STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT, 2018-2019

PROGRAM: Interior Design (M.A.)
SUBMITTED BY: Doug Seidler
DATE: 9/2019

Executive Summary: Description of Assessment Process

List **all** of the program's learning outcomes, as of the assessment year's catalog: *(regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)*

CIDA Standard	Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year *(Y=Yes)*	Year of Next Planned Assessment
s4 Global Context	Interior design students have a global view and consider social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in all aspects of their work.	2017-18 (PR)		2022-23
s5 Collaboration	Interior design students participate in interdisciplinary collaborations.	2017-18 (PR)		2022-23
s6 Business Practices and Professionalism	Interior Design students understand the fundamental principles and processes that define the profession of interior design and the value of interior design to society.	2017-18 (PR)		2023-24
s7 Human-Centered Design	Interior design students apply knowledge of human experience and behavior to designing the built environment.	2017-18 (PR)		2023-24
s8 Design Process	**Interior design students employ all aspects of the design process to creatively solve a design problem.**	**2017-18 (PR)**	**Y 2018-19**	
s9 Communication	**Interior design students are effective communicators.**	**2017-18 (PR)**	**Y 2018-19**	
s10 History	Interior design students apply knowledge of history and theory of interiors, architecture, decorative arts, and art when solving design problems.	2017-18 (PR)		2019-20
s11 Design Elements and Principles	Interior design students apply elements and principles of design.	2017-18 (PR)		2019-20
s12 Light and Color	Interior design students apply color effectively in communication and design work.	2017-18 (PR)		2019-20
s13 Products and Materials	Interior design students complete design solutions that integrate furnishings, products, materials, and finishes.	2017-18 (PR)		2020-21
s14 Environmental Systems and Comfort	Interior design students use the principles of lighting, acoustics, thermal comfort, and indoor air quality in relation to environmental impact and human wellbeing.	2017-18 (PR)		2020-21
s15 Construction	Interior design students understand interior construction and its interrelationship with base building construction and systems.	2017-18 (PR)		2021-22
s16 Regulations and Guidelines	Interior design students apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that impact human experience of interior spaces.	2017-18 (PR)		2021-22

Provide a <u>brief</u> description of the assessment process used including how results are shared and discussed and strengths, challenges, and planned improvements to the <u>process</u>, providing evidence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment. If there is something that is impeding your ability to implement improvements, please comment on those issues *(generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points)***:**

<u>Course Assessment</u>
Thesis II (ID-699) is a 3rd year design studio where students design individual projects based on evidence collected and analyzed in Thesis I (ID-698). Student projects are self-identified, researched, and developed under faculty supervision. Project practice areas often include healthcare, education, hospitality, and retail.
  • Interior design faculty assessed the thesis project completed by each enrolled student. Data is aggregated across all sections to access student learning outcomes defined by the Interior Design program.
  • Thesis committee members also assessed the projects during the final thesis defense using the department's thesis defense rubric.

Thesis II (ID-606) is a 2nd year design studio where students design individual and group projects. The project practice area focuses on workplace design.
  • Interior design faculty assessed the projects completed by each enrolled student. Data is aggregated across all sections to access student learning outcomes defined by the Interior Design program.

<u>Student Exit Survey</u>
Students that completed ID-699 during the assessment year were provided an exit survey where they were asked to self-report their competence in all four SLAs.
  • 11 of 18 students completed this survey.

Assessment strengths include sampling of student work across multiple courses in the curriculum. Because department learning outcomes should be evident in all upper level design studios, the assessment process has the potential to indicate student achievement across the program.

Assessment challenges include:
  • CIDA standards include multiple substandard that are specific competencies under the umbrella standard. While faculty looked specifically at sub-standards when evaluating SLAs, the exit survey only assesses the umbrella standard.

