

# **Master of Science in Construction Management Assessment Plan 2017-2018**

Design, Construction and Planning  
R. Ries  
rries@ufl.edu

*Office of the Provost*

*University of Florida*

*Institutional  
Assessment*

*Continuous Quality  
Enhancement*

## Table of Contents

Academic Assessment Plan for Master of Science .....	3
in Construction Management .....	3
A. Mission .....	3
B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures.....	4
C. Research.....	5
D. Assessment Timeline.....	5
E. Assessment Cycle .....	5
F. Measurement Tools .....	5
G. Assessment Oversight.....	8

# Academic Assessment Plan for Master of Science in Construction Management

Design, Construction and Planning

## A. Mission

The mission of the M. E. Rinker, Sr. School of Construction Management is to be the center of excellence for construction. The Rinker School will pursue this by:

1. Promoting professional and ethical behavior in education and practice,
2. Advancing the industry by creating new knowledge through research and scholarly activities,
3. Educating individuals in principles, knowledge and skills required to be successful in their professional careers, and
4. Providing service and transferring knowledge to the citizens of Florida, the construction industry, professional societies, the nation, and the world.

The Rinker School will achieve this mission by fostering a core culture of value and quality.

This mission directly supports aspects of all 11 goals of the College of Design, Construction, and Planning's strategic plan of 2017 (in process) and wholly supports the Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service mission of the University of Florida.

Aligning with the mission of the M.E. Rinker, Sr. School of Construction Management, this program promotes professional and ethical behavior in education and practice and educates individuals in principles, knowledge and skills required to be successful in their professional careers. This mission is achieved by fostering a culture of value and quality. It directly supports the College of Design, Construction and Planning's strategic plan of 2017 (in process) with respect to adding capabilities for Distance Education offerings, which in turn supports the teaching mission of the University of Florida.

## B. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures

SLO Type	SLO	Assessment Method	Delivery Mode
Knowledge	Identify a contemporary problem in the construction management discipline	Thesis Defense: 100% of students earn an average rating of 3 or higher, and 80% of students will earn an average rating of 4 or higher, from their committee members as recorded on the Thesis Defense Assessment Rubric	Campus
Knowledge	Create a literature review on a selected topic that encapsulates the latest research on the topic	Thesis Defense: 100% of students earn an average Rating of 3 or higher, and 80% of students will earn an average rating of 4 or higher, from their committee members as recorded on the Thesis Defense Assessment Rubric	Campus
Skills	Devise and apply research methods to solve problems and generate new knowledge	Thesis Defense: 100% of students earn an average Rating of 3 or higher, and 80% of students will earn an average rating of 4 or higher, from their committee members as recorded on the Thesis Defense Assessment Rubric	Campus
Skills	Demonstrate effective oral and written communication	Thesis Defense: 100% of students earn an average Rating of 3 or higher, and 80% of students will earn an average rating of 4 or higher, from their committee members as recorded on the Thesis Defense Assessment Rubric	Campus
Professional Behavior	Demonstrate appropriate conduct in professional settings.	Thesis Defense: 100% of students earn an average Rating of 3 or higher, and 80% of students will earn an average rating of 4 or higher, from their committee members as recorded on the Thesis Defense Assessment Rubric	Campus

### C. Research

Each Master of Science in Construction Management student is then required to propose, write, defend and submit a thesis under the direction of a committee consisting of faculty members as directed by the Graduate School. The thesis process, including the content of the document and meeting all due dates and milestones, must meet all requirements of the School, the College and the Graduate School.

### D. Assessment Timeline

Analysis and Interpretation: May  
 Program Modifications: Completed by August  
 Dissemination: Completed by August

### E. Assessment Cycle

SLOs	Year	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23
<b>Content Knowledge</b>							
#1		X	X	X	X	X	X
#2		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Skills</b>							
#3		X	X	X	X	X	X
#4		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Professional Behavior</b>							
#5		X	X	X	X	X	X

An “X” means the SLO has been reviewed.

