Outcomes Assessment

Prepared By
Deborah A. Storrings, PhD.

Fall 2010

- LSA311/611 - Natural Processes In Design
- LSA326 - Design Studio 1
## Table of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA311/611 - Natural Processes in Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Materials &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Grades</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes About the Surveys</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA326 - Design Studio 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Materials &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Grades</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes About the Surveys</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Recommendations and Conclusions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I - Syllabi</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix II - LA Outcomes Assessment Plan</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

“Education Assessment” became a buzzword in the last two decades of the twentieth century and continues to grow exponentially in the twenty-first. The State University of New York (SUNY) was no exception. SUNY Board of Trustees adopted resolutions in 1998 and 2004 that strengthened the University's longstanding commitment to rigorous and regular assessment of academic programs to enhance academic excellence. (http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/assessment.cfm). To this effort the SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry (ESF) was committed to developing and implementing its own assessment plan. ESF’s Provost, Bruce Bongarten, stated it like this, “Assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level benefits ESF and its patrons by encouraging thoughtful identification of educational objectives concordant with our mission -- to advance knowledge and skills to promote the leadership necessary for stewardship of both the natural and designed environments - and by ensuring that our graduating students have mastered the educational material embodied in those objectives.” (http://www.esf.edu/studentlearningoutcomeassessmentpolicyatesf.pdf)

In December of 2008, to comply with all the new educational assessment mandates, the Department of Landscape Architecture (DLA) produced a comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan (OAP) for both the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Program (BLA) and the Master of Landscape Architecture Program (MLA). The plan was shaped and developed with input from a variety of sources and authored by S. Scott Shannon. It then was reviewed and ratified by the whole of the DLA faculty and can be viewed in Appendix II. Each objective stated in the OAP has course(s) and or studio(s) associated with it revealing where each outcome is expected to be delivered. To determine if the pedagogy of individual courses/studios are meeting/exceeding or falling short of the stated objectives, it was decided that starting in the fall of 2010 formative evaluations should be performed on a course to course basis.

The primary purpose of these evaluations is to begin to gauge individual course content on its ability to meet the stated objectives in the OAP. Moreover, the evaluation can aid instructors in making adjustments to instructional materials and resources and assisting them in identifying trouble areas for students within instructional activities, assignments and exams. Data collected will also be used to indicate how successful the student feels (s)he was in grasping the course objectives.
Methodology

The evaluation was designed to be minimally invasive. Each course’s assessment examined the course syllabus, course materials and delivery, analysis of student grades, evaluation of a Student Self Assessment Survey, and the outcome of the ESF Course Assessment Survey performed by the college. Other data was collected from materials gathered from BlackBoard, the DLA FTP site, and grading from the registrar system.

The ESF Course Assessment Survey is given to students as a voluntary on-line form, consisting of 10 Likert Scale and 4 open-ended questions. Questions 11, 12, and 13 are dropped for classes that are not studios or that do not require a separate lab. Students can complete the ESF Course Assessment Survey 24/7 during the open window period. Students are also offered an incentive to complete the survey, which is usually entry into a drawing for a prize.

The Student Self Assessment Survey was given to those in attendance at the last class session of the course. The Student Self Assessment Survey consisted of 25 Likert Scale questions based on the same five-point Likert scale used on the ESF Course Assessment Survey. A higher score (closer to 5) indicates greater agreement with the statement, while a lower score indicates greater disagreement. The Likert Scale questions for the Student Self Assessment Survey were developed to measure the stated learning outcomes as pulled from the course syllabi. The Student Self Assessment Survey also had one open-ended question where students could comment or elaborate about any of the Likert scale questions.

The two courses chosen for evaluation were LSA311/611- Natural Processes in Planning and Design and LSA326-Design Studio 1. The syllabi for these classes can be viewed in Appendix I.
LSA 311/611 Natural Processes in Design

Introduction

Natural Processes is a lecture style class taught in the fall of 2010. The class took place in Room 145, Baker Lab on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 12:30 to 1:50pm. This room is a smart classroom with dual display screens and the capacity to hold approximately 80 students. The course was taught by Professor Dayton Reuter, who had two teaching assistants, Lisa Gorney and Marin Braco, both graduate students. There were 64 undergraduates and 10 graduate students who completed the course. Below are the descriptions of the courses as listed in the college catalog:

LSA 311 Natural Processes in Design and Planning (3)
Three hours of lecture per week. An overview of basic principles and processes of physical and biological landscape systems with respect to their roles in landscape design and planning. Emphasizes landform, soil, slope, hydrology, climate, energy and general ecological issues as common elements influencing landscape design and the land use decision-making process. Sources and uses of environmental data are discussed.

LSA 611 Natural Processes in Planning and Design (3)
Two hours and 40 minutes of lecture and one hour of discussion per week. This course addresses basic principles and processes of physical landscape systems with respect to their roles in landscape design and planning. Sources and uses of environmental data are discussed and illustrated. An emphasis is placed on landform, soil, slope, hydrology, climate and general ecological issues as common elements influencing landscape design and the land use decision making process.

Syllabus

The syllabus can be found in Appendix I, it is two pages long and is used for both LSA311 and LSA611. There are seven stated course objectives:

Objectives:

1. To familiarize students with the vocabulary and concepts associated with natural physical and biological attributes of the landscape.
2. To establish cause-and-effect relationships between natural processes, landscape design and planning activities, and resulting environmental quality.
3. To encourage a sense of curiosity, enthusiasm, and environmental ethic with respect to landscape resources and the way we use them.
4. The student will have an understanding of the presence and function of natural processes in the landscape.
5. The student will have an understanding of the effects of natural processes on design and planning activities.
6. The student will have an understanding of the need for collaboration between environmental disciplines.
7. The student will have an understanding the role of values, ethics, and politics in the decision-making process.

These seven objectives were incorporated into the last 10 questions of the SSA. Forty five of the 74 students that completed the course also completed the SSA, roughly 61%. Of these 45 the vast majority of students agreed that they had gained some knowledge or understanding of the stated objectives, while less than 7% disagreed.

The DLA Overall Assessment Plan states the following outcomes should be met or partially met though LSA311 and LSA611:

**LSA311**

2. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.
5. BLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place, or region, and identify important design forms, patterns, and organizing structures.
13. BLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their professional work.

**LSA611**

2. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.
10. MLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and storm water management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation
systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.

11. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and select appropriate materials and structural systems to implement design ideas.

Although the Overall Assessment Plan listed outcomes were not visibly stated as outcomes on the syllabus, it appears by reviewing the course schedule and other course materials that indeed these topics were introduced and/or covered in some way. The syllabus also contained excellent administrative, organizational, and housekeeping items, with clearly stated student performance expectations. Only one student out of the 45 who completed the Student Self Assessment Survey thought that the syllabus wasn't relevant or useful. Further, only one student disagreed that the course objectives were always clear.

Course Materials, Delivery & Assessment

Course materials were readily available and delivered in two electronic modes, Blackboard and through the LA FTP site. This allowed students to access materials at any time from any active internet site. Having a secondary source made it almost impossible for students not to have access. Materials were made available in a timely manner and provided in numerous formats for easy viewing and printing. Course materials seemed to be relevant and current to the presented topic. A few students made positive comments about the course materials, Found the material very interesting and The correlations between the class material and the FYI stuff really helps to bring everything together. Examples of course materials can be found on the enclosed DVD.

Course evaluation was done through a series of rote method exams, including true and false, fill in the blank and short answer questions. There were five quizzes, a midterm and a final exam. Students were given the opportunity to attend additional review sessions for exams. These sessions were conducted outside of the regularly scheduled class times. Review sessions were well attended with an average turnout of more than 66%.

On the instruction sheet attached to the Student Self Assessment Survey, students were given the definitions of three basic learning styles: kinesthetic, auditory and visual. They were asked to pick the one they felt best described their own way of learning. Out of the 45 completed Student Self Assessment Surveys, 66% identified themselves as visual learners, 33% as kinesthetic learners, and only 1% as auditory learners. By theory, exams containing short answers, fill-in and multiple choice
work best when given to kinesthetic learners, while visual learners are more comfortable with exams that use diagramming, essays and showing or outlining of processes or procedures.

**Analysis of Grades**

An analysis of final grades was performed by comparing the course grade with the student's semester grade point average and their overall grade point average. Outcome of the grading analysis can be seen on the tables found on page 10. Every student in the course (not just the 45 who completed the Student Self Assessment Survey) received a grade below his/her semester cumulative average and below their overall cumulative grade point average. It appears that non-majors scored slightly higher scores than LA majors, but they also have higher grade point averages, this was similar between genders. The higher the student class level the higher the grade, but here too the students overall grade point average also improved as class level went up.

Students seemed aware of grading issues and they reflected it in both the ESF Survey and on the Student Self Assessment Survey, where 33% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed that the grading was reasonable. Students comments reflected a discrepancy between the two teaching assistants who performed the grading, for example: *The grading was extremely unfair, TA was not fair at all and I often felt very cheated in the grading of the TAs.* Further, a number of students (most likely visual learners) felt that there should have been some other types of grading available such as homework and/or papers. These comments can be viewed under the ESF Course Survey Question 15; What are your suggestions, if any, for changes that would improve this course?

**Notes about the Surveys**

The results of the Student Self Assessment Survey can be seen on pages 12 to 14. Forty-five out of 74 students about 61% completed this survey and some students missed or skipped a few random questions. Of all answers, 62% were positive, 24% were neutral, and 14% were negative. Separating out and viewing only the 10 questions specifically linked to learning outcome the scores are as follows, 78% were positive, 20% were neutral, and 2% were negative.

The results of the ESF Course Assessment Survey can be seen on pages 15 to 20. Note that this survey separates the results for LSA311 and LSA611. For this reason the LSA611 survey is not valid because it did not meet the minimum sample size of seven. Only 3 out of 10 graduate students (30%) and 22 out of 64 undergraduate students (34%) completed the ESF Course Assessment Survey. Of all answers 78% were positive, 10% were neutral, and 12% were negative.
Also note answers to the open-ended questions on both surveys were copied word for word as students had written them. Hence, there are typos, grammar errors, abbreviations etc.
## Final Grad Analysis for LSA311/611

Grades: 74 students, 64 undergrads and 10 grads

### By Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Female (n=26)</th>
<th>Male (n=48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>LA Majors (n=57)</th>
<th>Non-LA Majors (n=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Freshmen (n=5)</th>
<th>Sophomore (n=42)</th>
<th>Junior (n=13)</th>
<th>Senior (n=4)</th>
<th>Grads (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergrads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Mean</th>
<th>Sem GPA</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Majors</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non LA Majors</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Mean</th>
<th>Sem GPA</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation and Recommendations

Looking at the two surveys especially the last half of the Student Self Assessment Survey it appears that the majority of students are grasping and comprehending the intended learning outcomes. Also almost all students had a positive attitude about the course and the knowledge they gained. Although, there were two items that appear to be out of sync.

Foremost, the distinct differences in the course catalog between LSA311 and LSA611. These differences do not appear anywhere in the syllabus. This problem can be addressed in numerous ways, but should be attended to as soon as possible. A couple of recommended solutions might be to have a course number change or to develop separate syllabuses to address the differences as stated in the college catalog.

The other issue is the disconnect in grading, where all students scored one-half a grade lower (.5) on average then their respective grade point averages. Students expressed an understanding of the course objectives and concepts but their class grades did not seem to accurately reflect this knowledge. When asked if they felt they had made progress in this class, there was only one negative response. Students had access to all materials in a timely manner, review classes were given, and yet students seem to perform poorly with no exceptions. Even those students who declared themselves as kinesthetic learner did not fare better than the others. Note that there are many interesting student comments given about testing, quizzes and exams on both surveys.

