

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PLAN

SUBMITTED BY: JANICE ELLINWOOD

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30, 2015

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

PAPER DOCUMENTS THAT RESULT FROM ASSESSMENTS ARE HOUSED IN THE OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR, AND THE ANALYSIS DERIVED FROM THEM ARE SENT ELECTRONICALLY TO FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Year of Next Planned Assessment
<i>Create garments (worthy of acceptance to Marymount's prestigious fashion show) that are of appropriate quality, function and aesthetics.</i>	2012-13	2015-16
<i>Design an aesthetically pleasing and functional line of apparel that is appropriate for a target market and visually expressed in a portfolio for entry into the industry.</i>	2012-13	2014-15
<i>Make technical drawings of apparel (flats and specs), fashion illustrations, and fashion presentations.</i>	2012-13	2014-15
<i>Conduct design research and apply findings to design problems.</i>	2011-12	2014-15

Describe how the program's outcomes support Marymount's Mission, Strategic Plan, and relevant school plan:

The outcomes directly relate to the effective career preparation of the fashion design students as well as the intellectual experience of each student. There is an emphasis on the aesthetics of the student work, whether the garments themselves, the lines they are a part of, or the two-dimensional planning for them, such as technical drawings, fashion illustrations or fashion presentations. The fashion design program has a reputation for providing its students with outstanding professional development, both in the form of the fashion show, to which students submit their designs and senior lines for jurying, and ultimately, scrutiny by members of industry. A noted designer, the recipient of Marymount's Designer of the

Year award, reviews the seniors' portfolios and provides feedback before they enter the field. In addition, the program promotes inquiry-based learning through student-faculty collaboration.

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

One assessment measure, the portfolio evaluation by faculty, which occurs at the conclusion of the academic program, is working reliably. The professional designer's oral evaluation of the senior portfolios has often worked reliably in the past, but that is limited to the particular designer and his/her priorities and experience. That also occurs at the end of the curriculum and was not as effective this year. The Senior Focus Group often provides good open-ended feedback, but this report makes clear that students should probably provide feedback specifically on the skills enumerated on the evaluation of the portfolio by faculty. The internship evaluations also provide valuable feedback, but once in a while, the Center for Career Services sends the wrong program evaluation. While all of these occur at the senior level, the faculty evaluations of fashion show garments include those entered and accepted to the show from sophomores, juniors and seniors. The program instituted inquiry-based learning in 2010-11. That ventures includes a project in children's apparel in AA265 Fashion Illustration I (for sophomores), a project in knitwear in AA385 Apparel Design II (for juniors), and one in AA407 Product Development (for seniors). Originally, the department obtained a grant, funded by Cotton Inc., where the students, along with the faculty member, developed appropriate designs in tennis apparel for women age 55 and over. This past year, they designed junior-sized golf apparel, again under a grant from Cotton Inc.

As a result of our 2012-13 Assessment Report and the Program Review in 2013-14, the faculty grew determined to improve student learning in the areas recorded the weakest by the assessment process. An end-of-junior-year assessment took place in May 2015, measuring student ability in making appropriate fabric choices for end products, selecting the appropriate fabric weights for end products, implementing function in a design, figure drawing, rendering of fabrics, choosing color(s), implementing aesthetic design decisions and flat drawing. This assessment was conducted across AA365 Fashion Illustration II and AA415 Apparel Design III by the faculty in those courses. The purpose of the assessment is to tailor teaching in the senior year to the areas of weakness indicated in the assessment.

While it has always been a significant challenge to follow up on the department faculty and the Director of the Center for Career Services, who maintain a role in the process, whether conducting in-class assessments or ones outside the classroom, such as the evaluation of fashion show garments or the forwarding of the internship evaluations, a more critical problem has emerged this year. The department is experiencing a profound turnover of faculty, going from 6 full-time positions (5 tenure track and 1 term) in 2014-15 to 4 (3 tenure track and 1 term) in 2015-16. The elimination of one of the tenure track faculty is anticipated for 2016-17. While Marymount wants to conduct a hiring freeze during the current academic year (2015-16), if the department does not gain, at the very least, one tenure-track faculty position and a full-time term position for 2016-17, the program will have to close. That eventuality would destroy one of Marymount's longest

student-supported traditions, the student fashion show, Portfolio in Motion. Because Washington DC is not an apparel producing center, it is not possible to use adjunct professors to staff courses.

