 - Area score for Management Concepts was 22.57 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 23.91.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
Targets are close. Continue to monitor

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping</td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://folio.taskstream.com/

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 3 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: $\geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: \( > 7 \) 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:**
There are 3 course outcomes were mapped to Quality Control with a .020 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle summary of findings: 11 course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a .0733 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle two course outcomes were mapped with no responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Recommendations:**
None. Meeting targets

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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
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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.
Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td>for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum needs to be</td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewed for related topics.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with appropriate content</td>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then needs to be mapped to the</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO.</td>
<td>Action resulted in targets being met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 3 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget request amount:</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes :**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

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

**Status**
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**
Additional information:
Action resulted in targets being met.

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:
**Findings**

_for Senior Exit Survey_

**Summary of Findings:**
97.06% rated "average" or above; 55.08% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None: Meeting or approaching targets.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**


**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 3 with less than 1.0 in the response ratio.

**Budget approval required?**

---

**Status**
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Action resulted in targets being met.

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
### Project Delivery

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

#### 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:**
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.

#### Findings

**Summary of Findings:**
Fall 2014 - Area score for Project Administration was 31.53 and was NOT noted as an area weakness. National average: 32.10.
Spring 2015 - Area score was 30.19 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 31.91.

Last cycle 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. Meeting or approaching targets.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

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

**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 Project Delivery within the curriculum:

- CM 1011 Introduction to Construction Management
- CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading
- CM 4221 Construction Project Management
- CM 4211 Construction 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: $\geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO;
- Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
- Mapping Frequency: $\geq 7$ 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 Course Assessments and or Exams

**Summary of Findings:**
There are 28 course outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 0.724 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle summary of findings: Twenty course outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 0.848 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None. Meeting or approaching targets.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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>Completed</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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:
Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**

in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Current Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(timeline):</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approval required?</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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:

Substantiating Evidence:

Status
for No Action Necessary

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Supporting Attachments:
Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student’s graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
100% rated "average" or above; 76.47% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :
Exceeded

Recommendations :
None. Targets have been met

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**Structures**

7. 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:**
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:**

---

**Questions**

Fall 2014 - Area score for Engineering Concepts was 8.44 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 9.54. Spring 2015 - Area score was 8.60 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 9.6. Last cycle: 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 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:
Continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes:
Internal measurement demonstrate significant improvement. The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Should see more positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016.

Substantiating Evidence:
AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:
There were 24 course outcomes mapped to Structures with a 1.267 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 22 outcomes mapped with a 2.69 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
Continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes:
A review of internal course measurements were completed. Errors were corrected; however, for the most part, the significant improvement seemed to be a result of the course modifications (course SLO action items from last cycle). Note: the students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Should see even more positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students move through modified courses like this one.
**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

### Monitor Progress

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment

---

### Status for Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Targets are closer as a result of the action.

**Next Steps:**
Continue to monitor; new action created.

### Substantiating Evidence:
Measures

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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitor Progress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong> Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.</td>
<td>for Monitor Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(timeline): End of Fall 2015</td>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Undergraduate Coordinator</td>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Action:</strong> Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.</td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget approval required?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget request amount:</strong> $0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Attachments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

---

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

---

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

---

**Status**
for Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools

---

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

---

**Additional information:**
Targets are closer as a result of the action.

**Next Steps:**
Continue to monitor; new action created.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
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:**

---

### Monitor Progress

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low
**Measure**

*Senior Exit Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. With 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding.

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Findings

*for Senior Exit Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**
97.06% rated "average" or above; 50% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
Continue to monitor.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Students strongly believe they understand the basic principles of structural behavior; however the direct assessments are not as confident.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):

---

**Status**
for Evaluate Related Course Assessment Tools

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Targets are closer as a result of the action.

**Next Steps:**
Continue to monitor; new action created.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Substantiating Evidence:

Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Systems

8. Understand the basic principles of mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems

End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Undergraduate Coordinator

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Course Assessments and or Exams

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

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: = >3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:**
No data obtained as this course was a transitional course from old to new curriculum. The College of Architecture offered the course for the old curriculum students. The first modified, new curriculum, CM course in Mech/Elect will be offered Fall 2015

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
None.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**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.

**Status**
for Add Topical Content

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Integration complete.

**Next Steps:**
Monitor learning during the next assessment cycle and work with the College of Architecture to develop a standard course assessment tool.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
### Monitor Progress

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment from the College of Architecture.