One recommendation for this problem might be to have a clearer idea of each student’s learning style and how that might be incorporated into testing and evaluation. Another suggestion is to have the current tests, quizzes, and exams analyzed for content, criterion and construct validity. This can help to certify and norm the testing instruments. Lastly, carefully reviewing and acting on suggestions that students have made on the surveys may also be helpful.
### General Learning Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I found the syllabus to be relevant and useful in facilitating my learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.067$, $Std=0.751$, $Var=0.564$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I thought the course objectives were always clear.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.133$, $Std=0.661$, $Var=0.436$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I thought the course was well organized.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.222$, $Std=0.636$, $Var=0.404$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I participated actively in the course.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.289$, $Std=0.991$, $Var=0.983$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I thought the course was well structured to meet the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.911$, $Std=0.874$, $Var=0.765$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I understood all the lecture material.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.578$, $Std=0.866$, $Var=0.749$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I thought the overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.933$, $Std=0.863$, $Var=0.745$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I thought the recommended readings were relevant and appropriate.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.844$, $Std=0.796$, $Var=0.634$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This course stimulated my interest and thoughts on the subject area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.133$, $Std=0.842$, $Var=0.709$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I thought the pace of the course was appropriate.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.956$, $Std=0.824$, $Var=0.680$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I thought the use of BlackBoard was helpful in my learning and participating in course activities/assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.133$, $Std=0.991$, $Var=0.982$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I thought the method for grading was reasonable.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.244$, $Std=1.171$, $Var=1.371$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I thought all activities reinforced my learning of the content material.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.356$, $Std=0.933$, $Var=0.871$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I understood all requirements of an assignment.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=4.000$, $Std=0.707$, $Var=0.500$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel I have made progress in this course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Statistics, $M=3.956$, $Std=0.824$, $Var=0.680$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LSA311/611 Natural Processes

## Student Self Assessment Survey

Continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Specific Learning Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I have a good working knowledge of the presence and function of natural processes in the landscape. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=3.886, \textit{Std}=0.655, \textit{Var}=0.429))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I understand the effects of natural processes on design and planning activities. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=4.114, \textit{Std}=0.579, \textit{Var}=0.336))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I clearly understand the need for collaboration between environmental disciplines. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=4.535, \textit{Std}=0.631, \textit{Var}=0.398))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I understand the role of values, ethics, and politics in the decision-making process. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=4.2277, \textit{Std}=0.743, \textit{Var}=0.552))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I have the breadth and depth of knowledge about natural processes to make informed judgments. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=3.614, \textit{Std}=0.813, \textit{Var}=0.661))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel confident I can work effectively with other disciplines when their expertise is needed. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=3.977, \textit{Std}=0.792, \textit{Var}=0.627))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am fluent in the vocabulary and concepts associated with natural physical and biological attributes of the landscape. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=3.568, \textit{Std}=0.873, \textit{Var}=0.763))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I can establish cause-and-effect relationships between natural processes, landscape design and planning activities. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=4.000, \textit{Std}=0.682, \textit{Var}=0.465))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have developed curiosity, enthusiasm, and environmental ethic with respect to landscape resources and the way we use them. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=4.2550, \textit{Std}=0.918, \textit{Var}=0.843))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can clearly describe the environmental processes and relate them to the influences they have on the built environment. (\textit{(Statistics, } M=3.977, \textit{Std}=0.698, \textit{Var}=0.488))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- Inconsistency in TA grading (#12)
- Class size was too big (#7)
- The course was incredibly dense. For that reason, I feel like I lack knowledge still in many areas. I don't think I could explain fluidly what I learned, but if someone was speaking about the subject I wouldn't be oblivious. I don't feel that I engaged much in the course because there wasn't much if any facilitated in class discussion. That isn't necessarily a bad thing, since most students digress within their own groups during class discussions anyway. I liked the practicality of everything, lessons weren't a random compilation of material with the subject in mind - they related to the real world and I feel like in comparison to a lot my classes I learned the most from here. A lot of it overlapped with my other classes and as such I brought this material there. Overall a nice class.
- I am not an LSA major so this class was not relevant to me in any way.
- I ♥ Dayton
- Blackboard – putting grades up would be extremely helpful!!!
- I am an environmental science major, w/graduate study in engineering. This class ended up exceeding my expectations. I plan to be a consultant like Professor Reuter (I didn’t know before-hand) so it was nice to get the reality of what I actually takes to be one.
- The grading was extremely unfair, TA was not fair at all. I understand and got the question but she would take points off anyways. I asked the other TA some questions about questions I got wrong and she said she would have given me the points. Every other quiz I had a significantly different grade and I didn’t think that was right.
- Overall, a great deal learned from the course. I wish the wetlands section was a bit less policy based and focused more on wetland environments and diversity of these systems.
- Quizzes should be open book.
- (#12) I felt test questions should be more about general categories and trends and less nit-picky, widen knowledge gained from this course.
- I wish we had more graded assignments other then tests. One TA graded way harder than the other. Found the material very interesting even though I didn’t do very well on the quizzes.
- I am not an LSA major so I only really picked up on the natural process part and have little interest in the design aspect. I took the course as a core requirement in environmental science, the course is good intro to design though.
- Dayton Rules
- (#13) – There were no activities – so nothing was reinforced.
ESF COURSE ASSESSMENT SURVEY  
LSA311

Scoring is based on the following point system: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Neutral; 4-Agree; 5-Strongly Agree. A higher score (closer to 5) indicates greater agreement with the statement. A lower score indicates greater disagreement. Questions 11, 12, 13 are only used for courses that include studios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course and subject matter were well organized. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.409, \text{Std}=0.651, \text{Var}=1.424)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor communicated effectively. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.091, \text{Std}=0.9, \text{Var}=0.81)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.409, \text{Std}=0.577, \text{Var}=0.333)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor seemed knowledgeable about the subject matter. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.682, \text{Std}=0.555, \text{Var}=0.308)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor conveyed a positive attitude toward students. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.273, \text{Std}=0.617, \text{Var}=0.38)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tests, assignments, and projects were fair. (\text{Statistics}, M=3.409, \text{Std}=1.37, \text{Var}=1.878)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grading was fair. (\text{Statistics}, M=3.045, \text{Std}=1.397, \text{Var}=1.952)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructional approach(es) used was (were) appropriate to the course. (\text{Statistics}, M=4.136, \text{Std}=0.919, \text{Var}=0.845)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor motivated me to do my best work. (\text{Statistics}, M=3.727, \text{Std}=1.175, \text{Var}=1.38)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I gave my best effort in this course. (\text{Statistics}, M=3.773, \text{Std}=1.203, \text{Var}=1.448)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. What was the most effective part of this course?

- Nothing at all
- Learning about the process of designing rather than the materials behind it
- The knowledge of the professor and guest lecturers provided students a great resource.
- That the class was straight forward.
- The information on the slides.
- I guess the exams
- Classes were very informative
- Dayton's enthusiasm and office hours
- It was nice to have the power point available online
- The instructor being in an environmental consulting business really helps him know the regulations and legal framework surrounding what we were learning. Bringing in other people who did their own design projects to present on them was helpful as well.
- The structure and how professor Reuter made all the connections. They were great and he was very knowledgeable about the subjects he was teaching. He had a lot of examples of successful landscape design and planning that were sensitive to the environment.
- The correlations between the class material and the FYI stuff really helps to bring everything together.
- Information was very useful and helpful.
- Very little
- Using photos of work that was done in relation to the course material was helpful.
- The professor talking to us directly, preparing us for our careers with personal advice. It's nice when the professor gets down to our level and gives us the "reality" of the world around us, which most of us are aware of. I learned a lot in this class, more than I expected.

15. What are your suggestions, if any, for changes that would improve this course?

- Get rid of it
- Possibly have a little more interaction
- There needs to be something other than quizzes and tests which amount towards the student grade. I studied a good amount for the quizzes and tests and it really didn't pay off for me. I am not the best test taker and it is unfair to limit class grades to that. There needs to be attendance, participation, small papers, group presentations on specific topics,...etc. Something else needs to be implemented to bring balance to this system because it is unfair and not necessarily a measure of grasping a concept. Just because I memorized the exact definition of what an ecological landscape is or because I memorized the ecological models, that doesn't necessarily mean I truly understand what them.
- N/A
- Spice up class a little more. It gets really monotonous when the professor just reads off the slides every day. Give homework or class assignments or something too because grading solely
on the quizzes is not fair.

Grading on quizzes should be more flexible, making it difficult to pass quizzes discourages students from excelling in the course.

Quizzes in a different format or open book... we cover a lot of info between classes and the detail required on quizzes is a lot to study for.

I often felt very cheated in the grading of the TAs. They often did not show up to their office hours. The quiz answer keys were often very similar to my own answers and I rarely received partial credit for them.

N/A

Continue to relate the subject matter to Landscape Architecture. I think that as design students, this is an aspect of the industry that we tend to overlook until we get into the work environment, and we tend to see it as a “necessary evil”. So this class really helps that.

An extra credit question in quizzes/exams. Multiple choice segment perhaps.

Have someone with a real background in science fact check slides etc.

16. Given all that you learned as a result of this course, what do you consider to be most important?

- It was all garbage
- Storm water management solutions and strategies
- Understanding the natural processes and how we as planners/designers must take them into consideration and at the same time, designing a system for humans that will hopefully have less of an impact.
- N/A
- The importance of understanding and filing all development documents
- There is so much. its hard to pick one thing.
- That designing sites to fit in with the natural landscape really is not as difficult as it seems, it only seems to be because the conventional design methods are much quicker and straightforward.
- Realizing that landscapes don't have to be simply constructed and that they can actually be IN harmony in the environment without the need of harmful chemicals or strategies that cause degradation of natural landscapes.
- Everything was important.
- A good background of natural processes in the built and natural environment.
- Hydrology information.
- The most important aspect was the preparation for what I want to do as a career, again, explaining the reality of the conflict between the environment and humans.

17. Do you have any additional comments or clarifications to make regarding your response(s) to any particular survey item?

- Terrible
- I said that the grading was unfair because to grade the TA’s used an answer key that the
professor wrote up to try to make grading fair. If your short answer (which was half of the quiz/test) wasn't exactly what he wrote down on the answer sheet, almost all points were taken off. Question interpretation, and different views of answers should be taken into consideration when grading writing portion of exams.

N/A

Grading was extremely unfair. He only graded on the quizzes and some people like myself understand the material but the quizzes are so particular it is hard to get a good grade on whether you understand the material or not. Plus the TA's were the ones who graded the quizzes and they were not equal in the grading so every other quiz (because they alternated quizzes) I got a really poor grade but on the other quizzes I got a really good grade. The professor should be the one to grade things because the quizzes because there was no consistency. If the TA's are the ones who continue to grade there needs to be more opportunities for the students to bring up their grades and to prove that they know the material they are just poor test takers. The class was not fair at all and I've very disappointed with it because this is not my first class with the professor and I had the same problem last time. I'm just thankful I figured out quickly that I dislike the TA system and am transferring to a school that does not have TAs and the professors are more worried about teaching and are not as full themselves as this professor is. He bragged way too much about his projects and his other job and seems to only care about proving to us how much he knows about the career rather than teaching us to make sure we are learning as much as possible.

Dayton Rules!!

No

N/A

None. A good class overall.

The science and lecture material and comments by the professor were questionable at times.

The testing style leaves no room for students to understand the material in the way that they do best. There is no flexibility in the grading; answers have to be exactly as the instructor would state them. I believe that this type of testing does not allow for the students to grow as individual scholars; it is great for memorization.

18. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that go beyond issues addressed on this survey?

Bad bad bad

Thank You, your knowledge in the field was a great teaching instrument!

N/A

No

N/A. Professor Reuter knows what he's talking about and I wish all other professors were similar in that they incorporated a sense of humor in all the information he prepared and conveyed.

None. Good Job.
### LSA 611 Natural Processes

Scoring is based on the following point system: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Neutral; 4-Agree; 5-Strongly Agree. A higher score (closer to 5) indicates greater agreement with the statement. A lower score indicates greater disagreement. Questions 11, 12, 13 are only used for courses that include studios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course and subject matter were well organized.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor communicated effectively.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor seemed knowledgeable about the subject matter.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor conveyed a positive attitude toward students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tests, assignments, and projects were fair.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grading was fair.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.667, Std=1.247, Var=1.556)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructional approach(es) used was (were) appropriate to the course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.667, Std=0.471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor motivated me to do my best work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4, Std=0.816, Var=0.667)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I gave my best effort in this course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.33, Std=.0471, Var=0.222)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. What was the most effective part of this course?

- The professor was very enthusiastic and provided engaging visual presentations for learning opportunities.
- Having the course material ready for downloading and printing on blackboard.

15. What are your suggestions, if any, for changes that would improve this course?

- Highly unlikely, but offer the course in two sections, allowing smaller classes. This would allow for discussions and increased student participation.
- No suggestions, it was an interesting class.

16. Given all that you learned as a result of this course, what do you consider to be most important?

- It was great to learn about the history of US policy regarding environmental decisions, as well as the inconsistencies in knowledge regarding our nation's natural resources.
- Not having a undergrad background in biology and the other topics covered in the class I found that the material excellent for learning how to design a space and all the things one needs to think about when designing.