Far less of an issue, It is also a challenge for the Department Chair to organize all of the data and retrieve it for the implementation of this report. Previous faculty always felt overwhelmed by the amount of assessments that are taken for both this program and the one in Fashion Merchandising. Most of these coincide with the preparation and implementation of the annual fashion show, which is a project that is in addition to their workload responsibilities, department and community service and scholarship.

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

The last report for Institutional Research was the Review of the Fashion Design program. Several recommendations evolved out of that report, some dealing with curriculum, others with marketing and facilities. Many of those are in process of implementation. In regard to curriculum, internship was decreased from 6 credits to 3. AA370 Tailored Garment Structures was deleted. The content of AA270 Clothing Analysis was split into two separate courses, a lecture focusing on technical design, mass production and the relationship between quality standards of clothing and pricing called AA307 Product Development I, and a second level sewing course, AA260 Sample Room Techniques II. A new assessment was created for the end of the junior year.

The Department implemented new web pages on MU's website, and a lock was installed on our upper level studio, Gailhac room 2002, so students could work on weekends. We are beginning to institute buses to G Street Fabrics in Rockville, to ease our students' ability to obtain supplies.

We yet hope to acquire industry-dedicated software, and training for it, through a grant, when the university approves the cost of one workstation. We hope to obtain task lighting in the sewing studios and new tables and chairs, where needed. We also hope to cultivate partnerships with industry. We expect to continue our great programs with the Center for Global Education, our fashion show, Portfolio in Motion, and the Designer of the Year Award.

In addition, we hope to have some faculty discussion about feedback obtained from the 2015 Student Focus Group regarding the outcome that is not assessed in this report : "Create garments (worthy of acceptance to Marymount's prestigious fashion show) that are of appropriate quality, function and aesthetics." They requested better explanation of slopers in AA350 Apparel Design I and to learn how to make them. They want to learn pattern grading. Although we have considered the idea repeatedly, they want us to consider teaching draping before flat pattern, bearing in mind that dealing with a body helps them to understand how a pattern piece works. At the very least, they suggest small units on draping in

AA350 Apparel Design I and AA385 Apparel Design II. They want more samples that apply to men's wear in AA250 Sample Room Techniques II.

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:
(List each recommendation and provide a specific response to each).

Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 1: Design an aesthetically pleasing and functional line of apparel that is appropriate for a target market and visually expressed in a portfolio for entry into the industry.

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes No

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

In the 2012-13 Assessment Report, the faculty evaluations and designer comments indicated a 50-60% achievement of this outcome, the lowest of all the previous reports. The categories that received lower assessments were: fabric choices, fabric weights, and functional design sense.

Assessment Activity

<u>Outcome Measures</u> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<u>Performance Standard</u> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<u>Data Collection</u> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<u>Analysis</u> 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
Direct Measure: Portfolio Evaluation by Faculty	90% of students must receive a rating of Excellent (5) or Good (4) in the categories that relate to line development and appropriateness for target market. Other options are average (3) and poor (2) and inadequate (1). The categories include: fabric choices, color harmony, fabric weights, aesthetic	Two faculty members, who do not teach the senior portfolio course or the senior course in which lines are produced, evaluate the portfolios. This occurs after the professional designer has conducted his/her review. The Department Chair tabulates the ratings.	Out of 11 seniors, ratings were: Fabric Choices: 7 excellent (5), 4 average (3) Color Harmony: 11 excellent (5) Fabric Weights: 7 excellent (5), 1 good (4) 1 average (3), 2 poor (2) Aesthetic Design Sense: 10 excellent (5) 1 good (4) Functional Design Sense: 5 excellent (5) 3 good (4), 3 average (3) Appropriateness for Target Market: 10 excellent (5) 1 good (4) The areas of weakness continue to be fabric choices, fabric weights and functional design.

	design sense, functional design sense and appropriateness for target market.		
Indirect Measure: Senior Focus Group	Seniors make positive comments assessing their knowledge of line development and designing apparel appropriate for target market.	The Department Chair meets with seniors near the end of the academic year to conduct the Senior Focus Group. She tabulates the responses.	When asked whether seniors felt they could design an aesthetically pleasing and functional line of apparel that is appropriate for a target market and visually expressed in a portfolio for entry into the industry, all answered yes. However, they made the following comments: They did not have adequate time to design creatively in AA418 Advanced Problems in Fashion Design I; the design process for the senior lines was too fast—suggested beginning that process prior to spring semester.
Direct Measure: Portfolio Evaluation by Designer	Designer comments on line development or appropriateness for target market.	The designer's comments are recorded word for word by the Department Chair during the portfolio review. Then she classifies them according to the categories measured in the portfolio evaluation by faculty.	It is very difficult to obtain a reliable assessment from a guest designer. The oral comments and conversation between student and designer is highly valuable. It is not beneficial to ask him/her to fill out an evaluation form. But he/she is self-directed in terms of the importance placed on the categories, often as a result of personal experience and is not always frank about shortcomings. In the case of Sue Wong, she commented positively on color choice for most portfolios, confirmed the students' aptitude for certain customer markets, but did not comment on fabric choice or weights or functional design.