**Implementation Plan**
**(timeline):**
End of Spring 2016

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

**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...
Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details

Status for Add Topical Content
Current Status: Completed
Budget Status: Additional information: Integration complete.

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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:


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

Status for Add Topical Content
Current Status: Completed
Budget Status:

Additional information:
Integration complete.

Next Steps:
Monitor learning during the next assessment cycle
and work with the College of Architecture to develop a standard course assessment tool.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**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:**

---

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment from the College of Architecture.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Spring 2016

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Undergraduate Coordinator

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Medium

---

**Status**
for Monitor Progress

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**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

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Exam*

**Summary of Findings:**
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add Topical Content</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action details:</td>
<td>for Add Topical Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce or reinforce mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems into other courses (i.e. CM 1011, 1102 and CM 4202)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong> Integration complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong> Monitor learning during the next assessment cycle and work with the College of Architecture to develop a standard course assessment tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementation Plan  
(timeline): |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin implementation Fall 2014 and reassess SLO Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Action:</strong> Seeking to increase course outcome mapping frequency to the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems Program SLO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget approval required?</strong> (describe): n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget request amount:</strong> $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Attachments:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| Monitor Progress  
Action details: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment from the College of Architecture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation Plan  
(timeline):** End of Spring 2016 |
| **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Undergraduate Coordinator |
| **Evaluation of Action:** Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Monitor Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
73.53% rated "average" or above; 20.59% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding". Lowest rating of all learning outcomes.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
Monitor the modified CM mech/elect course in the Fall of 2015. Visit with the College of
Status
for Add Topical Content

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:
Integration complete.

Next Steps:
Monitor learning during the next assessment cycle and work with the College of Architecture to develop a standard course assessment tool.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Add Topical Content

Action details:
Introduce or reinforce mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems into other courses (i.e. CM 1011, 1102 and CM 4021)

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:

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester

Status
for Monitor Progress

Current Status:
In Progress

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

---

**Sustainable Construction**

9. 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: $ \geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 7$ 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:**
Similar to the last cycle, this was not measured; therefore, no data acquired.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Moving Away

**Recommendations:**
Explore the possibility of implementing an entire course in Sustainably. In the meanwhile, review topical content and assessment to include in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Several courses teach sustainable applications; however, they were not included in the submitted SLO forms provided by the instructors at the end of each semester.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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.

**Status**
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Targets are being met due to this action.

**Next Steps:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.
**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes :

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

Status
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:
Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. With 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:
Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
97.06 rated "average" or above; 55.88% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding". Lowest rating of all learning outcomes.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None. Meeting and approaching targets.

Reflections/Notes:
As noted in the other assessment, students are understanding the basic principles of sustainable construction. It just isn't being measured using the various assessments.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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?
Team Building

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

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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:
There were 7 course outcomes mapped to Team Building with a 0.722 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle had no measurements.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None; meeting and approaching targets.

Reflections/Notes:
Visit to ACCE better defined how to measure this SLO. This information was implemented into the CM 4202 capstone course.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review ACCE Standards</th>
<th>Status for Review ACCE Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td>for Review ACCE Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As ACCE Standards become more defined, this need to be closely monitored as it relates to &quot;multi-disciplinary&quot; teams. Training is needed to determine whether or not the CM curriculum is meeting the intent of this SLO.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):

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

**Evaluation of Action:**
Training complete; report to faculty on CM compliance to SLO standard.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):
Budget approval will be within the CM Department for travel to ACCE

**Budget request amount:**
$1,600.00
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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan
**Review ACCE Standards**

**Action details:**
As ACCE Standards become more defined, this need to be closely monitored as it relates to "multi-disciplinary" teams. Training is needed to determine whether or not the CM curriculum is meeting the intent of this SLO.

**Implementation Plan**
*(timeline):*

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

**Evaluation of Action:**
Training complete; report to faculty on CM compliance to SLO standard.

**Budget approval required?**
*(describe):*
Budget approval will be within the CM Department for travel to ACCE

**Budget request amount:**
$1,600.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Measure**

**Senior Exit Survey**

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above
Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
100% rated "average" or above; 70.59% rated their learning in this area as either "above average" or "outstanding". Lowest rating of all learning outcomes.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Recommendations:
None; meeting targets.

