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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proficiently use quantitative and qualitative programming skills of project goals and objectives in written and graphic evaluative and assessment tools.</td>
<td>New Outcomes applied academic year 2013/2014</td>
<td>New Outcomes will be applied for 2014/2015 with the revision of graduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Efficiently formulate qualitative schematic design skills to develop solutions incorporating human factors, ADA and universal requirements, and environmental elements and responses.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efficiently formulate quantitative design development skills to develop solutions incorporating building and life safety codes; furniture, fixture, and equipment (FF &amp; E) requirements; and the built environment.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrate the ability to read, evaluate, and construct contract documents.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate theories, hypotheses, and/or design problems and effectively derive conclusions and solutions through research and assessment methods.</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and relevant school plan:
The first professional Master of Arts program in Interior Design is an accredited program by CIDA (Council for Interior Design Accreditation). Students admitted to the program have a baccalaureate degree; however, not in interior design or a closely related field. The post professional Master of Arts program in Interior Design is not accredited by CIDA -- CIDA does not accredit post-professional graduate programs. Students in the program have a baccalaureate degree in interior design or a closely related field.

Learning outcomes for the program reflects Marymount’s mission for graduates, that is, it responds to the undergraduate ID program and expands upon the foundation of knowledge and skill; this is reflected in the similarities and alignment of program outcomes; however graduate outcomes define a higher level of research application. Furthermore, the learning outcomes prepare students to be entry-level interior designers in the field of interior design. Our learning outcomes both support and are in line with CIDA’s accreditation criteria’s. To meet the changing needs of the profession and the changes made in the undergraduate program (new courses and revised sequencing of studio course), the outcomes have been changed for the 2013/2014 assessments. Additionally, the ID program is currently going through a program change for the graduate degree (mainly studio courses and their sequencing) fall 2014. The changes are being developed to align with the changes made in the undergraduate program, as well as to respond to our CIDA accreditation report from 2011. The program assessment outcomes will most likely change again to assess the new program outcomes.

Marymount's graduate students are expected to foster intellectual and independent growth, these expectations are the basis for the interior design program and are reflected in our outcomes, in that, studio courses promote independent critical thinking in the programmatic, schematic and design development stages. Likewise, in the thesis courses ID 698/699: Thesis or Design Research Project, students work independently and apply all knowledge and skills they have developed to effectively complete final project theses or research design projects.

The first-professional graduate program emphasizes entry-level design knowledge and skill and in latter studio courses implements the use of evidence based design research and application. Post-professional graduates enter with a foundation in design knowledge and skill; therefore, the post-professional graduate program emphasizes evidence-based design.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements

Strengths: Students from both the last graduate studio courses (ID 684 and 685) and thesis/research design project (ID 699) show strength in meeting outcome 1, 3 and 5. All of the 14 students assessed by faculty identified the students either showed adequate or strong knowledge of the skill or outcome.
When looking at the faculty assessment comparison of 6 students who took ID 580 in fall 2013 and summer 2014 (6 of the 14 assessed), students improved in knowledge and skills in outcome 3 and students showed significant improvement in knowledge and skill in outcome 1 and 2.

**Challenges:** Although students met the outcome 4 (85.7% or more have scale value of 2 or 3) this outcome seems to be an area showing only an adequate level of skills and knowledge for reading, evaluating, and constructing contract documents. From faculty comments, the construction documentation component is the largest area of weakness.

**Planned improvements:** Currently the graduate program is being overhauled to line up with the undergraduate program (systematic levels of studio courses). The course outcomes will align with CIDA standards and implement more evidence-based design research strategies in upper level studio courses. In addition, a construction documentation course (utilizing REVIT) will be implemented into the program to address the construction document outcome (#4).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update (Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes have changed from 2012/2013 and will most likely change with the new program changes for 2014/2015</td>
<td>Planned improvement is the overhaul of the studios courses in the program that will align with undergraduate studio courses implementing CIDA standards.</td>
<td>Program (upon GSC approval and FC) will be implemented Fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome and Past Assessment
Learning Outcome 1: Proficiently use quantitative and qualitative programming skills of project goals and objectives in written and graphic evaluative and assessment tools.