17. Do you have any additional comments or clarifications to make regarding your response(s) to any particular survey item?

- It seemed as though one TA graded more strictly than the other (although it should be understood that both sought very specific responses).
- Dayton is a good teacher, he knows his material and he conveys it to his students in a well organized manner.
LSA 326 Design Studio I

Introduction

Design Studio was taught in the fall of 2010 in Room 316, Marshall Hall on Monday, Wednesday and Fridays from 1:50pm to 4:55pm. This room is set up in a standard studio fashion, a random array of old style and new style desks with a small group meeting area. The course was team taught by Cheryl Doble, Dan Reeder and Margaret Bryant, who was also the lead instructor. There was also one teaching assistant, Rebecca Kanfer, a second year graduate student. There were 43 undergraduate students, 19 sophomores and 24 juniors. Below is the description of the course as listed in the college catalog:

LSA 326 Landscape Architectural Design Studio I (5)
Seven hours of studio and one hour of lecture per week. This course will instruct those enrolled in the processes of measuring various physical qualities of a site or landscape, and then how to apply knowledge of ecology, natural processes, and human behavior and culture to assess the viability of potential design uses and forms. The material addressed will include land measurement and measurement systems, physiography and landform, soils, hydrology, climate, and plant, animal and human ecology. A variety of manual and computer techniques for data collection, analysis and synthesis of natural and cultural systems information will be explored. The course will concentrate on the comparison of synthesis techniques and their use in land use and site design decision-making. Occasional local field trips will be utilized.

Prerequisites: LSA 182, LSA 226, LSA 227 and LSA 311 (or their equivalent) with grades of "C" or better, or permission of instructor.

Syllabus

The syllabus can be found in Appendix I, is four pages long and has clearly stated learning outcomes. There are eight stated objectives as listed below:

At the end of the course you should be able to:

1. Outline a process by which complex landscape design problems, including those on large sites, can be systematically investigated
2. Work successfully within a team structure to plan and carry out the inventory and analysis phases of a project
3. Understand the range of information (natural, social, cultural) that might be needed in a landscape inventory, as well as how to determine what information is essential and where it might be found.

4. Derive meaning from a landscape inventory (i.e., analyze data), represent the analysis with clear graphics, and make specific use of the analysis in subsequent design phases.

5. Ground landscape designs in a site's genus loci (This requires getting to know a site and its context in a very detailed way.)

6. Develop thoughtful site programs based on understanding of users, needs and site opportunities and constraints.

7. Explore multiple conceptual master plan designs (i.e., create design alternatives) and evaluate them according to project goals and objectives.

8. Effectively communicate design intent to others (faculty, fellow students, and clients) through

These eight objectives were incorporated into the last 10 questions of the Student Self Assessment Survey. Forty of the 43 students that completed the course also completed the Student Self Assessment Survey, roughly 93%. Of these 40 the vast majority of students agreed that they had gained some knowledge or understanding of the stated objectives, while less than 3% disagreed.

The DLA Overall Assessment Plan states the following outcomes should be met or partially met though LSA326:

1. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.

2. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.

3. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and adapt to a variety of political, legal, and regulatory contexts for design.

4. BLA graduates should be able to consider and draw upon the precedents and typologies developed over the course of the history of art and design.

5. BLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place, or region, and identify important design forms, patterns, and organizing structures.

6. BLA graduates should be able to observe, record, and visualize the form and character of 3-dimensional spaces.

7. BLA graduates should be able to select, apply, and communicate an appropriate and defensible design process to address and solve a wide range of design and planning problems.
8. BLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and stormwater management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.

10. BLA graduates should be able to effectively communicate design ideas using appropriate methods and techniques (to clients, the public, and contractors), from concept development through construction documentation.

11. BLA graduates should be both aware of, and comfortable adhering to the ethical standards of the profession of landscape architecture.

12. BLA graduates, upon entering into professional work, should value the interests of the communities in which they practice, and society as a whole, as well as their individual clients.

13. BLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their professional work.

Although the Overall Assessment Plan listed outcomes were not visibly stated as outcomes on the syllabus, it appears by reviewing the course projects evaluation criteria and other course materials many of these topics were introduced and/or covered in some way. The syllabus also contained other items such as the attendance policies and explanation of performance expectations and of the course format. There were three items listed as those to be evaluated, projects at 80%, journals at 10% and participation at 10%, but there were no details on a specific grading criteria and no further evidence of evaluation for journaling.

Five students out of the 40 students who completed the Student Self Assessment Survey thought that the syllabus was not relevant, with an additional 21 (53%) feeling neutral about its content. Further, only eight students (20%) thought the course objectives were always clear.

**Course Materials, Delivery & Assessment**

Course materials were delivered in a few manners: Blackboard, through the LA FTP site, via email and in class or onsite handouts. Not all materials that were available via FTP were available on Blackboard. Many electronic documents/materials given to students were enormous in size and may have been difficult to download. For example, there was one map over 35 megabytes and almost all PowerPoints were 10 megs and above. Many materials/instructions or project adjustments were sent via email and on
short notice, hence materials were not always available in a timely manner and usually delivered in one format only. Course materials seemed to be relevant and current to the presented topic. Examples of course materials can be found on the enclosed DVD.

Course assessment was done through project evaluation. The syllabus mentions there would be three projects but there seems to be work for only two. Examples of completed project work were asked for several times but none were received. Student final projects were eventually downloaded from the FTP site and included on the enclosed DVD. Also downloaded from the FTP site were some evaluation forms, a scoring rubric for project one, an information statement sheet about project 2 (Montezuma Project) that contained criteria for evaluation but no rubric, and lastly there was a document entitled Final Studio Grading Rubric 2010. The last document was also not a rubric but an outline of generic project evaluation criteria (can be seen on the DVD under LSA326/evaluation). Having no graded material/work, it can’t be determined how any of this information applies, was used or fits together.

Here too students were asked to self identify what they felt best described their own way of learning by selecting from one of the three learning styles: kinesthetic, auditory and visual. Out of the 40 who completed the Student Self Assessment Survey, 45% identified themselves as visual learners, 55% as kinesthetic learners, with no auditory learners.

Analysis of Grades

An analysis of final grades was performed by comparing the course grade with the student’s semester grade point average and their overall grade point average. Outcome of the grading analysis can be seen on the tables found on the next page. Reviewing them by class, the sophomores scored higher than both their semester grade point averages and their overall grade point averages, while the juniors scored under on both. By gender the males scored lower than both their grade point averages while the females scored higher then their overall all grade point averages but lower than their semester grade point average, but these numbers were not significant. Course grades were within tolerance, there was only a .01 difference between the average grade for all students in the course versus the overall average GPA of all students who completed the course.

Student responses were spread across the board with a slight skew to the positive when asked on the Student Self Assessment Survey whether they thought the method for grading was reasonable: 12% strongly disagreed, 15% disagreed, 28% were neutral, 35% agreed and 10% strongly agreed. The results on the ESF Course Assessment Survey about grading was even more positive with >1% strongly disagreed, >10% disagreed, 26% were neutral, 48% agreed and 15% strongly agreed. The surveys
contained only one or two comments on grading, which would seem accurate based on the notion that both surveys posted positive response numbers and that almost all students received grades in their average range.

Final Grad Analysis for 326

Grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>By Sex (n=15)</th>
<th>By Sex (n=28)</th>
<th>By Class (n=19)</th>
<th>By Class (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=28)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Mean | Sem GPA | Cum GPA
--- | --- | ---
All | 2.81 | 2.89 | 2.82
Females | 3.03 | 3.06 | 2.95
Males | 2.69 | 2.80 | 2.75
Sophomores | 2.65 | 2.60 | 2.56
Juniors | 2.93 | 3.13 | 3.03

Notes about the Surveys

The results of the Student Self Assessment Survey can be seen on pages 27 to 30. Forty out of 43 students, about 93% completed this survey and some students missed or skipped a few random questions. Of all answers 62% were positive, 24% were neutral, and 14% were negative. Separating out the 10 questions specifically linked to learning outcomes as stated on the syllabus, the scores are as follows: 78% were positive, 20% were neutral, and 2% were negative. These numbers seem in contradiction to Questions 3 & 5 which received very negative responses. Question 3 addressed course organization and Question 5 asked if the course was well structured to meet the learning outcomes.

The results of the ESF Course Assessment Survey can be seen on pages 31 to 34. Of all answers 63% were positive, 27% were neutral, and 10% were negative. Also note answers to the open-ended questions on both surveys were copied word for word as students had written them. Hence, there are typos, grammar errors, abbreviations etc.
Observation and Recommendations

Access to student final products was gained by retrieval off the FTP site, this was the same for finding evaluation criteria. Without knowing the grades of any of the student projects it wasn't possible to compare scores to the stated evaluation criteria. Hence, it's difficult to make any kind of analysis or recommendations. The one thing that popped out is the negative responses to questions 3 & 5 on the Student Self Assessment Survey. This revealed some areas of weaknesses in the course delivery. This issue was not a total surprise, course instructors acknowledge that the course was evolving and that they were trying to implement new strategies. This resulted in the instructor's inability in getting materials to students quickly and keeping to the written schedule.

According to the syllabus the schedule for project one was to be passed out in class and then further updates would be available. Updated schedules were not found and it appears from student comments that due dates seem to change regularly. For example: Course was so disorganized, which got me confused at times of what is due and Due dates of projects are unclear because of all the changing and have meant different times while using the same wording between projects. This can easily be resolved by including a complete schedule within the syllabus, if for some reason the schedule should change, a new revised syllabus can be produced to keep everyone informed and up to date with changes.

There are two other recommendations for improving delivery. This first is when using Blackboard and the FTP site, materials should be posted to both equally, hence less confusing for students. Next, materials should be reduced to the smallest usable size, while also making them available in a universal file format such as pdf and jpg. This last recommendation works twofold, students with Macs will have equal access and final products will be more manageable when students start off with smaller size base materials.

To finish, it would have been advantageous to be able to compare completed project scores against stated evaluation criteria/instruments. Also the use of a similar system to grade student work is best practice, note there was a specific rubric for project one, but one did not seems available for project 2? Reviewing evaluation criteria and recording where students are performing strongly or weakly helps identify which of the course outcomes are or are not being successfully communicated. Moreover this type of evaluation can illustrate where adjustments and improvements in all aspect of design, development and evaluation of a course can be made.
# LSA326 Design Studio 1