### F. Measurement Tools

#### Rinker School Student Learning Outcome Thesis Rubric

Rate each evaluation criteria with a score between 1 and 3. Note: There are multiple descriptions found in most boxes in the matrix. All descriptions of the student’s work within any box (Below, Meets, Exceeds) do not have to be true for the student to earn the score that corresponds to that box. The reviewer should choose the box that best characterizes the student’s performance during the thesis process. Each committee member shall complete a separate form. *This form is to be used exclusively for the School’s self-assessment, and is not part of the student’s permanent record. This paper document shall be destroyed as soon as the data thereon can be transmitted to an electronic file.*

Student number: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator number: \_\_\_\_\_

1 – Below Expectations                      2 – Meets Expectations                      3 – Exceeds Expectations

<b>SLO</b>	<b>Below Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Problem definition</b>	Unable to define the research area coherently.	Demonstrates a knowledge of the research area and the general topic that exceeds that of others within the universal field of Construction Management.	Demonstrates a profound knowledge of the research area.	
<b>Literature Review and knowledge of precedent</b>	Unable to demonstrate coherent knowledge of research previously conducted on the topic of the research and related topics;  Similarly unable to demonstrate coherent knowledge of how previous research applies to the research the student conducted in preparation for this thesis.	Demonstrates a coherent knowledge of previous research performed on the relevant research topic and related topics;  Able to articulate a knowledge of how this previous research applies to the research conducted in preparation for this thesis.	Demonstrates a profound knowledge of research previously conducted on the topic of the thesis research and related subject matter;  Demonstrates profound knowledge of how previous research applies to the research conducted in preparation for this thesis;  Skillfully builds on previous research.	
<b>Research skills and methods</b>	The research process was different from what was proposed and the student offered no reasonable explanation for why this was so;  Unable to demonstrate that the research methods or methodology employed were adequate to answer the research problem;  Research process not systematic	The research process was sufficiently close to what was proposed, or any changes in the process were sufficiently explained;  Research methods or methodology employed were adequate to answer the research problem;  Research process was systematic enough to be replicated by a skilled researcher with a	The research process was as proposed, or the student completely and succinctly explained any deviation;  Research methods or methodology employed were exemplary and thoroughly answered the research problem in a comprehensive manner;  Research process was systematic enough to be replicated by a competent researcher	

	enough to be replicated by future researchers with any degree of certainty.	reasonable degree of certainty.	with a high degree of certainty.	
<b>Written Thesis</b>	<p>Writing contains errors in spelling, grammar, English and syntax;</p> <p>Research process not explained in a manner sufficient to ensure that a future researcher could follow the student's procedure with realistic hopes of achieving repeatable results;</p> <p>Organization of the thesis does not lend itself to the readers' understanding of the research process;</p> <p>Style of writing insufficiently formal for an archival document such as a thesis.</p>	<p>Spelling, English, grammar and syntax correct;</p> <p>Research process explained in a manner sufficient that a skilled future researcher could follow the student's procedure with realistic hopes of achieving repeatable results;</p> <p>Organization of the thesis lends itself to the readers' understanding of the research process.</p> <p>Style of writing sufficiently formal for an archival document.</p>	<p>Writing and organization are exemplary in every respect;</p> <p>Research process explained in a manner sufficient that any competent future researcher could follow the student's procedure with a high probability of achieving repeatable results.</p>	
<b>Overall professionalism during thesis process</b>	<p>Has failed to meet deadlines during the thesis process;</p> <p>Dressed in a manner not suitable for a professional presentation;</p> <p>Became flustered or defensive when questioned by the committee, at times not showing proper respect and deference to committee members;</p>	<p>Met all deadlines during the thesis process;</p> <p>Dress acceptable for the presentation, but not impressive;</p> <p>Maintained composure fairly well under questioning, but seemed disconcerted at times;</p> <p>Was mostly proper in the use of technical terms and lexicon</p>	<p>Met all deadlines during the thesis process; dress was impeccable for presentation;</p> <p>Completely composed during the presentation and answered questions with confidence and in a dignified manner;</p> <p>Was always proper in the use of technical terms and lexicon during the presentation;</p>	

	Used technical terms and lexicon improperly during the presentation; instances of plagiarism or improper documentation of the writings of others detected in the thesis.	during the presentation; Any instances of plagiarism or improper documentation of the writings of others detected in the thesis were minor, an obvious oversight and quickly and easily corrected.	There were no instances of plagiarism or improper documentation of the writings of others detected in the thesis.	
--	--	---	---	--

**G. Assessment Oversight**

Name	Department Affiliation	Email Address	Phone Number
E. Minchin	Graduate Advisor	minch@ufl.edu	352-273-1153
R. Ries	Director	rries@ufl.edu	352-273-1150
A. Chini	Interim Associate Dean	chini@ufl.edu	352-294-1407