Is this outcome being reexamined? X Yes □ No
If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.
Due to the results of our 2011 CIDA re-accreditation the department has re-examined the content of courses in both the undergraduate and graduate department and have put in place 2013 a new undergraduate program with specific sequencing of studio CIDA standard content. Currently, a proposal for the graduate program to meet the same specific sequencing studio courses with CIDA standard content is being developed. The learning outcomes will be established to reflect the new course outcomes.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome measures are direct assessments done by faculty-assessing student’s final studio course work. All faculty used the same assessment rubric (Fig. 1 in the Appendix).

Using a 0-3 pt. value scale; 80% of the students must obtain a value of 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met. Value 2 identifies adequate evidence of the skill and knowledge. Value 3 identifies strong evidence of the skill and knowledge.

Assessment rubrics were distributed to faculty who taught the following courses:
- ID 684/685: Master Studio I and II
- ID 687: Thesis or Research
- Design Project II
Faculty assessed students’ final projects using a 0-3 value scale (0- no evidence of skill and knowledge, 1- minimal evidence of skill and knowledge, 2- adequate evidence of skill and knowledge, 3- strong evidence of skill and knowledge)

Total of 14 students were assessed. Breakdown is 2- ID 685 spring 2014 (both first professionals), 6- ID 684 summer 2014 (all first professionals), 6- ID 699 spring 2014 (3 first professionals, 3 post professionals).

- Please see appendix for the analysis process.
- 100% of the students had a value of 2.0 or greater. The learning outcomes were met.

In addition, 6 students from ID 580 fall 2013 were the same students who took ID 684 summer 2014. A comparative analysis showed a strong improvement in this outcome from the two courses. (see appendix)
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This assessment is a direct measure to assess the skill and knowledge of students in both tracks of the program (post and first processional)

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment shows this outcome to be strength in the program. 100% of the students achieved a 2 or 3 value. Additionally, of the 14 students assessed, 8 (57%) were evaluated at a value of 3 (strong evidence of the skill and knowledge). When looking at the comparison between the evaluations of ID 580 and ID 684, there was a significant improvement in the students’ ability to apply the skills and knowledge of this outcome.

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

Although the outcome was met and the assessment has shown the outcome to be a strength of the program, the following program improvements will be done:

• Revised program and curriculum structure
• Revised learning outcomes
Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 2: Efficiently formulate qualitative schematic design skills to develop solutions incorporating human factors, ADA and universal requirements, and environmental elements and responses.

Is this outcome being reexamined?  X Yes  □ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

Due to the results of our 2011 CIDA re-accreditation the department has re-examined the content of courses in both the undergraduate and graduate department and have put in place 2013 a new undergraduate program with specific sequencing of studio CIDA standard content. Currently, a proposal for the graduate program to meet the same specific sequencing studio courses with CIDA standard content is being developed. The learning outcomes will be established to reflect the new course outcomes.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The outcome measures are direct assessments done by faculty-assessing student’s final studio course work. All faculty used the same assessment rubric (Fig. 1 in the Appendix). | Using a 0-3 pt. value scale; 80% of the students must obtain a value of 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met. Value 2 identifies adequate evidence of the skill and knowledge. Value 3 identifies strong evidence of the skill and knowledge. | Assessment rubrics were distributed to faculty who taught the following courses:  
- ID 684/685: Master Studio I and II  
- ID 699: Thesis or Research Design Project II  
Faculty assessed students’ final projects using a 0-3 value scale (0- no evidence of skill and knowledge, 1- minimal evidence of skill and knowledge, 2- adequate evidence of skill and knowledge, 3- strong evidence of skill and knowledge) | 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |
| Total of 14 students were assessed. Breakdown is 2- ID 685 spring 2014 (both first professionals), 6- ID 684 summer 2014 (all first professionals), 6- ID 699 spring 2014 (3 first professionals, 3 post professionals). | • Please see appendix for the analysis process. |
| | • 85.7% of the students had a value of 2.0 or greater. The learning outcomes were met. |
| | In addition, 6 students from ID 580 fall 2013 were the same students who took ID 684 summer 2014. A comparative analysis showed strong improvement in this outcome from the two courses. (see appendix) |
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This assessment is a direct measure to assess the skill and knowledge of students in both tracks of the program (post and first processional)

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment shows this outcome was met. However, two students were given a value of 1 (minimal evidence of the skill and knowledge in this outcome). However, when comparing the evaluation of the 6 students who took ID 580 and 684 there was significant improvement in student’s skills and knowledge of this outcome.