**Student Self Assessment Survey**

Scoring is based on the following point system: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Neutral; 4-Agree; 5-Strongly Agree. A higher score (closer to 5) indicates greater agreement with the statement. A lower score indicates greater disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Learning Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I found the syllabus to be relevant and useful in facilitating my learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.225, Std=0.768, Var=0.589)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I thought the course objectives were always clear.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=2.500, Std=1.038, Var=1.077)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I thought the course was well organized.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=2.350, Std=1.051, Var=1.105)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I participated actively in the course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.256, Std=0.637, Var=0.406)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I thought the course was well structures to meet the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=2.925, Std=1.023, Var=1.046)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I understood all the lecture material.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.475, Std=0.905, Var=0.820)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I thought the overall environment in the class was conducive to learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.600, Std=1.081, Var=1.169)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I thought the recommended readings were relevant and appropriate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.513, Std=0.970, Var=0.941)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This course stimulated my interest and thoughts on the subject area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.775, Std=0.891, Var=0.794)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I thought the pace of the course was appropriate.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.225, Std=0.947, Var=0.897)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I thought the use of BlackBoard was helpful in my learning and participating in course activities/assignments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.675, Std=1.071, Var=1.148)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I thought the method for grading was reasonable.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.150, Std=1.189, Var=1.413)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I thought all activities reinforced my learning of the content material.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.400, Std=0.982, Var=0.964)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I understood all requirements of an assignment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=2.846, Std=1.065, Var=1.134)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel I have made progress in this course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.051, Std=0.736, Var=0.541)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Specific Learning Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can use techniques for systematic exploration of site qualities, user needs, and site programming.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.051, Std=0.647, Var=0.418)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I can interact with a client/stakeholder to understand their vision, values, and concerns.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.051, Std=0.605, Var=0.366)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can outline a process by which complex landscape design problems can be systematically investigated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.744, Std=0.637, Var=0.406)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I can work successfully within a team structure to plan and carry out the inventory and analysis phases of a project.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.075, Std=0.997, Var=0.994)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I understand the range of information that might be needed in a landscape inventory, as well as how to determine what information is essential and where it might be found.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.975, Std=0.660, Var=0.435)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I can derive meaning from a landscape inventory, represent the analysis with clear graphics, and make specific use of analysis.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.825, Std=0.636, Var=0.404)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I can ground landscape designs in a site genus loci.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.270, Std=0.769, Var=0.592)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I can develop a site program based on understanding a user’s needs and site opportunities and constraints.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=4.000, Std=0.506, Var=0.256)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I can view and then evaluate multiple conceptual master plan designs and evaluate them according to project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.872, Std=0.615, Var=0.378)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can effectively communicate design intent to others through various graphic representation techniques and oral presentations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Statistics, M=3.975, Std=0.660, Var=0.435)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course was so disorganized, which got me confused at times of what is due and what isn't. Throwing curveballs at us is not a good idea and that's exactly what was done. This was the most unorganized course I have ever taken in my 3 years at college. Bios grading, disorganized structure which does not follow original instructions. The most disorganized studio I’ve ever been in. Constant mind changing. I don’t know what question 22 means. We need more crit time it seems like I was always waiting to get feedback so that I could move forward with my work. Also grades came slow it is important to have grade of 1st project before 2nd is finished so I can learn from my mistakes. This class was very stressful place due to the lack of clarity in what was expected done. When things are due should be more clear! Also what is needed/required should be clear. Lectures are helpful but explanations of what a generative idea is should be better made. I feel that the goals and objective should be made more clear and that new assignments shouldn’t be able to given outside of class via email. Suggestions or recommendations perhaps... Overall clarity and unity of communication could be better and more thought out before being told to us. I very much enjoy the studio program. It is always challenging and pushing you to improve and do your best. There was no structure to the studio which is problematic since there is clearly a lot of important information that just couldn’t be conveyed properly. I felt junior year studio had a lot to offer but failed in communication effectively. This needs to be seriously considered for future studios. I’m tired. Clarifying emails were sometimes clarifying, sometimes frustrating, if a new assignment was introduced, offend via email. Also Montezuma project: I usually love assignments but 2B of class on one project ready and ruined my inspiration. Program needs structure. Due dates of projects are unclear because of all the changing and have meant different times while using the same wording between projects. A lot of time was spent on small pieces of the project with some uncertainty when much more time to develop the design and presentation to its fullest while focusing on the function of the design (Goals/Objectives) would have been greatly appreciated. I would get excited about this class if more site ecology/human use patterns and how design is generated to be most beneficial to the clients was taught – this would be great. The course at times seemed unorganized between section leaders as to what was expected in terms of assignments’. This led to confusion/difficulties in meeting deadlines as to whom to fulfill their requests.
Sometimes constraints were not fully organized, sometimes there was little work and other times work was loaded on us. Would also like to design in other settings.

I really appreciated the opportunity to present to the actual communities (Chittenango and Montezuma) I’m glad I was able to get that experience.

Time management is needed by the section leaders.

Honestly, I’m not sure what I learned. I just felt so overwhelmed and unsure about everything we were doing. I’m sure part of that is my fault, but I don’t it all was. I feel like things could’ve happened differently, more productively. You guys already know most of the issues we’ve been having. The lack of communication between section leaders and between section leaders and students. At times it was also quite unclear what was expected of us and the individual assignment we were completing. Also, it seemed like we sometimes lost sight of the bigger picture and how all the little things fit together.
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Scoring is based on the following point system: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Neutral; 4-Agree; 5-Strongly Agree. A higher score (closer to 5) indicates greater agreement with the statement. A lower score indicates greater disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The course and subject matter were well organized. (Statistics, M=2.688, Std=0.768, Var=0.59)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor communicated effectively. (Statistics, M=3.063, Std=0.658, Var=0.434)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching. (Statistics, M=4.125, Std=0.599, Var=0.359)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor seemed knowledgeable about the subject matter. (Statistics, M=4.313, Std=0.464, Var=0.215)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor conveyed a positive attitude toward students. (Statistics, M=4.188, Std=0.527, Var=0.277)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tests, assignments, and projects were fair. (Statistics, M=3.438, Std=0.704, Var=0.496)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grading was fair. (Statistics, M=3.438, Std=0.864, Var=0.746)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructional approach(es) used was (were) appropriate to the course. (Statistics, M=3.313, Std=0.768, Var=0.59)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor motivated me to do my best work. (Statistics, M=3.813, Std=0.634, Var=0.402)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I gave my best effort in this course. (Statistics, M=4.5, Std=.0707, Var=.05)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was provided with adequate orientation and guidance for proceeding with laboratory/studio activities. (Statistics, M=3.385, Std=.738, Var=.544)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The instructor(s) was helpful in assisting with problems and difficulties in the lab/studio. (Statistics, M=3.769, Std=.576, Var=.331)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Space &amp; facilities were adequate for required activities. (Statistics, M=3.615, Std=1.003, Var=1.006)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. What was the most effective part of this course?

- Getting used to working with the community directly and working as teams
- Visiting the sites, work days/lecture days
- Having the presentations so that feedback by different professors help influence design concepts.
- Opportunities to present to actual town members (ie physically GOING to Chittenango and Montezuma) is really valuable experience that I’m glad we were able to get.
- To properly inventory and analyze a project site
- The projects were very good to applying all the different aspects of landscape architecture.
- Studio is always challenging, however this past semester really pushed all of the students to do their best.
- The reviews and critiques are almost always very helpful and I can reform my ideas to come up with something better every time.
- Learning how to research and incorporate that into our designs
- This course was effective in learning the process of gathering information on a particular project and identifying certain features and learning to build a design around those aspects. Having a general idea for a design and relating it in different ways.
- We worked with larger scale plans, which was different than the other semesters of studio being much more smaller site specific

15. What are your suggestions, if any, for changes that would improve this course?

- More structured grading and professor feedback on a studio by studio basis.
- More site visits, more organization between teachers/sections
- PLEASE be more organized, everything was so jumpy from projects to projects. So confusing, the due dates, what was needed that day, etc.
- Communication between section leaders could be improved, as well as communication to the students.
- This studio was one of the most unorganized (and because of that, infinitely frustrating) courses I’ve taken at ESF. The discrepancy between the three studio professors was a HUGE contributor to this. I spent a huge amount of time trying to figure out what was going on for any given assignment/day, but no one ever really knew for sure. This lack of organization made studio incredibly frustrating and added so much unnecessary difficulty to an already difficult (comes with the territory) type major/studio.
There needs to be more communication between section leaders. There was a battle-of-alpha-leaders and resulted in constant confusion and stress. Project objectives and requirements as well as what is really wanted needs to be better outlined.

The organization between the professors needs to improve because it is very confusing when one professor says one thing and then another says something else. Also, the 5 different emails about a similar subject should be collaborated into one email so it's more organized and less confusing to us.

Junior studio is made up of 43 kids and only 3 professors. We need more professors in the studio, so that students have the chance each studio period to talk with and get help from the professors. There were many times I wouldn’t get to talk to the professor at all.

I think being more clear when trying to explain new things would be very beneficial. For example, giving us an actual example of what a "generative idea" is rather than throwing around a lot landscape architecture buzzwords that we don't fully comprehend yet, in attempts to define it would have made the second project a lot easier.

Better explain and provide some examples to better help with the understanding of what a generative idea is.

Examples need to be used by professors. If they give us a relevant example of what is expected, it makes things easier to learn from.

The course was not completely prepared from the start, there was always an updated course outline which is ok but sometimes we were either crunched for time, or there was a waste of it. I would like to have the discussion less interfere with the time we have in the studio to do work sometimes it feels like there is not enough time to actually do the work but there is to talk about it. I think there are ways to prevent this by splitting up the class by the sections and talking about the projects more that way as well as presenting in these smaller units.

While this survey says Professor Bryant at the top, there were two other section leaders: Professor Doble, and Professor Reeder. Instructors need to communicate between themselves outside of class, so they aren't wasting our class time figuring out what should happen next and/or how things should progress. Instructors should not have meetings scheduled during our three hour studio class time. They should also stay in the studio - the whole three hours- to answer questions and give guidance, even if their office is just down the hall. A system of signing up for desk critiques needs to be set up, so instructors don't continue to start with the same students each studio period. It is unacceptable that students should have to wait an hour after the allotted time in studio, in order to talk to their section leader. The project should be broken down into smaller projects, with definitive due dates, so we accomplish more within the semester.

This course seemed very unorganized and had no structure.

16. Given all that you learned as a result of this course, what do you consider to be most important?

It was all garbage
17. Do you have any additional comments or clarifications to make regarding your response(s) to any particular survey item?

- No
- Trips to Chittenango and Montezuma were really good field experiences.
- I just feel that the professors knew what they were talking about, they just didn’t show it properly and there was not consistency between sections
- I would like to work on a range of different site developments, this semester was only on undeveloped wooded areas which were very good location because we got to work with the communities. But I would like to work with other locations like more urban areas etc.
- Professor Bryant was sympathetic to the confusion and tensions occurring in the studio, and made progress to rectify the situations. Professor Reeder did not seem to participate much with in this studio - he was more like an observer. Professor Doble did send out clarifying emails and clarified during class time, which was sometimes helpful. By only having one of the professors as my section leader I feel I did not get the expertise of all of them, and as a result I may be biased as to how I felt studio this semester turned out. While there was issues this semester with this studio, new concepts were still presented.

18. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that go beyond issues addressed on this survey?

- No
- I believe more critiques could be helpful. Also it should be mixed up as to where/ who to start with for desk critiques so it is not always the same person first every studio session
- Landscape Architecture students should receive a higher print quota, or allow the CAV lab to have longer and more reasonable hours because when its open students are in classes.
Overall Recommendations and Conclusions

The Student Self Assessment Survey was administered on the very last class session of the semester in both LSA311/611 and LSA326. In LSA311/611 many students did not attend the last class and with the heavy burden of finals on their minds students may not have put much thought into their answers. In LSA326 almost all students were in attendance, but they were there to perform their final presentations, therefore again their focus may not have been on the survey. These were not the most favorable conditions or times. To increase the number of high-quality completed Student Self Assessment Surveys, it would be best administered before the last week of classes. A pre- and post- learning style inventory might also be a good tool to help aid in curriculum design and evaluation.

There was no response from LSA326 when asked to schedule the final survey and as noted earlier there really wasn’t any sense of urgency to participate or communicate about their classroom assessment activities. Faculty buy-in needs to be prioritized for outcomes assessment to be successful. Running a mandatory faculty meeting about the positive attributes of assessment and the assessment process might be useful in gaining much needed faculty support.

Lastly, the LA Overall Assessment Plan needs to be updated. Over the last three years many courses have changed names and/or course numbers and do not appear or correctly appear in the current plan. Examples include LSA306, LSA633 and LSA458/459 which do not appear anywhere in the current plan. Degree requirements and grading procedures may have also changed and are not reflected in the current document. Modifications to the Overall Assessment Plan ought to occur on an annual basis because the environment, the needs of society and the skills and credentials for the profession are constantly changing. Hence, revisions to this document should be continuous and certainly warranted. Developing a small faculty committee to review this document annually, possibly during the winter semester break or over the summer, might be a good solution.

Since this is the first evaluation preformed at the course level it can serve as a benchmark for those who come after, but note that the format set here is open to change so that it may better accommodate the needs of the program. One last observation about this document, due to its existence there was a notable increase in interest by the faculty to gain a higher level of understanding about the OAP and a desire to improve course syllabi for the spring semester to better reflect the expected outcomes as stated in the plan.
Appendix I

Syllabi
Course Syllabus

A. Instructors.

Dayton Reuter, Professor
305 Marshall Hall, 470-6545,
ddreuter@esf.edu
Office hours: T/Th, 8:30–12:00

Marin Braco, Graduate Assistant
mebraco@syr.edu

B. Class Meeting Arrangements.

Lectures: T/Th, 12:30–1:50, 145 Baker

C. Introduction

Landscapes contain a multitude of interactions between biotic and abiotic elements. Responsible utilization of land requires an understanding of these elements and the setting created by their presence and interaction. Because design and planning is fundamentally about organizing and manipulating resources to satisfy our goals, learning about the physical and biological context of a setting is central to the design and planning process. Those who practice design and planning bear primary responsibility for impacts to the environment caused by their creations. This doesn't mean you must be an expert on all environmental topics, but it does require sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge about these topics to make informed judgments and to work effectively with other disciplines when their expertise is needed.