Interpretation of Results

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

This outcome has not been achieved to the high standard the department faculty desire. Breaking down the results by category, it has been achieved in relation to color harmony, aesthetic design sense and appropriateness for target market, but not to fabric choice, fabric weights and functional design sense.

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

A silver lining in the face of this unachieved outcome is the related assessment put in place for the end of junior year in May 2015. For the four juniors, ratings were: Fabric Choice: 2 excellent (5), 2 good (4); Fabric Weights: 2 excellent (5) 2 good (4); Functional Design Sense: 2 excellent (5) 1 good (4) 1 average (3); Aesthetic Design Sense: 4 excellent (5); Color Harmony: 4 excellent. These imply some improvement in the next report. The smaller number of students may explain why the learning was more effective. On the other hand, the results may have to do with the particular individuals. However, In addition, the senior focus group should probably consider the program outcomes in a manner that breaks down learning into categories consistent with the portfolio evaluation by faculty, so they can respond specifically about fabric choice, fabric weights and functional design.

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

First of all, the end-of junior-year assessment should continue. Second, the Senior Focus Group should include outcomes broken into categories similar to those stated in the portfolio evaluation. Because of the current industry emphasis on technical design, the department is implementing learning about specs (a technical drawing of a garment showing construction details along with a table of measurements) in all pattern-making courses. These assignments should probably demand entire spec packs. This activity should improve the students' thinking about functional design. That leaves the problem of working with fabrics—both choosing the right fabric and the correct weight of fabric for the end product. Faculty must converse about ways to zero in on that learning, which is often experiential. At any rate, this outcome should be re-assessed next year

Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 2: Make technical drawings of apparel (flats and specs), fashion illustrations, and fashion presentations.

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes No

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

In the 2012-13 Assessment Report, the outcome was not achieved, especially in terms of specs with measurements, flat drawings, rendering figures, rendering fabrics, and showing evidence of construction in their drawings.

Assessment Activity

<u>Outcome Measures</u> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<u>Performance Standard</u> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<u>Data Collection</u> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<u>Analysis</u> 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
Direct Measure: Portfolio Evaluation by Faculty	90% of seniors must receive a rating of excellent (5) or good (4) in the categories of flat drawing, specs with measurements, evidence of construction, rendering figures, and rendering of fabrics. Other ratings are average(3), poor (2) and inadequate (1).	Two faculty members, who do not teach the senior portfolio course or the senior course in which senior lines are produced, evaluate the portfolios. This occurs after the professional designer has conducted his/her review. The Department Chair tabulates the ratings.	Out of 11 seniors, ratings were: Flat Drawings: 4 excellent (5) 5 good (3) 1 average (3) Specs w/Measurements: 4 excellent (5) 1 good (4) 5 average (3) 1 poor (2) Rendering of Figures: 6 excellent (5) 2 good 4 average (3) Evidence of Construction: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (4) 1 average (3) Rendering of Fabrics: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (4) 2 average (3) None of the categories reached the performance standard. However, Flat Drawings and Evidence of Construction were close. These categories were the most

			problematic: Specs with Measurements and Rendering of Figures.
Indirect Measure: Internship Evaluation	Site supervisors must rate interns superior (4) or good (3) in “make technical drawings, fashion illustrations and presentations.”	Site supervisors choose the ratings and return the evaluations to the Director of the Center for Career Services. The Director forwards them to the Department Chair, and she tabulates the ratings.	For 9 interns, on this outcome, internship supervisors rated 3 excellent, 4 good, 1 average and 1 N/A, meaning the intern did not perform these function in her internship. For this assessment, the outcome was close to being achieved.
Indirect Measure: Senior Focus Group	Seniors make positive comments assessing their own knowledge of “making technical drawings, fashion illustrations and presentations.”	The Department Chair meets with seniors near the end of the academic year to conduct the Senior Focus Group. She tabulates the responses.	When asked whether they felt they had learned to “make technical drawings, fashion illustrations and presentations,” all students responded affirmatively. Ensuing discussion recommended the course AA395 Digital Presentation for Fashion for the junior year, which is a “good [experience] for technical design and giving extra [attention] to design[ing].” They also recommended the assigning of complete tech packs. In addition, they recommended more drawing from models in AA265 Fashion Illustration I.