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

Although the outcome was met and students have shown a significant improvement in implementing the outcome, the following program improvements will be done:

• Revised program and curriculum structure
• Revised learning outcomes
**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 3**: Efficiently formulate quantitative design development skills to develop solutions incorporating building and life safety codes; furniture, fixture, and equipment (FF & E) requirements; and the built environment.

**Is this outcome being reexamined?**  X Yes □ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program. Due to the results of our 2011 CIDA re-accreditation the department has re-examined the content of courses in both the undergraduate and graduate department and have put in place 2013 a new undergraduate program with specific sequencing of studio CIDA standard content. Currently, a proposal for the graduate program to meet the same specific sequencing studio courses with CIDA standard content is being developed. The learning outcomes will be established to reflect the new course outcomes.

**Assessment Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outcome measures are direct assessments done by faculty-assessing student's final studio course work. All faculty used the same assessment rubric (Fig. 1 in the Appendix).</td>
<td>Using a 0-3 pt. value scale; 80% of the students must obtain a value of 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met. Value 2 identifies adequate evidence of the skill and knowledge. Value 3 identifies strong evidence of the skill and knowledge.</td>
<td>Assessment rubrics were distributed to faculty who taught the following courses: - ID 684/685: Master Studio I and II - ID 699: Thesis or Research Design Project II Faculty assessed students' final projects using a 0-3 value scale (0- no evidence of skill and knowledge, 1- minimal evidence of skill and knowledge, 2- adequate evidence of skill and knowledge, 3- strong evidence of skill and knowledge)</td>
<td>2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 14 students were assessed. Breakdown is 2- ID 685 spring 2014 (both first professionals), 6- ID 684 summer 2014 (all first professionals), 6- ID 699 spring 2014 (3 first professionals, 3 post professionals).</td>
<td>• Please see appendix for the analysis process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of the students had a value of 2.0 or greater. The learning outcomes were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, 6 students from ID 580 fall 2013 were the same students who took ID 684 summer 2014. A comparative analysis showed improvement in this outcome from the two courses. (see appendix)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This assessment is a direct measure to assess the skill and knowledge of students in both tracks of the program (post and first processional)

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment shows this outcome to be strength in the program. 100% of the students achieved a 2 or 3 value. Additionally, when looking at the comparison between the evaluations of ID 580 and ID 684, there was an improvement in the students ability to apply the skills and knowledge of this outcome.

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

Although the outcome was met and the assessment has shown the outcome to be strength of the program, the following program improvements will be done:

• Revised program and curriculum structure
• Revised learning outcomes
Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate the ability to read, evaluate, and construct contract documents.

Is this outcome being reexamined? X Yes □ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

Due to the results of our 2011 CIDA re-accreditation the department has re-examined the content of courses in both the undergraduate and graduate department and have put in place 2013 a new undergraduate program with specific sequencing of studio CIDA standard content. Currently, a proposal for the graduate program to meet the same specific sequencing studio courses with CIDA standard content is being developed. The learning outcomes will be established to reflect the new course outcomes.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population.</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome measures are direct assessments done by faculty-assessing student’s final studio course work. All faculty used the same assessment rubric (Fig. 1 in the Appendix).

Using a 0-3 pt. value scale; 80% of the students must obtain a value of 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met. Value 2 identifies adequate evidence of the skill and knowledge. Value 3 identifies strong evidence of the skill and knowledge.