C. Course goals and objectives

This class is concerned with the interaction between natural environmental processes and human endeavors of land development and site design. The goal is to describe the environmental processes and relate them to the influence they have on the built environment. Since these topics are complex and cover many fields of study, the subject material must be addressed in a broad and integrated manner.

The purpose of this course is to provide students with an understanding of:
1. The presence and function of natural processes in the landscape.
2. The effects of natural processes on design and planning activities.
3. The need for collaboration between environmental disciplines.
4. The role of values, ethics, and politics in the decision-making process.

Course objectives include:
1. To familiarize students with the vocabulary and concepts associated with natural physical and biological attributes of the landscape.
2. To establish cause-and-effect relationships between natural processes, landscape design and planning activities, and resulting environmental quality.
3. To encourage a sense of curiosity, enthusiasm, and environmental ethic with respect to landscape resources and the way we use them.

E. Course organization

The content of the course is addressed through lectures and readings. The topics include natural physical attributes of the environment, natural biotic attributes of the environment, and case studies of projects which exemplify sensitivity for natural processes in design and planning. The focus is not only on technical matters, but also on attitudes, ethics and cultural concerns about the environment.

Refer to the class schedule for a listing of lecture topics and the timing of quizzes and exams.

F. Grading policy

1. Five quizzes, 50 points each. The lowest quiz grade is automatically dropped, leaving a total of 200 quiz points counting toward the final grade.
2. Midterm and final exam, 100 points each, 200 points total.
3. There are no makeup quizzes (the lowest quiz grade is dropped, eliminating the effect of one grade of 0). There will also be no makeup examinations without prior individual arrangement with the professor. The individual must demonstrate unavoidable extreme personal circumstances. "I overslept" or "my car wouldn't start" are not acceptable reasons.
4. Quizzes and the midterm exam will be returned in class one week after the date the test was taken. Claiming quizzes and the midterm exam are the student's responsibility. All materials not claimed within two weeks of their return date may be discarded.
5. The final exam will not be returned. Grades will be available one week after the date the final examination is taken. Appointments will be accepted for individuals wishing to review their performance on the final exam.

With 400 points possible on all course work, grades will be assigned according to the following point categories:

1. 400 to 370 points: A
2. 369 to 360 points: A-
3. 359 to 350 points: B+
4. 349 to 330 points: B
5. 329 to 320 points: B-
6. 319 to 310 points: C+
7. 309 to 290 points: C
8. 289 to 280 points: C
9. 279 to 240 points: D
10. 239 points or less: F

**Note:** Point categories represent initial grade assessments. Final grades may be adjusted according to individual extenuating circumstances and demonstrated performance.

G. Reading materials

This course utilizes distributed class notes, as well as required readings and other optional (FYI) readings. Content listed as other is elective and therefore will not appear on quizzes or exams.

All course materials are available by electronic download from this [http://blackboard.syr.edu/](http://blackboard.syr.edu/)

Your Blackboard logon NetID is the same as the text to the left of the @syr.edu e-mail account, and your password is the same as your e-mail password. After logging on, look for the course materials under:


Each student is responsible for obtaining course materials from the online source. If you have difficulty obtaining or using these materials, please see the professor or course graduate assistant. All college and class e-mail correspondence is sent to your syr.edu e-mail address. Please remember to check this account regularly for official correspondence, and do not let e-mails build up in your inbox. Once full, all additional announcements will be blocked until you make space by deleting some mail from your inbox.

Much of the content for this course is explained and placed into context during class lectures, thus attendance is strongly encouraged for all class activities. No specific penalties are incurred by absence from class, since grades are determined by the points awarded on quizzes and examinations. However, regular attendance is advantageous to the learning experience and thus is viewed favorably for grade assessment.
LSA 326 Design Studio I Course Syllabus

Teaching Team
Margaret Bryant     Cheryl Doble     Dan Reeder     Rebecca Kanfer
mbrvant@esfedu     csdoble@svr.edu     dareeder@svr.edu     rikanfer@svr.edu

Introduction
In the sophomore year, studio classes introduced you to concepts of landscape architectural design based upon theories of form and spatial composition. You engaged the design process through diagramming, sketching, and modeling. Projects in the sophomore studio introduced design as a generative process of exploration, making, and reflection with the aim of developing an understanding of the landscape and then using this understanding to make design proposals for various purposes.

This semester you will continue to explore the ways that design ideas may affect the form and experiential qualities of the environment. You will also consider the ways that the site can inspire and inform design decisions. From initial observations and experiential understanding through a thoughtful process of inventory and analysis, you will move through the design process to develop conceptual design proposals for our study sites - places that are already important to their respective communities. Learning to see, really see, ordinary things and places that we may take for granted and looking at them from multiple perspectives is challenging. Representing your understanding graphically so that others may follow your logic and generating design ideas based on factual and experiential information is a key part of this studio.

This studio is distinguished by the following characteristics:
• Integration of exploratory design studies with traditional methods of data collection and analysis
• An increase in complexity of study sites and problems, including an increase in project scale
• Techniques for systematic exploration of site qualities, user needs, and site programming
• Interaction with a “client” or stakeholder groups to understand their vision, values, and concerns

Studio projects are designed to help you further develop skills of observation and perception as you investigate, document and examine the interrelationships of natural systems and cultural practices at our study sites. In the design process, this investigation is referred to as inventory and analysis. Through your inventory, you will ask many questions (a process of inquiry) -- for example, what patterns are evident on the site and how do different processes and/or activities contribute to these? Answers to your questions provide information (data) that can be recorded in various ways to help you and your clients understand the character and conditions of a particular site.

Following data collection or inventory is the analysis step. This involves moving from the collection, mapping, and representation of data to the discovery of patterns and behaviors on a site. You will examine the often-broad collection of inventory factors and ask how these are relevant to the proposed project. How might they influence the site program, form generation, and design decisions?
Landscape architects must also be sensitive to the values, needs and desires of their clients. We are responsible for not only listening to their initial ideas, but also expanding those ideas into a project program that ensures both a complete solution of place and an awareness of how the proposed program will highlight or disrupt the site's natural and cultural features. In the projects this semester, you will explore all of these through "real time" meetings with our clients and in studio brainstorming discussions.

Learning Outcomes
The studio has been designed to achieve the following learning outcomes. At the end of this course, you should be able to:

• Outline a process by which complex landscape design problems, including those on large sites, can be systematically investigated
• Work successfully within a team structure to plan and carry out the inventory and analysis phases of a project
• Understand the range of information (natural, social, cultural) that might be needed in a landscape inventory, as well as how to determine what information is essential and where it might be found
• Derive meaning from a landscape inventory (i.e., analyze data), represent the analysis with clear graphics, and make specific use of the analysis in subsequent design phases
• Ground landscape designs in a site's genus loci (This requires getting to know a site and its context in a very detailed way.)
• Develop thoughtful site programs based on understanding of users, needs and site opportunities and constraints
• Explore multiple conceptual master plan designs (i.e., create design alternatives) and evaluate them according to project goals and objectives
• Effectively communicate design intent to others (faculty, fellow students, and clients) through various graphic representation techniques and oral presentations

Course Format
Meeting times
The design studio is where the content of other courses in the curriculum is expressed through application in design projects. The studio will make a serious demand on your time. Studio meets from 1:50 until 4:55 every Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Wednesdays will largely be devoted to "work days", and pin-ups will be on Mondays and Fridays to the maximum extent possible, in an effort to establish a predictable rhythm in the studio. On Monday and Friday you will be expected to arrive in studio with new work to review with your section leader. Faculty will not spend time reviewing old work that has not been advanced between studio sessions. We will cover a great deal of material each studio session, and it is during this time that we can be most effective in providing you with feedback. Studio time will be devoted to only LSA 326 projects; no outside work will be permitted during studio without the consent of studio instructors.

Attendance
Your attendance for all studio periods is required. We understand there are times when illness, family circumstances, etc. may prevent your attendance; however, we expect you to contact your section instructor to let them know if you will be late or absent from studio. All unexcused absences or tardiness (without an official note from a doctor or Counseling Services, 110
Bray) will result in a 5% deduction from the final grade. Any unexcused absence from a scheduled critique will result in failure of the current project.

Studio activities
Studio time may be devoted to a variety of activities including lectures, discussions, desk critiques, interim reviews, final reviews, or field/site visits. You should come to studio with all of the materials that you will need to work productively, including your journal and any reference books or materials that you have collected. Lectures, guest presentations and seminar discussions will be held in Room 212 Marshall Hall and, unless specified otherwise, will begin at 1:50. Out of courtesy to whomever is presenting, we expect you to arrive on time. The lecture sequence is integral to the content of the course and you are responsible for keeping notes on all of the material covered in lectures. It is expected that this information will be incorporated into your project solutions.

Individual desk critiques will occur regularly and group interim reviews and final reviews are scheduled at key points during the semester. The interactive feedback process is an essential part of working towards a successful project solution; work efficiently with your studio instructor.

If you submit materials for review, whether hard copy or digital, you must put your name and the date of submission on each and every page. Also, if sending digital files you must include your name - at least your last name - in the name of the digital file.

Journal
Many landscape architects keep an ongoing journal as an important visual resource. They may record site information, design ideas, detail measurements, and thoughts about design explorations. As part of your off-campus semester you will be required to keep a professional journal. Later on in your career you will find this practice to be an invaluable way to help you remember and develop alternative design solutions in your work.

Each student is required to keep a LSA 326 studio journal. In it you are to record your studio notes, sketches of places, thoughts and questions you may have about a project, research notes and field observations. Periodically throughout the semester we will assign journal exercises followed by a review. At the end of the semester your journal will be included in the final portfolio review. It will be evaluated for its graphic and intellectual content.

Field Trips and Tours
Field trips will be required during this semester. These will be critical to the successful completion of studio projects. All students should be properly dressed and equipped for recording notes and site conditions no matter what the weather conditions.

Schedule
The schedule for Project 1 is included in the project statement that will be distributed on the first day of class. This schedule will cover the first month of the semester. Shortly after the beginning of the semester, the details of Projects 2 and 3 will be resolved, and a tentative schedule for the remaining part of the semester will be made available. All course information will posted on the course web page.

Required Readings
Readings will be placed on Blackboard throughout the semester, and they will be discussed in class after the assignment is made. We strongly encourage you to read current issues of design and planning journals (for example, Landscape Architecture, Tapas, Places and Garden Design).
Course Work Components and Grading Criteria
Grades will be based on projects, presentations, journal entries, and your contribution to the studio through active and constructive participation. Your section instructor will assign grades for individual projects; the final grade will be based on a portfolio review conducted by all studio faculty and the teaching assistant.

Studio/Projects: 80% of the semester final grade. At the beginning of each project you will receive evaluation criteria that will be used to determine a grade for that project. Projects will be evaluated by assessing the quality of the work specific to the goals and objectives of the exercise and the quality and effectiveness of its presentation and communication with respect to typical standards and conventions of the profession.

All project work is to be neatly prepared in accord with customary practices of the profession - similar sheet size, orientation, graphic composition, and to include complete annotation - project and student name, scale, north arrow and date.

Journal: 10% of the semester final grade. Journals will be reviewed periodically during the semester. Please review the discussion of journals above to be sure that you are clear about the expected content.

Participation and Attendance: 10% of the semester final grade. The studio faculty and TA will review attendance at lectures and studio, and participation in discussions and critiques. An explanation of overall studio evaluation and grading criteria will be distributed on the first day of class. More specific grading criteria for individual projects will be distributed with each new project statement.

Studio policy will be to accept projects only on or before the assigned due date, even if work must be submitted incomplete. No projects will be accepted past the due date and time without prior special arrangements made with your section instructor.

It is the policy of the Faculty of Landscape Architecture that a student must complete each studio class with a grade of C or better to continue in the studio sequence.

Portfolio Review
All students are required to store work completed over the semester and to present that work, and any evaluations you have received on that work, at the end of the semester during the studio portfolio review to be scheduled during exam week.