Closing the Loop: Progress on Planned Improvements from Prior Year

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update *(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)*
Students will be able to articulate a global view and integrate considerations of social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in their work.	Since Spring 2016, thesis has shifted to a studio format class, so student work has begun to integrate strong evidence of the articulation of a global view and integrate considerations of social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in their work Stronger documentation of this SLO will be required for thesis projects and in the 1st practice studio ID-605. Curricular changes will be implemented to improve student understanding for unique construction techniques not typical to the US. This additional learning objective will enhance students' integration of global social, economic, and ecological contexts in their design thinking. Curricular changes will be introduced to improve and strengthen this SLO in ID605 and in ID699.	Curricular changes (highlighted left) were not implemented in Spring 2017 to address these weaknesses in preparation for our CIDA Accreditation visit in Fall 2017. Based on this accreditation visit, the external CIDA visiting team identified the following: S4 Global Context – The program was in compliance with this standard with one noted area to be addressed. S4.a. Students are aware that building technology, materials, and construction vary according to geographic location. **Inadequate Evidence.** *The ID Department is currently re-evaluating the entire program curriculum based on the 2017-18 program review and is considering increased instruction for this SLA in additional courses within the curriculum. We anticipated a 2020-21 curricular revision that addresses this issue.*
Students will be able to apply knowledge of human experience and behavior to designing the built environment.	The department will revise curriculum following receipt of the CIDA report in April 2018. (The CIDA visiting team conducted a fall 2017 review of the MA program for re-accreditation. The alumni survey will be changed to strengthen the tool in providing more clarity in understanding varied levels of competencies and to balance the scale of evaluation. The survey assessment scale will be revised to a 5-point evaluation. The scale will be changed to "1" as failure to meet the learning outcome, "2" as below average, "3" as a neutral position to clarify adequate or average performance in learning, "4" as above average or good achievement, and "5" as high attainment or excellence in achieving the learning outcome. This new scale will improve the assessment process and provide more detail information to assist in planning	**Completed and assessed as compliant in the FA17 CIDA Visit/SP18 Program Review.** Based on the Fall 2017 accreditation visit, the external CIDA visiting team identified the following: S7 Human Centered Design – The program was in full compliance with this standard. S7.c Methods for gathering human-centered evidence is a **Program Strength**

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update *(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)*
	for strengthening the curriculum or in planning curricular revisions.	
Students will be able to communicate effectively in both oral and written formats.	Future strengthening for thesis will include revision to the curriculum to require more thorough development of lighting in student evidenced based design projects. The curricular revision will be part of a comprehensive assessment of the MA curriculum upon receipt of the CIDA visiting team report in April 2018. Curricular changes will improve the integration of accreditation standards across the curriculum. 2 courses will be identified for assessment of revised curriculum.	**Completed and assessed as compliant in the FA17 CIDA Visit/SP18 Program Review.** Based on the Fall 2017 accreditation visit, the external CIDA visiting team identified the following: S9 Communication – The program was in full compliance with this standard. *The ID Department is currently re-evaluating the entire program curriculum based on the 2017-18 program review. Beginning in Spring 2018, the department streamlined instruction within two existing courses to improve competencies in visual communication.*

GOAL	STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE GOAL	ACTION TAKEN	PROGRESS
Interior designers have a global view and consider social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in all aspects of their work.	Revise curriculum in academic year 2018-2020 to enhance students' awareness of varied building technology, materials, and construction vary according to geographic location.	The department evaluated this standard as part of the curriculum session at the Summer 2019 department retreat.	**In Progress** The department is actively reviewing this standard with an anticipated 2020-21 curricular revision.
Assure that students maintain correct sequencing of required coursework throughout the 6 semesters of the ID MA program	Action to improve this situation will be to put holds on the graduate students' registration accounts. Advisors will lift holds after advising students and before the students can register.	The department is enforcing existing pre-requisites. The registrar has not added advising hold for graduate students. Graduate advisors are degree planning the entire degree with each graduate student.	**Completed** Students are currently in sequence for their degree. This goal appears to be completed.

GOAL	STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE GOAL	ACTION TAKEN	PROGRESS
Strengthening is needed in developing students' abilities to take risks in creatively solving problems; and there is a weakness in students' transfer of knowledge and skills from one semester to the next. These two important aspects of learning are important hallmarks for creativity and integration of learning. Creating new ideas and implementing new technologies takes courage and developing ways of learning in curriculum and classroom activities to strengthen these two attributes will improve the student learning outcomes.	Revise curriculum in academic year 2018-2020 to enhance risk taking and creative problem solving.	Creative-risk-taking was implemented beginning Fall 2019 in the graduate foundation studios. The department is exploring alternate methods to support transfer of knowledge across courses/semesters. This should be implemented by 2020.	**In Progress** The department is actively reviewing this standard with an anticipated 2020-21 curricular revision.
Improvement in the alumni assessment tool will also help to clarify ranges of learning	Work with faculty to increase career counseling with students.	No action taken.	**Future: AY 2020-21** Beginning in AY 2020-21, the department will have a third full-time faculty member available to advise graduate students. This will decrease advisee loads and improve opportunities to discuss career paths and goals.
Increase quantity of full-time faculty teaching evening and late-afternoon courses.	Hire seventh FT faculty line (currently approved for a search)	The department currently has 6 full-time TT faculty and 2 Continuing Instructor lines.	**In Progress** Full-time faculty are teaching evening and late afternoon courses in the graduate program.