Interpretation of Results

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

It is apparent from the faculty ratings of the portfolio that this outcome has not been achieved. That instrument revealed that students were stronger in flat drawing and showing evidence of construction (in illustrations) and weaker in specs with measurements and the rendering of figures. However, internship supervisors did not show the same discrepancy. In fact, one wrote: “[Student’s] creativity in design and ability to create artwork and flats, specs and presentations are her

strongest point.” Graduating seniors did not report they were unprepared in the execution of specs like their predecessors in 2013.

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

The end-of-junior-year assessment, implemented in May 2015, did some related evaluation. The ratings for four juniors are as follows: Figure Drawing: 2 excellent 2 good; Rendering of Fabrics: 1 excellent 2 good 1 Average; Flat Drawing 1 excellent 2 good 1 average. This indicates some improvement forecasted for the next assessment report.

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

The end-of –junior-year assessment should continue. The senior focus group should elicit responses by categories that are consistent with the portfolio evaluation by faculty. Specs, most often with complete spec packs, should be assigned in all fashion design studios in the pattern making and senior sequence: AA350 Apparel Design I, AA385 Apparel Design II, AA415 Apparel Design III, AA418 Advanced Problems in Fashion Design I and AA423 Senior Fashion Design Portfolio. In addition, as a result of the Program Review, a former course, AA270 Clothing Analysis, was split into two courses: AA307 Product Development I, a lecture concentrating on technical design, as well as topics such as apparel production and the relationship between quality standards of apparel and pricing, and AA260 Sample Room Techniques II, meant to give students additional sewing experience. The new course should be an adequate springboard for the execution of specs that occurs in the rest of the curriculum. The courses are planned for Spring 2016. AA265 Fashion Illustration I should provide more drawing from the model. More conversation should take place among faculty regarding the rendering of fabrics. This outcome should be re-assessed in the next report.

Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 3: Conduct design research and apply findings to design problems.

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes No

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

Assessment Activity

<u>Outcome Measures</u> Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.	<u>Performance Standard</u> Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.	<u>Data Collection</u> Discuss the data collected and student population	<u>Analysis</u> 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.
Direct Measure: Evaluation of sophomores who are developing apparel designs for pre-school children in AA265 Fashion Illustration I.	60 % of students must receive a rating of excellent (5) in the categories of problem identification, research, ideation, implementation and presentation. Other options are good (4), average (3), inadequate (2), and below average (1).	The faculty member for AA265 Fashion Illustration I evaluates the children’s wear presentations (both oral and visual). The Department Chair tabulates the ratings.	Out of 11 students, the ratings were: Problem Identification, Planning and Project Focus: 5 excellent (5) 6 good (4) 2 average (3) Research, Selection and Evaluation: 5 excellent (5) 6 good (4) 2 average (3) Ideation: 5 excellent (5) 6 good (4) 2 average (3) Execution/ Implementation: 5 excellent (5) 6 good (4) 2 average (3) Presentation & Evaluation of Solution: 5 excellent (5) 6 good (4) 2 average (3)
Direct Measure: Evaluation of juniors who are developing knitwear designs in AA385 Apparel Design II	60 % of students must receive a rating of excellent (5) in the categories of problem identification, research, ideation, implementation and	The faculty member for AA 385 Apparel Design II evaluates the knitwear projects. The Department Chair tabulates the ratings.	Out of 8 students, the ratings were: Problem Identification, Planning, Project Focus: 5 excellent (5) 3 average (3) Research, Selection and Evaluation: 6 excellent (5) 2 average (3) Ideation: 6 excellent (5) 1 average (3)

	presentation. Other options are good (4), average (3), inadequate (2), and below average (1).		Execution/Implementation: 4 excellent (5) 1 good (4) 3 average (3) Presentation & Evaluation of Solution: 1 excellent (5) 7 average (3)
--	---	--	--