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Review ACCE Standards

Action details:
As ACCE Standards become more defined, this need to be closely monitored as it relates to "multi-disciplinary" teams. Training is needed to determine whether or not the CM curriculum is meeting the intent of this SLO.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Status
for Review ACCE Standards

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:
Approved

Additional information:
Visit to ACCE complete. Information resulted the modification of the CM 4202 Enterprise. Targets are now being met.
### Surveying

11. **Apply basic surveying techniques for construction layout and control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>AICAC Level I Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**
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 2014 - Area score for Construction Geomatics was 3.42 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 3.46. Spring 2015 - Area score for Construction Geomatics was 3.02 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 3.47. Previous cycle: 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:
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
Continue to monitor.

**Reflections/Notes:**
There are only 6 questions on this cycle's exam. Measurement came close to meeting national averages.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

### Action


#### 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

**Status**
for Reinforce Topic at Senior Level

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Targets are being met due to this action.

**Next Steps:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Evaluation of Action:
Response ratio falls below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
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: ≥ 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: ≥ 7 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:
There were 8 outcomes mapped to Surveying with a 1.00 ratio of negative to positive responses. Previous assessment cycle - 7 course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 1.375 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Internal course measurement was reviewed. It helped improve the results. The senior capstone course was slightly adjusted for this area and seemed to help.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---


**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
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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
### 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

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

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

Status
for Reinforce Topic at Senior Level

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:
Targets are being met due to this action.

Next Steps:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:
Evaluation of Action:
Response ratio falls below 1.0

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale, with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding.

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
94.15% rated "average" or above; 55.89% rated their learning in this area as either "above average" or "outstanding". Lowest rating of all learning outcomes.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching
Recommendations:
None; meeting or approaching target

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Ethics**

12. Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles

---

**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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:
There were 4 course outcomes were mapped to Ethics with a 0.091 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None. meeting or approaching targets.

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:
Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes :
None.

Substantiating Evidence:

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

---

**No Action Necessary**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan (timeline):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps:
None
## Measure

**Senior Exit Survey**

**Program Level:** INDIRECT - SURVEY

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding.

**Acceptable Target:**
> 70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
> 70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Findings

*for Senior Exit Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**
100% rated "average" or above; 76.47% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting or exceeding targets.
### Substantiating Evidence:


### Action

#### in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>AICAC Level I Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details/Description:

The American Institute of Constructors'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:

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 2014 - Area score for Materials, Methods, and Project Modeling and Visualization was 18.13 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 19.51. Spring 2015 - Area score for Communication Skills was 16.93 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 19.78. Last cycle: 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:
No action at this time as internal measurements are positive. Need to continue to monitor as old curriculum become obsolete.

Reflections/Notes:
The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Movement toward targets is stagnant as a result. Should see positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016.

Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Current Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(timeline):</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Action:</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Substantiating Evidence:**

- **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 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 3502 Construction and Civil Materials
- CM 3503 Soils in Construction
- CM 3165 Highway Construction
- CM 3355 Maintenance and Turnaround

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: $\geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
- Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**

- Mapping Frequency: $\geq 7$ 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:
There were 24 course outcomes were mapped to Method, Materials, and Equipment with a 0.712 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 18 course outcomes were mapped to with a 0.61 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None; target met or approaching.

Reflections/Notes:
None.

Substantiating Evidence:
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)


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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes :**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

**No Action Necessary**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details:</th>
<th>Current Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds targets</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Budget Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(timeline):</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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>Next Steps:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

None
**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - 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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

*Senior Exit Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL: INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale, with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding.

**Acceptable Target:**

>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**

>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**
**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**
100% rated "average" or above; 54.71% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting and approaching target.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**
[14. Analyze construction](#)

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

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

**Measure**

*AICAC Level I Exam*

---

**Construction Documents**

14. Analyze construction
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 AICAC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2014 - Area score for Budgets, Costs, and Cost Control was 28.40 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 26.42. Spring 2015 - Area score for Communication Skills was 25.57 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 26.42. Last cycle: 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:

Ideal Target Achievement :

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

Reflections/Notes :
The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. Movement toward targets is stagnant as a result. Should see positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016

Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
**(timeline):**
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Measure**

**Course Assessments and or Exams**

**COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER**

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

CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading
CM 2256 Industrial Estimating

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: \( \geq 3 \) course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: \(< 1.0 \) negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: \( \geq 7 \) 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:**
There were 15 outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 1.0 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 10 course outcomes were mapped to Project Delivery with a 1.0 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting and approaching targets