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:
This is a response to our last assessment (2016-17). Response to the Dean's letter from the 2018 Program Review is attached as a separate document.

Comment IV Assessment Measures and Targets: *For outcomes 2 and 3: What is "minimal mastery"? Is "adequate mastery" an oxymoron? That language might be a bit confusing. Your scale is also a bit unbalanced.*

Response: We have relabeled categories to read "Weak, Inadequate, Adequate, and Strong"

Comment V Analysis of Results and Implications: *Data analysis could be more clear. What was the overall result as well as the results by student category? What else did you learn about students' achievement of the specific skills? What did they do well, where do they need strengthening?*

Response: We have attempted to provide clearer analysis in this report.

Learning Outcome 8 (CIDA Standard 8 Design Process which includes 8.a.,8.e.,8.g.)

Outcome Measures *Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.*	Performance Standard *Define the acceptable level of student performance.*	Data Collection *Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?*	Result *Did you meet your target? What was the result?*
Outcomes in **ID-699 Thesis II** were measured by Interior Design faculty and Industry Experts (serving on the Thesis Committee). Standard rubrics provide direct measures with categorical data.	**80%** of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome.	In ID-699, this outcome is measure in each student's Thesis Defense using the thesis defense rubric. The rubric is completed by the committee chair and two additional committee members for each committee.	**192** assessment items were collected for this learning outcome in this course. **97%** of students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome. *See table 1 for reported evaluations and analysis.*
Outcomes in **ID-606 Practice Studio II** were measured by Interior Design faculty. Standard rubrics provide direct measures with categorical data.	80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome.	In ID-606, this outcome is measured via assessment rubric. The assessment rubric is completed by the teaching faculty for this course at the end of the semester.	**54** assessment items were collected for this learning outcome in this course. **85%** of students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome. *See table 1 for reported evaluations and analysis.*
Outcomes were also measured with an **exit survey** of students that completed ID- 699 during the reporting year.	80% of students will self-assess as "strongly agree" or "agree" for this learning outcome.	Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-699 Thesis II. The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA.	**10** students responded to this survey question. **90%** of students "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they were prepared for this learning outcome. *See table 1 for reported evaluations and analysis.*

Learning Outcome 8 (continued)

S8 - Design Process

ID-699	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Weak (0)	Inadequate (1)	Total Unacceptable		Adequate (2)	Strong (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 8.a.	48	0	1	1	2%	17	30	47	98%
Standard 8.e.	96	0	5	5	5%	39	52	91	95%
Standard 8.g.	48	0	0	0	0%	13	35	48	100%
Total	**192**	**0**	**6**	**6**	**3%**	**69**	**117**	**186**	**97%**

ID-606	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Weak (0)	Inadequate (1)	Total Unacceptable		Adequate (2)	Strong (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 8.a.	18	0	1	1	6%	10	7	17	94%
Standard 8.e.	18	1	1	2	11%	5	11	16	89%
Standard 8.g.	18	0	1	1	6%	11	6	17	94%
Total	**54**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**7%**	**26**	**24**	**50**	**93%**

EXIT SURVEY	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Strongly Disagree (0)	Disagree (1)	Total Unacceptable		Agree (2)	Strongly Agree (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 8	10	0	1	1	8%	8	3	11	92%
Total	**10**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**8%**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**92%**

Interpretation of Results

Analysis and Implications: *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

A significant percentage of student projects demonstrate this learning outcome and CIDA standard.

Strengths: Student projects exceeded the performance standard in both ID-699 (3rd year) and ID-606 (2nd year). Student responses to the department exit survey also exceed the performance standard and are in alignment with the faculty reported data. As a percentage, more projects in ID-609 achieve acceptable performance when compared with projects in ID-606.