Endnote
This studio will be a much more valuable and hopefully enjoyable experience for you if you accept that everything pertinent to your proposed design solutions will not be found in a single book on landscape architecture or presented in a single lecture. The relevant data may be found in books from other, seemingly unrelated references, on site, or through conversations. This acceptance places the responsibility of project "ownership" on you. You must take the time to review the materials presented to you at the onset of a project and through research - reading, watching, listening - further develop the project to reflect what the site has to offer, the client's desires, the users' needs, and your syntheses. This results in wise design decisions.
Appendix II

DLA Outcomes Assessment Plan
Background and Introduction
The Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (BLA) Program at SUNY-ESF is a first professional degree; it is unique within the SUNY system, and recognized by the NY State Department of Education. As a professional program, the BLA is accredited by the American Society of Landscape Architects and the associated Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board (LAAB, similar to ABET accreditation for professional engineering programs). The specialized nature of a professional program like the BLA makes the assessment of learning outcomes relatively straightforward, yet still critical to maintaining a high quality educational program. Assessment of learning outcomes in some form has always been a central component in the professional accreditation process for the department.

In recent years, the documentation and reporting requirements have evolved to become more explicit and transparent, but the underlying need to provide accountability to the profession we serve has provided a consistent theme in the LAAB review process undertaken by the department every 5 years. In addition to the formally documented process of assessment required by accreditation, the Department of Landscape Architecture has long fostered a less formal but no less important process of assessment to periodically review and revise our courses, curriculum, and teaching methods. Central to this process is the use of end of semester critiques and portfolio reviews for all studio courses. Teachers from across the department are invited to participate (as well as practitioners from the local professional community), in a collaborative review of the work of students, providing summary critique and feedback on projects to students, as well as insights for future course and curriculum revisions or adjustments to teaching emphasis and general pedagogy.

As we approach the end of the current accreditation cycle for both LAAB and Middle States Commission on Higher Education, formal documentation of assessment activities is obviously a priority for ESF. This document is intended to help illustrate the importance of outcomes assessment as a tool within the Department of Landscape Architecture, and in particular to clearly and methodically document efforts to define and measure learning outcomes within the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture program.

Rationale
As a method of ensuring compliance with various external standards, the process of outcomes assessment is often seen as little more than distraction from the real business of teaching and learning. Assessment is valuable, however, when an academic program or faculty can realize tangible and useful results, without becoming an additional administrative burden to an already overtaxed teaching faculty. Any method developed should be conceived within the existing structure of the educational program, embedded within existing coursework if possible without adding new tasks or layers of additional bureaucratic recordkeeping. Additionally, the outcomes to be measured, whether quantitatively or qualitatively, need to be considered in a manner which will provide valuable feedback to teaching faculty and thus provide insight into improving teaching and learning.

The plan outlined below is intended to formalize and institutionalize on a more regular and ongoing basis an activity that currently has only seen structured documentation every 5 years with the preparation of the LAAB Self-Study Report for accreditation. A significant part of the preparation of the self study is the statement and clarification of programmatic mission and desired learning outcomes, and a corresponding demonstration of the program’s ability to meet the standards of the profession through the delivery of coursework and other educational experiences explicitly tied to these objectives. The primary means of demonstrating our proficiency is through the use of broadly defined...
portfolios of student work. For past accreditation reports and site visits, student work has been collected across an array of courses, each contributing individually and/or collectively to capture a “snapshot” of materials from each course assessing all of 13 learning objectives prior to graduation (see Mission Statement below for listing of learning outcomes/objectives). Outside professionals representing three major constituent groups (an academic administrator, a practicing LA professional, and a professional LA educator) act as the independent evaluators of the program. The mission and objectives used to define and articulate the learning outcomes for this process are outlined in the following section.

Mission and Objectives of the BLA Program
The mission of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Program is “to provide an educational setting and curriculum which cultivates in our students the knowledge, skills and values of the profession of landscape architecture, with the unique signature of ESF’s Department of Landscape Architecture.” This specific mission is derived from that of the College, which encompasses education, research and public service. The mission is focused on the sensitive design of our environment, considering a wide array of human uses and cultural expressions, an understanding of fundamental ecological systems, structure and functions, and the range of landscape settings from urban to wilderness. The curriculum of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Program is structured to foster an understanding of the ethics, standards and body of knowledge embraced by the profession of landscape architecture. The program provides students the opportunity to develop a broad background of substantive knowledge and theory, a working understanding of the creative nature of the design process and problem solving, and proficiency with the practical skills and craft required in the profession. Site design and site planning is used as the primary vehicle for developing and applying knowledge and theory, exploring the design process, and developing the range of skills required by the profession of landscape architecture. The objectives of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Program, specific to achieving the mission, have three main areas of concern: knowledge, skills, and values.

1. Knowledge

Students are encouraged to value scholarship and learning as continuous processes which are integral with professional and personal growth. Knowledge to be acquired is focused in four major substantive areas, including:

- Social and Cultural: liberal and fine arts, and social and behavioral sciences
- Biophysical: physical, biological, and earth sciences
- Context and Place: design history and theory; built form, organization, and pattern
- Landscape Architectural Technology: design communication & visualization, site engineering & structural design, design materials, sustainable systems, and construction processes

This knowledge is intended to provide students with a broad and firm foundation on which to build future specialization.

2. Skills

The skills essential to the professional education of students of landscape architecture are those which will allow them to be responsible for design projects at a variety of scales from inception to implementation. Fundamental to this is competence in decision-making, derived from effective use of holistic design and planning processes; soundly based on theory, and leading to effective choices of methods, technologies, and materials. At all stages, the importance of the development of an array of graphic, oral, and written communication skills is emphasized.

3. Values

The values which will guide each student's future work and education are implicit in the content and progression of the program, and are presented by examples, problems, and discussion. A primary objective is the development of an historical perspective concerning the designed environment and the philosophical, practical and theoretical issues related to landscape architecture. Students learn to value the landscape as both a physical and environmental asset, as well as a visual and cultural expression of time and place. A final major concern is the goal of ethical service to society through design and planning in the landscape, particularly with respect to the sustainable stewardship of landscapes and the environment.
Specific outcome oriented objectives for the expression of particular knowledge, skills, or values include the following:

1. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.

2. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.

3. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and adapt to a variety of political, legal, and regulatory contexts for design.

4. BLA graduates should be able to consider and draw upon the precedents and typologies developed over the course of the history of art and design.

5. BLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place, or region, and identify important design forms, patterns, and organizing structures.

6. BLA graduates should be able to observe, record, and visualize the form and character of 3-dimensional spaces.

7. BLA graduates should be able to select, apply, and communicate an appropriate and defensible design process to address and solve a wide range of design and planning problems.

8. BLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and stormwater management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.

9. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and select appropriate materials and structural systems to implement design ideas.

10. BLA graduates should be able to effectively communicate design ideas using appropriate methods and techniques (to clients, the public, and contractors), from concept development through construction documentation.

11. BLA graduates should be both aware of, and comfortable adhering to the ethical standards of the profession of landscape architecture.

12. BLA graduates, upon entering into professional work, should value the interests of the communities in which they practice, and society as a whole, as well as their individual clients.

13. BLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their professional work.

Methods of Assessment Like the outcomes assessment components included in the LAAB accreditation process, the following methods will rely substantially on the utilization of portfolios or other selected examples of student work to assess student learning outcomes. Two distinct methods will be utilized in this process, each incorporating a strategy of embedding an assessment tool within an appropriate required course (or courses) in the curriculum.

Method One:

Over the past 5 years, all BLA students have been required to prepare a portfolio of student work during their final semester in the program as a component of LSA 455 – Professional Practice (a required course for BLA students). This year, we intend to formalize the use of this requirement as an embedded outcomes assessment tool for use in both our Middle States and LAAB accreditations. The project brief for the portfolio assignment is attached as Appendix D.
**Data Collection and Assessment Analysis:** Each student will submit a digital copy of their portfolio for permanent documentation on file with the Department of Landscape Architecture; these files will be maintained on an active basis for a minimum of 5 years, and in archival form indefinitely. On an annual basis, the DLA Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will convene to review a random sampling of portfolios and perform an internal learning outcomes assessment, reviewing the selected portfolios utilizing criteria addressing each of the learning outcomes noted above. Each learning outcome will be assessed using a 4 level evaluation rubric (Appendix B) establishing thresholds for the following levels:

- **Level One:** Exceeding Standards
- **Level Two:** Meeting Standards
- **Level Three:** Approaching Standards
- **Level Four:** Not Meeting Standards

The rubric will define the criteria and illustrative indicators necessary to assess levels of competency or student achievement for each learning outcome. To enable a more manageable assessment process, all 13 of the outcome objectives will not be addressed each year; a selected subset of 3-5 objectives will be reviewed each year, with the complete range of objectives covered in its entirety over not more than a three year span. Every 5 years, all 13 objectives will be assessed by external evaluators as a part of the LAAB accreditation process.

**Method Two:**

Since 1972, the BLA Program has included a major, semester long synthetic experience occurring during the 1st semester of the 5th year: the Off-Campus Program (LSA 460). The Off-Campus Program (OCP) provides a unique learning opportunity for each BLA student as they apply the skills, knowledge, and values acquired during 4 years of traditional lecture and studio based instruction in a unique, independent, and self-described design thesis project. Students travel to various locations within the United States and abroad, and each conducts an independent research project focusing on a specific topic uniquely suited to the place they have chosen. In addition to a major “design thesis” project, each student is required to keep a journal/sketchbook to record their reflections on design, place, and culture; a study notebook or daily log to record field observations and to document their decision making process throughout the undertaking of their thesis project; and weekly correspondence with their advising professor summarizing their progress with each course component (a course outline is attached as Appendix C). The nature of the OCP, as a holistic and synthetic “capstone” experience suggests that the physical products resulting from each student’s work will express many, if not all of the learning outcomes described above.

**Data Collection & Assessment Analysis:**

Each student submits final documentation of their OCP work for review by their faculty advisor. The design thesis project and other components are each graded (using a traditional A-F nominal grading system) as a part of the student’s performance evaluation for LSA 460. While grades themselves imply a form of outcomes assessment, the BLA Committee will conduct further assessment analysis using the associated grades by applying a 4 level assessment rubric similar to that used for method one and thus placing them into context with the same outcome standards established previously.

In the future, it is intended that the BLA committee will develop further methods of outcomes assessment that examine the curriculum on a course by course basis, particularly the studio sequence, in an attempt to identify specific weaknesses in teaching or leaning and then more precisely target or develop corrective measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
<th>Where Addressed in Program:</th>
<th>How Assessed: Goals &amp; Methods</th>
<th>Data Collection Plan</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Response to Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 312, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.</td>
<td>EFB 101, EFB 320, GOL 105, LSA 220, LSA 311, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 433, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and adapt to a variety of political, legal, and regulatory contexts for design.</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 326, LSA 423, LSA 451, LSA 455, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BLA graduates should be able to consider and draw upon the precedents and typologies developed over the course of the history of art and design.</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 205, LSA 206, LSA 226, LSA 312, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 405, LSA 422, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. BLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place, or region, and identify important design forms, patterns, and organizing structures.</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 205, LSA 206, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 311, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 405, LSA 451, LSA 422, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective</td>
<td>Where Addressed in Program:</td>
<td>How Assessed: Goals &amp; Methods</td>
<td>Data Collection Plan</td>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>Response to Assessment Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BLA graduates should be able to observe, record, and visualize the form and character of 3-dimensional spaces.</td>
<td>LSA 182, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 300, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 433, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BLA graduates should be able to select, apply, and communicate an appropriate and defensible design process to address and solve a wide range of design and planning problems</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 300, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. BLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and stormwater management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.</td>
<td>LSA 227, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 333, LSA 342, LSA 343, LSA 422, LSA 433, LSA 423, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and select appropriate materials and structural systems to implement design ideas.</td>
<td>LSA 343, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective</td>
<td>Where Addressed in Program</td>
<td>How Assessed: Goals &amp; Methods</td>
<td>Data Collection Plan</td>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>Response to Assessment Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. BLA graduates should be able to effectively communicate design ideas using appropriate methods and techniques (to clients, the public, and contractors), from concept development through construction documentation.</td>
<td>CLL 190, CLL 205, CLL 290, CLL 410, LSA 182, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 300, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 410, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 433, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. BLA graduates should be both aware of, and comfortable adhering to the ethical standards of the profession of landscape architecture.</td>
<td>LSA 220, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 433, LSA 451, LSA 455, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BLA graduates, upon entering into professional work, should value the interests of the communities in which they practice, and society as a whole, as well as their individual clients.</td>
<td>EST 200, LSA 220, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 312, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 451, LSA 455, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. BLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their professional work.</td>
<td>EFB 101, EFB 320, GOL 105, LSA 220, LSA 311, LSA 226, LSA 227, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>Capstone Project (Off-Campus Program), Cumulative Professional Portfolio</td>
<td>Data to be collected annually at the completion of the fall semester of the 5th year for OCP projects, and at the completion of the spring semester of the 5th year for the professional portfolio</td>
<td>Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes, with specific identifications of shortcomings and recommendations for improvement</td>
<td>Faculty will examine and propose corrective measures as necessary to appropriate program components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sample Assessment Rubric for Learning Outcome #1: Social, Behavioral, and Cultural Factors in Design

SUNY-ESF Department of Landscape Architecture Learning Outcomes Assessment
Undergraduate Knowledge, Skill, or Value area Outcome #1: Social, Behavioral, and Cultural Factors in Design

Learning Outcome(s):
BLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.