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**
[SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)]

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**Monitor Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for Monitor Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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
**Summary of Findings:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

### Action

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor Progress</th>
<th>Status for Monitor Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(timeline): End of Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Berryman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Action:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget approval required?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget request amount:</strong></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measure**

*Senior Exit 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

**Findings for Senior Exit Exam**

**Summary of Findings:**
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

**Monitor Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Monitor Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Target:</td>
<td>&gt;70% of the respondents rate &quot;average&quot; or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Target:</td>
<td>&gt;70% of the respondents rate &quot;above average&quot; or &quot;outstanding&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/Responsible Personnel:</td>
<td>CM 4202 Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
97.06% rated "average" or above; 70.59% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Recommendations:
None; exceeded targets

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Status
for Monitor Progress

Current Status:
In Progress

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

Budget approval required?
Construction Software

15. Apply appropriate state-of-the-art electronic-based technology to manage the construction process

**Measure**

*Course Assessments and or Exams*

**COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER**

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

CM 1102 Construction Plan Reading
CM 2215 Safety
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: \( \geq 3 \) course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: \(< 1.0\) negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: \( \geq 7 \) 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:**
There were 7 course outcomes were mapped to Construction Software with 0.00 ratio of
negative to positive responses (no negative responses recorded). Last cycle: 3 course outcomes were mapped to Construction Software with 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative responses recorded)

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :
Exceeded

Recommendations :
None; exceeded targets

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:
SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement :**

**Recommendations :**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes :**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*
**Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping**

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

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Measure**

**Senior Exit Survey**

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Survey*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

**Status**
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**
Meeting targets due to this action.

**Next Steps:**
None.

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

*Senior Exit Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**

The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding.

**Acceptable Target:**

>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**

>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Survey*

**Summary of Findings:**

91.18% rated "average" or above; 61.77% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

Approaching
**Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details**

**Status**
for Review Curriculum and SLO Mapping

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Meeting targets due to this action.

**Next Steps:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Oral Communications**

16. Create oral presentations

**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:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:


Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and

Status for Monitor Progress

Current Status:
In Progress

Budget Status:
Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:

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 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: = or > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO
Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = or > 7 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:
There were 6 outcomes were mapped to Oral Presentations with a 1.667 ratio of negative to positive responses Last cycle: 5 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:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Moving Away

Recommendations:
Degraded since last cycle. Frequency being met; however, not meeting course learning outcomes. This result conflicts with the Senior Exit Survey. Need to review assessments for accuracy and oral presentation activities for students.

Reflections/Notes:
The students taking the exam are still in the old curriculum. As a result, movement toward targets is stagnant or in decline. Should see positive movement towards targets when the new curriculum students take the exam in the Spring of 2016.

Substantiating Evidence:

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

---

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

**Budget approval required? (describe):**
Budget request amount:
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Measure**

*Senior Exit Survey*

---

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

*for Senior Exit Survey*

---

**Summary of Findings:**
97.06% rated "average" or above; 55.88% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".
**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting or exceeding targets

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitor Progress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td>for Monitor Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget Status:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(timeline):</strong> End of Fall 2015</td>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Next Steps:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Berryman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Evaluation of Action:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Budget approval required?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supporting Attachments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(describe):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Budget request amount:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Priority:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
**Written Communications**

17. Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline.

**Measure**

**AICAC 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 AICAC Level I Exam*

**Summary of Findings:**
Fall 2014 - Area score for Communication Skills was 23.78 and was noted as an area weakness. National average: 26.09. Spring 2015 - Area score for Communication Skills was 25.02 and was noted as an area weakness. National average was 25.93. Last cycle: 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. National average was 20.2

**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:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**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 the response ratio and mapping frequency.

**Acceptable Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $\geq 3$ course outcomes mapped to SLO; and
Response Ratio: $< 1.0$ negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: $> 7$ 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:**
There were 6 course outcomes were mapped to Writing Assignments with a 0.765 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 2 course outcomes were mapped with a 1.667 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
The increase in writing assignments and the CxC implementation has greatly improved the measurement.