Opportunities: Student self-reporting of standard awareness trends down from faculty assessment in both courses. This could indicate that students are not fully aware of this standard.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements <u>for this year based on assessment of outcome:</u>
Because this standard shows a significant student achievement at a "strong" the program will make no changes to the curriculum.

Learning Outcome 9 (CIDA Standard 9 Design Communication which includes 9.b.,9.d.,9.e.)

Outcome Measures *Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.*	Performance Standard *Define the acceptable level of student performance.*	Data Collection *Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?*	Result *Did you meet your target? What was the result?*
Outcomes in **ID-699 Thesis II** were measured by Interior Design faculty and Industry Experts (serving on the Thesis Committee). Standard rubrics provide direct measures with categorical data.	**80%** of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome.	In ID-699, this outcome is measure in each student's Thesis Defense using the thesis defense rubric. The rubric is completed by the committee chair and two additional committee members for each committee.	**102** assessment items were collected for this learning outcome in this course. **77%** of students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome. *See table for reported evaluations and analysis.*
Outcomes in **ID-606 Practice Studio II** were measured by Interior Design faculty. Standard rubrics provide direct measures with categorical data.	80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome.	In ID-606, this outcome is measured via assessment rubric. The assessment rubric is completed by the teaching faculty for this course at the end of the semester.	**54** assessment items were collected for this learning outcome in this course. **85%** of students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome. *See table for reported evaluations and analysis.*
Outcomes were also measured with an **exit survey** of students that completed ID-699 during the reporting year.	80% of students will self-assess as "strongly agree" or "agree" for this learning outcome.	Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-699 Thesis II. The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA.	**7** students responded to this survey question. **100%** of students "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they were prepared for this learning outcome. *See table for reported evaluations and analysis.*

Learning Outcome 9 (continued)

S9 - Communication

ID-699	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Weak (0)	Inadequate (1)	Total Unacceptable		Adequate (2)	Strong (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 9.b. faculty rubric	18	0	0	**0**	0%	7	11	**18**	100%
Standard 9.d. faculty rubric	18	0	3	**3**	17%	11	4	**15**	83%
defense rubric	48	3	17	**20**	42%	16	12	**28**	58%
Standard 9.e.	18	0	0	**0**	0%	6	12	**18**	100%
Total	**102**	**3**	**20**	**23**	**23%**	**40**	**39**	**79**	**77%**

ID-606	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Weak (0)	Inadequate (1)	Total Unacceptable		Adequate (2)	Strong (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 9.b.	18	1	1	**2**	11%	9	7	**16**	89%
Standard 9.d.	18	0	3	**3**	17%	4	11	**15**	83%
Standard 9.e.	18	0	3	**3**	17%	2	13	**15**	83%
Total	**54**	**1**	**7**	**8**	**15%**	**15**	**31**	**46**	**85%**

EXIT SURVEY	Responses	Unacceptable Outcomes				Acceptable Outcomes			
		Strongly Disagree (0)	Disagree (1)	Total Unacceptable		Agree (2)	Strongly Agree (3)	Total Acceptable	
Standard 9	7	0	0	**0**	0%	6	1	**7**	100%
Total	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0%**	**6**	**1**	**7**	**100%**

Interpretation of Results

Data collected in the thesis defense rubrics were significantly lower for Standard 9.d. when compare to data collected from faculty rubrics for the same standard.

Strengths: Student projects exceeded the performance standard in both ID-699 (3rd year) and ID-606 (2nd year) for all standards except 9.b. (defense rubrics). Student responses to the department exit survey also exceed the performance standard and are in alignment with the faculty reported data.

Opportunities: Results from defense rubrics varies significantly when compared to faculty rubrics for standard 9.d. Because the majority of students "pass" the defense with minor revisions, it is possible that students continued work on projects components that improved the visual communication in their projects. The faculty rubrics assessed the final project which included improvements resulting from the Thesis Defense.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Beginning in Spring 2019, we adjusted the balance of software instruction in our skills-focused courses ID-223 Presentation Drawings and ID-545 Graduate Construction Documents) to better align with industry expectations for visual communication. We anticipate that this change will result in improved competencies for CIDA standard 9 beginning in AY 2020-21.

Appendices *(please only include items that will help reviewers understand your process – for example, test questions, rubrics, survey questions, more detailed description of assessment measures, summary tables of survey results, etc.)*