Assessment rubrics were distributed to faculty who taught the following courses: ID 684/685: Master Studio I and II ID 699: Thesis or Research Design Project II Faculty assessed students’ final projects using a 0-3 value scale (0: no evidence of skill and knowledge, 1: minimal evidence of skill and knowledge, 2: adequate evidence of skill and knowledge, 3: strong evidence of skill and knowledge)

Total of 14 students were assessed. Breakdown is 2- ID 685 spring 2014 (both first professionals), 6- ID 684 summer 2014 (all first professionals), 6- ID 699 spring 2014 (3 first professionals, 3 post professionals).

- Please see appendix for the analysis process.

- 85.7% of the students had a value of 2.0 or greater. The learning outcomes were met.

In addition, 6 students from ID 580 fall 2013 were the same students who took ID 684 summer 2014. A comparative analysis showed the skills and knowledge of the outcome remained the same. (see appendix)
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This assessment is a direct measure to assess the skill and knowledge of students in both tracks of the program (post and first processional)

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment shows the outcome was met. Although the outcome was met, the assessment shows the students are weakest in this outcome. Of the 14 students, only 3 (27.85%) showed strong evidence of the skills and knowledge in this outcome. Additionally, when looking at the comparison between the evaluations of ID 580 and ID 684, there was no improvement in the students ability to apply the skills and knowledge of this outcome.

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

Although the outcome was met, the following program improvements will be done:
- Revised program and curriculum structure (addition of Construction Document course with REVIT to be included)
- Revised learning outcomes
Outcome and Past Assessment
Learning Outcome 5: Evaluate theories, hypotheses, and/or design problems and effectively derive conclusions and solutions through research and assessment methods.

Is this outcome being reexamined?  X Yes  □ No
If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program. Due to the results of our 2011 CIDA re-accreditation the department has re-examined the content of courses in both the undergraduate and graduate department and have put in place 2013 a new undergraduate program with specific sequencing of studio CIDA standard content. Currently, a proposal for the graduate program to meet the same specific sequencing studio courses with CIDA standard content is being developed. The learning outcomes will be established to reflect the new course outcomes.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect. | Define and explain acceptable level of student performance. | Discuss the data collected and student population. | 1) Describe the analysis process.  
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |
| The outcome measures are direct assessments done by faculty-assessing student’s final studio course work. All faculty used the same assessment rubric (Fig. 1 in the Appendix). | Using a 0-3 pt. value scale; 80% of the students must obtain a value of 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met. Value 2 identifies adequate evidence of the skill and knowledge. Value 3 identifies strong evidence of the skill and knowledge. | Assessment rubrics were distributed to faculty who taught the following courses: ID 684/685: Master Studio I and II ID 699: Thesis or Research Design Project II Faculty assessed students’ final projects using a 0-3 value scale (0- no evidence of skill and knowledge, 1- minimal evidence of skill and knowledge, 2- adequate evidence of skill and knowledge, 3- strong evidence of skill and knowledge) | • Please see appendix for the analysis process.  
• 100% of the students had a value of 2.0 or greater. The learning outcomes were met. |
| Total of 14 students were assessed. Breakdown is 2- ID 685 spring 2014 (both first professionals), 6- ID 684 summer 2014 (all first professionals), 6- ID 699 spring 2014 (3 first professionals, 3 post professionals). In addition, 6 students from ID 580 fall 2013 were the same students who took ID 684 summer 2014. A comparative analysis showed the skills and knowledge of the outcome remained the same. (see appendix) | | | |
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

This assessment is a direct measure to assess the skill and knowledge of students in both tracks of the program (post and first processional)

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The assessment shows this outcome to be a strength in the program. 100% of the students achieved a 2 or 3 value. Additionally, of the 14 students assessed, 9 (64.3%) were evaluated at a value of 3 (strong evidence of the skill and knowledge). When looking at the comparison between the evaluations of ID 580 and ID 684, there was no change; however, the strongest evidence of this outcome is in the students’ theses/research design project which may imply the strong evidence of this outcome

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

Although the outcome was met and the assessment has shown the outcome to be a strength of the program, the following program improvements will be done:

• Revised program and curriculum structure
• Revised learning outcomes