**Reflections/Notes:**
Many of the older students seem to have benefited from the CxC implementation.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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

**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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---


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

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - 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):
Measure
Senior Exit Survey

PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY

Details/Description:
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

Acceptable Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

Ideal Target:
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

Implementation Plan (timeline):
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:
CM 4202 Instructor

Supporting Attachments:

Findings for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
100% rated "average" or above; 61.77% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None; exceeding target and approaching ideal target.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

### Action

**Integrate CxC into the Curriculum**

**Status**
for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**
Meeting targets due to this action.

**Next Steps:**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan (timeline):</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key/Responsible Personnel:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Coordinator</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Action:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking to have implementation plan in place with courses and faculty CxC certified by the university.</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget approval required? (describe):</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget request amount:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Attachments:</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>for Integrate CxC into the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

18. Create a construction project safety plan

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 2014 - Area score for Construction Safety was 16.07 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 15.95. Spring 2015 - Area score was 14.64 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 15.72. Last cycle: 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:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Approaching

Recommendations :
None; meeting and approaching Ideal targets.

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary

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 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: \( \geq 3 \) course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: \( \geq 7 \) 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:
There were three course outcomes mapped to Safety with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative response recorded). Last cycle: 2 course outcomes were mapped with a 0.00 ratio of negative to positive responses (no negative response recorded).

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
None; meeting targets.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:
[SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)]

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

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

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:
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:
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes :
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

No Action Necessary | Status
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Exit Exam</strong></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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs
Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**

in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

---

**No Action Necessary**

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Measure**

Senior Exit Survey

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above
**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Findings**

for Senior Exit Survey

**Summary of Findings:**
94.2% rated "average" or above; 52.94% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement :**
Approaching

**Recommendations :**
None; meeting targets

**Reflections/Notes :**
None.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**No Action Necessary**

**Action details:**
Meets or exceeds targets

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Evaluation of Action:**

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

**Status**
for No Action Necessary

**Current Status:**
Completed

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
Estimating

19. Create construction project cost estimates

Measure
AICAC 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 AICAC Level I Exam

Summary of Findings:
Fall 2014 - Area score for Bidding and Estimating was 21.69 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 22.69. Spring 2015 - Area score was 21.12 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 22.78. Last cycle: Fall 2013 - Area score was 27.27 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 28.39. Spring 2014 - Area score was 27.88 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 28.60

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement :
Moving Away

Recommendations :
Review topical content and delivery.
**Reflections/Notes:**
Revisited assessment during the last cycle with little change in results

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- AIC Level I Exam Fall 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

## Action
### in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitor Progress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td>for Monitor Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional information:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantiating Evidence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation Plan (timeline):
End of Fall 2015

| **Key/Responsible Personnel:** | Chuck Berryman |

### Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

### Budget approval required? (describe):
Budget request amount: $0.00

### Priority:
Low

### Supporting Attachments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong> The curriculum and delivery needs to be reviewed for related</td>
<td>for Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Cycle Summary Report - Details

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: = > 3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

Ideal Target:
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 0.5

Budget Status:

Additional information:
Moving towards targets due to action.

Next Steps:
Continue to monitor to see if learning continues to approach targets.

Substantiating Evidence:

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:
Findings

for Course Assessments and or Exams

Summary of Findings:
There were 10 course outcomes were mapped to Estimating with a 1.111 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 12 course outcomes were mapped with a 1.389 ratio of negative to positive responses.

Results: Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations:

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Not Met

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
Review topical content and delivery.

Reflections/Notes:
Assessment tools were reviewed and modified. It provided a modest improvement.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan (timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Status
for Monitor Progress

Current Status:
In Progress

Budget Status:

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Substantiating Evidence:
Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low

Supporting Attachments:

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

Status
for Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping

Current Status:
Completed

Budget Status:

Additional information:
Moving towards targets due to action.

Next Steps:
Continue to monitor to see if learning continues to approach targets.

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:**
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**

**Ideal Target Achievement:**

**Recommendations:**
Complete Survey in next cycle.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

---

**Action**  
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan
### Monitor Progress

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
*(timeline):*
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

### 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 - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement :

Recommendations :
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

**Action**

*in 2015 Assessment Cycle (F2014/S2015) - Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monitor Progress</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong> for Monitor Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action details:</strong></td>
<td>Current Status: In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.</td>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan</strong> (timeline):</td>
<td>Additional information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Fall 2015</td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong></td>
<td>Substantiating Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Berryman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required? (describe):

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action details:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong> for Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum and delivery needs to be reviewed for related</td>
<td>Current Status: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

**Senior Exit Survey**

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor

**Supporting Attachments:**
Findings
for Senior Exit Survey

Summary of Findings:
97.06% rated "average" or above; 67.65% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

Acceptable Target Achievement:
Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement:
Approaching

Recommendations:
Continue to monitor as the results are contrary to other assessments.