Assessment Method(s):
Student learning will be assessed using a cumulative portfolio of student work consisting of design and planning projects developed over the course of the program, and compiled as a requirement of LSA 455 – Professional Practice. An internal self-assessment by a collection of DLA faculty will be conducted annually using the objective specific rubric defined under “assessment criteria.” An independent external assessment performed by teams from ASLA-LAAB will be conducted in 5 year cycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives:</th>
<th>Course(s):</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria Rubric, including Illustrative Indicators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate understanding and knowledge of human social and cultural behaviors through the development of site scale landscape architectural designs</td>
<td>LSA 212, LSA 326, LSA 327, LSA 422, LSA 423, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>1. Exceeding Standards: Projects convey clear understanding of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community, including facility with complex multicultural or international settings. Projects reflect a strong command of concepts of human scale, defensible space, ergonomics, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as ADA). Projects illustrate exceptional facility with methods of user analysis and space programming, including evaluative techniques such as post occupancy evaluation and participatory methods for analysis and design. 2. Meeting Standards: Projects convey clear understanding of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects reflect a working knowledge of concepts of human scale, defensible space, ergonomics, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as ADA). Projects illustrate facility with methods of user analysis and space programming. 3. Approaching Standards: Projects convey recognition of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects reflect some knowledge of concepts of human scale, defensible space, ergonomics, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as ADA). Projects illustrate familiarity with methods of user analysis and space programming. 4. Not Meeting Standards: Projects convey only basic rudiments of various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects minimally incorporate concepts of human scale, defensible space, ergonomics, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as ADA). Projects do not illustrate a use of various methods of user analysis and space programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate understanding and knowledge of applicable human social and cultural behaviors through the development of community and/or regional scale plans and public policies</td>
<td>LSA 212, LSA 326, LSA 422, LSA 451, LSA 460, LSA 470</td>
<td>1. Exceeding Standards: Projects convey clear understanding of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community, including facility with complex multicultural or international settings. Projects reflect a strong command of concepts of imagability, placemaking, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as traditional or form based zoning). Projects illustrate exceptional facility with methods of demographic and associated geospatial analysis, and/or participatory methods for analysis and planning. 2. Meeting Standards: Projects convey clear understanding of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects reflect a working knowledge of concepts of imagability, placemaking, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as traditional or form based zoning). Projects illustrate facility with methods of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demographic and associated geospatial analysis.

3. Approaching Standards: Projects convey recognition of the various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects reflect some knowledge of concepts of imagability, placemaking, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as traditional or form based zoning). Projects illustrate familiarity with methods of demographic and associated geospatial analysis.

4. Not Meeting Standards: Projects convey only basic rudiments of various social, behavioral, and cultural characteristics of a particular place, population, or community. Projects minimally incorporate concepts of imagability, placemaking, and the range of associated legal codes and standards (such as traditional or form based zoning). Projects do not illustrate a use of various methods of demographic and associated geospatial analysis.

Appendix C: Off-Campus Program Description Off-Campus Program

The Off-Campus Program has been a requirement of the undergraduate program since 1970. It is based upon the premise that a more insightful and mature graduate can be developed through exposure to and observation and study of physical and cultural environments other than one's own immediate and familiar environment. Expanded understanding, objectivity, and compassion toward human capabilities with regard to the potentials and limitations of the physical and socio-cultural environments and design form are central to the program.

The Off-Campus Program provides the opportunity for direct contact with different cultures, life styles, value systems, and physical environments which sharpen the individual student's awareness of the environment and culture in which the student will practice. The experience of each student allows the individual to engage environmental challenges with a heightened sense of perspective and a depth of historical awareness. Thus, there is a greater realization of the unique need for designed environments to be a product of the people, place, time, and value system concerned. The general purpose of the Off-Campus Program is to optimize and enhance the learning of professional knowledge and skills. The actual environment and community is the location of the learning experience and, thus, is a complement to the formal environments of the classroom. The potentials of the specific location are engaged by the student through an individual study which is pertinent to professional, educational and personal goals. Thus, the program more fully accommodates the individual's ideas, intentions, capabilities, and interests. Additionally, the personal capacities of self-confidence and motivation, inventiveness, and resourcefulness of the student are enhanced.

The program is a four-semester sequence which begins with LSA 424 - Preparation for Off-Campus in the fall of the 4th year, during which study locations are identified, student groups formed, and faculty advisors assigned. In the spring of the 4th year, LSA 425- Orientation for Off-Campus Experiential Studio, each student, under the direction of their faculty advisor (usually 4-7 students per advisor), develops a study proposal that thoroughly documents, in written and graphic form, all aspects of the proposed study, including academic intention, study methodology and procedures, documentation, location research, physical arrangements, and scheduling. The program culminates in the 5th year, with LSA 460 - Off-Campus Design Thesis Studio, and LSA 461 – Off-Campus final Presentation Seminar.

There are three basic study types available to the students during the off-campus semester:

1. Self-Described Study. In the self-described study, the student identifies a study subject and location, and designs the complete study research method. This type of study has the following characteristics: 1) independence of activity; 2) wide choice of study subject; 3) wide choice of study locations; and 4) research/study experience.

2. Directed Work Study. In the directed work study, the student selects from a group of prearranged possibilities that have been described in terms of both location and general "work" responsibilities. This type of study has the following characteristics: 1) program and responsibilities planned; 2) greater possibilities for professional contacts; and 3) a "working" experience. The directed work study allows the student to work under supervised
conditions in providing analysis and design services to communities, large or small, that otherwise might not be able to obtain such services.

3. **Faculty-Described Study.** In the faculty-described study, the student has the option to join a team working with a faculty advisor on a research project of particular interest to the faculty member. This type of study has the following characteristics: a) topical area generally defined, but flexible, according to student interests, b) research methodology described by faculty advisor, c) balance of theory and practical concerns, and d) possible publication of results.

The required three-semester sequence of the Off-Campus Program is unique and distinctive among undergraduate programs throughout the United States. It offers to the students a wealth of opportunities not normally available to students in landscape architecture.
MLA Outcomes Assessment Plan

Master of Landscape Architecture Program
Department of Landscape Architecture
SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry

The Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) Program at SUNY-ESF is a first professional degree and is open to students who have a bachelor’s degree in any discipline. It is unique within the SUNY system, and recognized by the NY State Department of Education. As a professional program, the MLA is accredited by the American Society of Landscape Architects and the associated Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board (similar to ABET accreditation for professional engineering programs). The specialized nature of a professional program like the MLA makes the assessment of learning outcomes relatively straightforward, yet still critical to maintaining a high quality educational program. Assessment of learning outcomes in some form has always been a central component in the professional accreditation process for the department. In recent years, the documentation and reporting requirements have evolved to become more explicit and transparent, but the underlying need to provide accountability to the profession we serve has provided a consistent theme in the LAAB review process undertaken by the department every 5 years.

Rationale

As a method of ensuring compliance with various external standards, the process of outcomes assessment rarely seems as more than a mildly disagreeable distraction from the real business of teaching and learning. Such an assessment, as a task in and of itself, is only valuable to an academic program or faculty if it can provide tangible and useful results. Several considerations must be incorporated into the assessment process to assure that whatever results provides value, without becoming an additional administrative burden on an already taxed teaching faculty. First, any method developed should be conceived within the existing structure of the educational program, embedded within existing coursework if possible without adding new tasks or layers of additional bureaucratic recordkeeping. Second, the outcomes to be measured, whether quantitatively or qualitatively, need to be considered in a manner which will provide valuable feedback to teaching faculty and thus provide insight into improving teaching and learning.

The plan outlined below is intended to formalize and institutionalize on a more regular and ongoing basis an activity that currently has only seen structured documentation every 5 years with the preparation of the LAAB Self-Study Report for accreditation. A significant part of the preparation of the self study is the statement and clarification of programmatic mission and desired learning outcomes, and a corresponding demonstration of the program’s ability to meet the standards of the profession through the delivery of coursework and other educational experiences explicitly tied to these objectives. The primary means of demonstrating our proficiency is through the use of broadly defined portfolios of student work. For past accreditation reports and site visits, student work has been collected across an array of courses, each contributing individually and/or collectively to capture a “snapshot” of materials from each course assessing all of 15 learning outcomes prior to graduation. Outside professionals representing three major constituent groups (an academic administrator, a practicing LA professional, and a professional LA educator) act as the independent evaluators of the program. The mission and objectives used to define and articulate the learning outcomes for this process are outlined in the following section.

Mission and Objectives of the MLA Program

The mission of the Master of Landscape Architecture Program is “to provide an educational setting and curriculum which cultivates in our students the knowledge, skills and values of the profession of landscape architecture, with the unique signature of ESF’s Department of Landscape Architecture.” This specific mission is derived from that of the College, which encompasses education, research and public service. The mission is focused on the sensitive
design and planning of our environment, considering a wide array of human uses and cultural expressions, an understanding of fundamental ecological systems, structure and functions, and the range of landscape settings from urban to wilderness. The curriculum of the Master of Landscape Architecture Program is structured to foster an understanding of the ethics, standards and body of knowledge embraced by the profession of landscape architecture. The program provides students the opportunity to develop a broad background of substantive knowledge and theory, a working understanding of the creative nature of the design process and problem solving, proficiency with the practical skills and craft required in the profession and an understanding of research methods as they relate to professional design and planning applications. Site design, site planning, community design and planning and landscape and urban ecology are used as the primary vehicles for developing and applying knowledge and theory, exploring the design process, and developing the range of skills required by the profession of landscape architecture.

The objectives of the Master of Landscape Architecture Program, specific to achieving the mission, have three main areas of concern: knowledge, skills, and values.

1. Knowledge
Students are encouraged to value scholarship and learning as continuous processes which are integral with professional and personal growth. Most important is the core body of knowledge associated with the profession of landscape architecture. This includes: design; graphic communication and visualization; plants and ecology; site engineering and construction documentation; design history; design theory; behavioral factors; urbanism; research methods; project proposal development and professional practice. In addition, the Master of Landscape Architecture Program offers students an opportunity to use elective courses and the Capstone process (research methods, the Capstone proposal and the Capstone Studio) to engage Areas of Study that are within the profession but beyond the core subjects that the Department must teach to meet accreditation standards. The Areas of study are Community Design & Planning, Cultural Landscape Preservation and Studies and Landscape & Urban Ecology.

2. Skills
The skills essential to the professional education of students of landscape architecture are those which will allow them to be responsible for design projects at a variety of scales from inception to implementation. Fundamental to this is competence in decision-making through the effective use of holistic design and planning processes (based on theory, research, analysis and creativity) that lead to the enhancement, protection or transformation of community and place in ways that are environmentally, socially, economically and aesthetically sound. At all stages, the importance of the development of an array of graphic, oral, and written communication skills is emphasized.

3. Values
The values which will guide each student's future work and education are implicit in the content and progression of the program, and are presented by examples, problems, and discussion. A primary objective is the development of an historical perspective concerning the designed environment, the philosophical, practical and theoretical issues related to landscape architecture, the compelling trends and imperatives of our time, and the on-going research that advances the state of the art. Students learn to value the landscape as both a physical and environmental asset, as well as a visual and cultural expression of time, community and place. A final major concern is the goal of ethical service to society through design and planning in the landscape, particularly with respect to the sustainable stewardship of landscapes, communities and the environment.

Specific outcome oriented objectives for the expression of particular knowledge, skills, or values include the following:

1. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.

2. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology and physiography into design and planning of the land.

3. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and adapt to a variety of political, legal, and regulatory contexts for design.

4. MLA graduates should be able to consider and draw upon the precedents and typologies developed over the course of the history of art and design.
5. MLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place, or region, and identify important design forms, patterns, and organizing structures.