Direct Measure: Evaluation of seniors who are developing new clothing products in AA407 Product Development.	60% of students must receive a rating of excellent (5) in the categories of problem identification, research, ideation, implementation and presentation. Other options are good (4), average (3), inadequate (2), and below average (1).	The faculty member for AA407 Product Development evaluates the students' clothing products. The Department Chair tabulates the ratings.	Out of 9 seniors, ratings were: Problem Identification, Planning, Project Focus: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (3) Research, Selection and Evaluation: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (3) Ideation: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (3) Execution/Implementation: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (3) Presentation & Evaluation of Solution: 5 excellent (5) 4 good (3)
---	--	---	--

Interpretation of Results

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

This outcome is not quite achieved. At the sophomore level, inquiry learning was mastered by just less than 50%. Of course, students are just beginning to achieve the skills with which they demonstrate inquiry learning. At the junior level, it was achieved except in the case of "Presentation and Evaluation of the Solution." In a knitwear project, that reflects the professionalism in the construction methods. Knits are sewn on specialty sewing machines, not the usual home sewing ones that several students are used to. At the senior level, the outcome was achieved. These results demonstrate a progression that potentially indicates an acquiring ease for inquiry learning with matriculation.

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

A subtlety in the results indicates that in a visual discipline, such as fashion design, it is the mastering of presentation skills that is the biggest challenge, not the understanding of the problem focus, the capacity to research, the conception of a solution, or even, perhaps, its initial execution, That implies the need to master materials, whether with art media or with sewing and fabric, in order to earn a rating of "excellent." That lends logic to the fact that students would demonstrate better skills at the senior level. The department should consider whether to re-state the standard for this outcome in a different fashion.

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

Faculty should discuss their expectations on the inquiry projects and whether the presentation skills are what holds students back at the earlier level(s). Perhaps a restatement of the performance standard is indicated. As a result of the university's desire to use inquiry learning assessment tools to measure the liberal arts core, a new instrument has been designed for future use with this outcome, one that measures information literacy, communication and critical thinking, although all of these were implied in the former instrument. This outcome should be re-assessed using that instrument in the next report.

A complete student learning assessment report includes appendix of rubrics, survey questions, or other relevant documents and information.

Appendix A
EVALUATION OF FASHION SHOW GARMENT
FASHION DESIGN PROGRAM

Outcome: *Create garments, worthy of acceptance to Marymount's prestigious fashion show, that are of appropriate quality, function and aesthetics.*

Garment Description:	Excellent= 4	Good= 3	Fair = 2	Poor = 1
Quality				
Functional Design				
Aesthetic Design				

Comments on:

Quality:

Functional Design:

Aesthetic Design:

Evaluator: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B
FASHION DESIGN – PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

SCALE: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Average = 3, Poor = 2, Inadequate = 1

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Introductory Page					
2. Graphics/Page Layout					
3. Fabric Choices					
4. Color Harmony					

5. Fabric Weights					
6. Design Sense (Aesthetic)					
7. Design Sense (Functional)					
8. Flat Drawings					
9. Specs with Measurements					
10. Rendering Figures					
11. Evidence of Construction					
12. Rendering of Fabrics					
13. Appropriateness for Target Market					
14. Overall Presentation					

Date_____ Signature_____ Final Score_____

Title_____

Appendix C

Questions for Senior Focus Group

1. Do you feel that you can create garments, worthy of acceptance to Marymount's prestigious fashion show, that are of appropriate quality, function and aesthetics?
2. Do you feel you can design an aesthetically pleasing and functional line of apparel that is appropriate for a target market and visually expressed in a portfolio for entry into the industry?
3. Can you make technical drawings of apparel (flats and specs), fashion illustrations, and fashion presentations?
4. Can you demonstrate competency in design research and its application to design problems?

**INTERNSHIP
 EVALUATION OF STUDENT BY EMPLOYER
 MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY
 SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
 FASHION DESIGN CURRICULUM
 ARLINGTON, VA 22207
 (703) 284-1560
 FAX (703) 284-3859**

Student's Name: _____ Date: _____

Employing Firm: _____

Agency Supervisor: _____

Student's Position: _____

PLEASE RATE THE STUDENT ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING:

	Superior (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Poor (1)	N/A (0)
Attendance					
Attitude					
Ability to get along with others					
Adaptability					
Initiative					
Oral communication					
Written communication					
Ability to:					
Create garments that are of appropriate quality, function, and aesthetics.					
Make flats and specs, fashion illustrations, and fashion presentations.					

Further comment on the student and/ or the fashion design program:

Continue on next page

Would you recommend this student for future employment in the field?

Yes

No

Signature of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

2/2010