Reflections/Notes:
Student perceive that they have learned the fine art of estimating but the direct assessment tell a different tale.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress
Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):
### Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Review Related Curriculum, Delivery, and Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Status: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information: Moving towards targets due to action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget request amount:</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**Supporting Attachments:**

### Measure

**AICAC Level I Exam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Details/Description:**

### Scheduling

20. Create construction project schedules
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 21.04 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 25.43. Spring 2014 - Area score was 22.55 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 25.55. Last cycle: Fall 2013 - Area score was 27.52 and was noted as an area weakness; national average: 32.71. Spring 2014 - Area score was 28.79 and was noted as an area weakness; national average was 32.35.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Not Met

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Moving Away

**Recommendations:**
No action at this time as internal measurements are somewhat 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 2014 (Adobe Acrobat Document)
- AIC Level I Exam Spring 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

---

### Action

in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan
### Monitor Progress

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

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

**Budget request amount:**
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

### 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 3356 Industrial 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: = >3 course outcomes mapped to SLO; and Response Ratio: < 1.0 negative/positive responses

**Ideal Target:**
Mapping Frequency: = > 7 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:**
There were 3 course outcomes were mapped to Scheduling with a 1.0 ratio of negative to positive responses. Last cycle: 6 course outcomes were mapped to Surveying with a 0.909 ratio of negative to positive responses.

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Met

**Ideal Target Achievement :**
Approaching

**Recommendations :**
None: meeting targets.

**Reflections/Notes :**
The number of mapped course outcomes is lower due to less course offerings during the curriculum changes (no schedule course was offered in the Fall of 2014; otherwise this metric would show "approaching" ideal target.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- SLO Course Summary 2015 (Adobe Acrobat Document)

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

---

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and

**Status**
for Monitor Progress

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**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:**
Summary of Findings:
N/A; this is an off year cycle for this measurement. No data gathered.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Complete Survey in next cycle.

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

Implementation Plan
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

Key/Responsible Personnel:
Chuck Berryman

Evaluation of Action:
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

Budget approval required?
(describe):

Budget request amount:
$0.00

Priority:
Low
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

Findings
for Senior Exit Exam

Summary of Findings:
N/A - Senior Exit Exam is being modified to align with Program SLOs

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Ideal Target Achievement:

Recommendations:
Continue to develop Senior Exit Exam for Fall 2015

Reflections/Notes:
None

Substantiating Evidence:

Action
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

Monitor Progress Status
for Monitor Progress

Action details:
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

**Budget approval required?**
(describe):
Budget request amount:
$0.00

**Priority:**
Low

**Supporting Attachments:**

---

**Measure**

*Senior Exit Survey*

**PROGRAM LEVEL; INDIRECT - SURVEY**

**Details/Description:**
The Senior Exit Survey is given during the last semester prior to the student's graduation. The survey asked the respondent to determine their level of knowledge as it pertains to the Program Learning Outcomes on a 5 point scale. with 1 = unacceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = Outstanding

**Acceptable Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "average" or above

**Ideal Target:**
>70% of the respondents rate "above average" or "outstanding"

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**
Survey is administered to graduating seniors at the end of each semester during the CM 4202 Enterprise course.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
CM 4202 Instructor
Supporting Attachments:

**Findings**
for Senior Exit Survey

**Summary of Findings:**
97.06% rated "average" or above; 61.76% rated their learning in this area as either "above average or "outstanding".

**Acceptable Target Achievement:**
Exceeded

**Ideal Target Achievement:**
Approaching

**Recommendations:**
None; meeting or approaching targets.

**Reflections/Notes:**
None

**Substantiating Evidence:**

**Action**
in 2015 Assessment Cycle(F2014/S2015) - Action Plan

**Monitor Progress**

**Action details:**
Review the next semester results to see if the metrics have changed toward a positive direction. Review assessment related to the AIC Exam and Course Assessment.

**Implementation Plan**
(timeline):
End of Fall 2015

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**
Chuck Berryman

**Evaluation of Action:**
Monitor to see if assessment scores are higher. If so, no further action is needed. If lower, adjustments will need to be made.

**Status**
for Monitor Progress

**Current Status:**
In Progress

**Budget Status:**

**Additional information:**

**Next Steps:**

**Substantiating Evidence:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget approval required?</th>
<th>(describe):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget request amount:</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>