6. MLA graduates should be able to observe, record, and visualize the form and character of 3-dimensional spaces.

7. MLA graduates should be able to define the nature of a design or planning challenge and to develop coherent proposals for addressing them.

8. MLA graduates should be able to discover, assess and use relevant research from related and unrelated fields to inform strategies and tactics in design and planning and be able to conduct research to help advance the state of the art of landscape architecture.

9. MLA graduates should be able to select, apply, and communicate an appropriate and defensible design process to address and solve a wide range of design and planning problems.

10. MLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and stormwater management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.

11. MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and select appropriate materials and structural systems to implement design ideas.

12. MLA graduates should be able to effectively communicate design ideas using appropriate methods and techniques (to clients, the public, and contractors), from concept development through construction documentation.

13. MLA graduates should be both aware of, and comfortable adhering to the ethical standards of the profession of landscape architecture.

14. MLA graduates, upon entering into professional work, should value the interests of the communities in which they practice, and society as a whole, as well as their individual clients.

15. MLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their professional work.

METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

Like the outcomes assessment components included in the LAAB accreditation process, the following methods will rely substantially on the evaluation of projects and examinations associated with each class and studio and the utilization of portfolios, Capstone Studio Projects and other selected examples of student work to assess student learning outcomes. Four distinct methods will be utilized in this process, each incorporating a strategy of embedding an assessment tool within an appropriate required course (or courses) in the curriculum.

**Method One: Evaluation of Grade Point Averages in the Curriculum**
MLA students must have a 3.00 grade point average (GPA) to be awarded a degree. Students wishing to receive a teaching assistantship or a graduate assistantship must have a GPA of 3.20. Beginning this year, after each semester the Graduate Curriculum Committee will review and discuss all students who fail to achieve a 3.00 to determine which learning outcomes are not being met, why they are not being met and what corrective actions (programmatic, pedagogical or behavioral) are necessary on the part of faculty or students.

**Method Two: Review of Cumulative Professional Portfolios**
Over the past 5 years, all MLA students have been required to prepare a portfolio of student work during their final semester in the program as a component of LSA 655 – Professional Practice. This year, we intend to formalize the use of this requirement as an embedded outcomes assessment tool for use in both our Middle States and LAAB accreditations. Each student will submit a digital copy of their portfolio for permanent documentation on file with the Department of Landscape Architecture; these files will be maintained on an active basis for a minimum of 5 years, and in archival form indefinitely. On an annual basis, the Department of Landscape Architecture Graduate Curriculum Committee will convene to review a
random sampling of portfolios and perform internal learning outcomes assessment, reviewing the selected portfolios utilizing criteria addressing each of the learning outcomes noted above. Each learning outcome will be assessed using a 4 level evaluation rubric.

- Level One: Exceeding Standards
- Level Two: Meeting Standards
- Level Three: Approaching Standards
- Level Four: Not Meeting Standards

The rubric will define the criteria and illustrative indicators necessary to assess levels of competency or student achievement for each learning outcome. To enable a more manageable assessment process, all 15 of the outcome objectives will not be addressed each year; a selected subset of 3-5 objectives will be reviewed each year, with the complete range of objectives covered in its entirety over not more than a three year span. Every 5 years, all 15 objectives will be assessed by external evaluators as a part of the LAAB accreditation process.

**Method Three: Design Studio Presentations** Because the design studio is the primary vehicle for learning and applying the knowledge, skills and values of landscape architecture, much of the on-going process of outcomes assessment is possible through the oral and graphic presentation of student work. The presentation before a design jury, the studio class and invited guests allows the student to clearly communicate the manner and the extent to which they have applied what they have learned in their courses and it allows faculty to clearly see where improvements need to be made in the curriculum. This makes outcomes assessment an on-going and integral aspect of the MLA Program.

**Method Four: Evaluation of the Capstone Studio Project** Since 1995, the MLA Program has used the Capstone sequence as a unique opportunity for students to apply the knowledge, skills and values acquired during the three years of study. The Capstone sequence includes LSA 640 Research Methods, LSA 799 Capstone Proposal and LSA 800 Capstone Studio. The sequence allows the student to: learn research methods relevant to the arts of design and planning; identify a design or planning challenge; prepare a proposal as to how that challenge might be addressed; defend that proposal; use knowledge, skills and values acquired in the program to prepare design and/or planning recommendations to meet the identified challenge; defend those recommendations, and; prepare a document that includes each of the above steps and suggests opportunities for further explorations by future students.

In the Capstone sequence each MLA student is guided by a major professor and at least one (and sometimes more) additional faculty member or professional who constitute the students committee. The makeup of the committee is based on the Area of Study chosen by the student. The committee works with the student to select a thematic studio, one related to the chosen Area of Study, in the fourth semester of the program and relevant electives. In addition the committee helps the student to identify a Capstone topic, project location and (often) a project client. Students take LSA 640 Research Methods in the Fourth semester of the program. In that class they learn how to identify researchable topics, what research topics might be relevant to landscape architecture, various ways to conduct research, how to distinguish between good and poor research and how to use research to address design and planning challenges. They take LSA 799 Capstone Proposal in the fifth semester. The student develops the proposal with the aid of their committee and must defend it twice through illustrated oral presentations to faculty and other graduate students. The weekly meetings with the committee and the two presentations allow the student to marshal the professional knowledge and skills necessary to identify a design or planning challenge and to create a viable proposal for meeting that challenge. In the sixth and final semester students take LSA 800 Capstone Studio Project. This is an individual design or planning project carried out by the student with guidance from his or her committee. This is where the student most comprehensively marshals the knowledge, skills and values acquired in the program. Each student presents the Capstone Studio project three times in the final semester. The first two presentations are to show the work in progress and to receive instructive critique. The final presentation, called the Capstone Seminar, is to present the project’s final recommendations.

The GPA review, the portfolio reviews, the design studio presentations and the reviews of the Capstone Studio projects will continue to be major assessment tools for the Master of Landscape Architecture Program.
THE MASTER OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE ASSESSMENT PLAN

OVERVIEW

LEARNING OBJECTIVE ONE: MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of social, cultural, and behavioral factors into design and planning of the land.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 650 Behavioral Factors of Community Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process; LSA 605 History of Landscape Architecture; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 632 Planting Design.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program, through presentations and critiques in the design studios, through portfolio reviews in LSA 655 Professional Practice and through reviews of the LSA 800 Capstone Studio at the end of the sixth and final semester.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE TWO: MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and incorporate a broad range of natural factors and processes, including climate, ecology, geology, soils, hydrology, and physiography into design and planning of the land.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 611 Natural Factors in Design & Planning; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examination; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through cumulative professional portfolio reviews and evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE THREE: MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and adapt to a variety of political, legal and regulatory contexts for design and planning.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 652 Community Development Process; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation; LSA 655 Professional Practice.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.
DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through review of cumulative professional portfolio reviews and evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE FOUR: MLA graduates should be able to consider and draw upon the precedents and typologies developed over the course of the history of art and design.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 552 Graphic Communication; LSA 605 History of Landscape Architecture; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through review of cumulative professional portfolios and evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE FIVE: MLA graduates should be able to consider and assess the design context of a particular site, place or region and identify important design forms, patterns and organizing structures.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 611 Natural Factors in Design & Planning; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 605 History of Landscape Architecture; LSA 652 Community Development Process.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluation of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through reviews of cumulative professional portfolios and through evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE SIX: MLA graduates should be able to observe, record, and visualize the form and character of three-dimensional spaces.
WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 552 Graphic Communication; LSA 500 Digital Graphics; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 605 History of Landscape Architecture; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE SEVEN: MLA graduates should be able to define the nature of design and planning challenges and to develop coherent proposals for addressing them.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 640 Research Methods; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 652 Community Development Process; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 799 Capstone Proposal; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation Studio; LSA 632 Planting Design.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of Capstone proposals, cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and evaluations of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE EIGHT: MLA graduates should be able to discover, assess and use relevant research from both related and unrelated fields to inform design and planning strategies and tactics and be able to conduct research to advance the state of the art of landscape architecture.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 605 History of Landscape Architecture; LSA 652 Community Development Process; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 640 Research Methods; LSA 799 Capstone Proposal.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Final examinations; design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of Capstone proposals, cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through term papers, final examinations, oral presentations and through presentations and critiques in the design studios; at the end of the
program through evaluations of Capstone proposals, Capstone Studio projects and cumulative professional portfolios.

**ASSESSMENT RESULTS**: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

**RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS**: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE NINE**: MLA graduates should be able to select, apply and communicate an appropriate and defensible design process to address and solve a wide range of design and planning problems.

**WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM**: LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 799 Capstone proposal; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation Studio; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process; LSA 640 Research Methods.

**HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS**: design studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of course projects; evaluations of Capstone proposals and Capstone projects.

**DATA COLLECTION PLAN**: Data to be collected throughout the program through evaluations of course projects, studio presentations and critiques; at the end of the program through evaluations of Capstone proposals and Capstone Studio projects.

**ASSESSMENT RESULTS**: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

**RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT**: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE TEN**: MLA graduates should be able to incorporate significant technical considerations necessary for the implementation of site designs, including site grading, drainage and storm water management, erosion control, soils design, design of pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, parking design, incorporation of ADA/universal design requirements, incorporation of sustainable systems, and design of ecologically suitable/sustainable plantings.

**WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM**: LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 611 Natural Factors in Design & Planning; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studio; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process.

**HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS**: Final examinations; studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of course projects and Capstone projects.

**DATA COLLECTION PLAN**: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations, evaluations of course projects, studio presentations and critiques; at the end of the program through evaluations of Capstone projects.

**ASSESSMENT RESULTS**: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

**RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT**: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVE ELEVEN**: MLA graduates should be able to consider, assess, and select appropriate materials and structural systems to implement design ideas.
WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 611 Planting Design; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation Studio; LSA 600 Introductory Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 621 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio.

HOW ASSESSED – GOAL & METHODS: Final examinations; studio presentations and critiques; evaluations of course projects and Capstone projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through final examinations, evaluation of course projects and presentations and critiques in design studios; at the end of the program through evaluations of Capstone studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE TWELVE: MLA Graduates should be able to effectively communicate design ideas using appropriate methods and techniques (to clients, the public, and contractors), from concept development through construction documentation.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 552 Graphic Communication; LSA 500 Digital Graphics; LSA 645 Construction Documentation Studio; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Course-related projects; presentations and critiques in the design studios; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and of Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through course-related exercises and projects; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE THIRTEEN: MLA graduates should be both aware of, and comfortable with, adhering to the ethical standards of the profession of landscape architecture.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 697 Topics and Issues of Landscape Architecture; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 655 Professional Practice; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Course-related projects; presentations and critiques in the design studios; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and of the Capstone Studio project.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through course-related projects and final examinations; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.
LEARNING OBJECTIVE FOURTEEN: MLA graduates, upon entering into professional work, should value the interests of the communities in which the practice, and society as a whole, as well as their individual clients.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 697 Topics and Issues in Landscape Architecture; LSA 601 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Sites Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Sited Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio, LSA 655 Professional Practice; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design, LSA 652 Community Development Process.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Course-related projects and examinations; presentations and critiques in the design studios; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and of Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through course-related projects and examinations; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: Assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.

LEARNING OBJECTIVE FIFTEEN: MLA graduates should feel a professional obligation to act as stewards of the land itself (considering all of its ecological and biophysical complexity) in the course of their work.

WHERE ADDRESSED IN THE PROGRAM: LSA 697 Topics and Issues in Landscape Architecture; LSA 611 Natural Factors in Design & Planning; LSA 600 Introductory Design Studio; LSA 601 Site Design Studio; LSA 620 Advanced Site Design Studio; LSA 670 Thematic Design Studios; LSA 800 Capstone Studio; LSA 632 Planting Design; LSA 615 Site Construction; LSA 645 Construction Documentation; LSA 655 Professional Practice; LSA 650 Behavioral Factors in Community Design; LSA 652 Community Development Process.

HOW ASSESSED – GOALS & METHODS: Course-related projects and examinations; presentations and critiques in design studios; evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and of Capstone Studio projects.

DATA COLLECTION PLAN: Data to be collected throughout the program through course-related projects and examinations and projects; at the end of the program through evaluations of cumulative professional portfolios and of Capstone Studio projects.

ASSESSMENT RESULTS: assessment will result in qualitative evaluations of student learning outcomes to identify strengths and shortcomings.

RESPONSE TO ASSESSMENT: Faculty will implement appropriate programmatic and pedagogical adjustments.