

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Interior Design Master of Arts

SUBMITTED BY: Bridget May

DATE: 09/30/2015

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

Data is stored on an encrypted computer with department chair and encrypted backup on-site and off-site.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

The M. Wilhelmina Boldt Interior Design Program offers two tracks leading to a Master of Arts in interior design. The post-professional track is for those with an undergraduate degree in interior design or architecture. The first professional track is for those with a baccalaureate degree not in interior design or architecture.

Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to

- comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems and generate creative solutions that enhance the human experience in interior environments;
- select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication;
- demonstrate knowledge of the impact of building systems and interior construction on design solutions; and
- understand and apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces.

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

Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to:

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
Comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems as demonstrated through A) multiple concepts that synthesize information gathered during programming and B) demonstration of creative thinking through presentation of a variety of ideas, approaches, and concepts.	<i>New Outcome applied academic year 2014-2015</i>	Yes	2016

Select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication;	<i>New Outcome applied academic year 2014-2015</i>	Yes	2016
Demonstrate knowledge of the impact of building systems and interior construction on design solutions, specifically distribution systems and vertical circulation;	<i>New Outcome applied academic year 2014-2015</i>	Yes	2016
Understand and apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces, particularly fire detection and suppression;	<i>New Outcome applied academic year 2014-2015</i>	Yes	2016

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

As specified in the university mission, strategic plan and school plan of Arts and Sciences, Interior Design’s graduate programs foster intellectual curiosity and promote career preparation. The curriculum both develops and builds on knowledge and skills that enable students to effectively solve design problems in various practice areas in Interior Design (retail, work places, healthcare) and through independently developed capstone evidence-based design projects completed in the two thesis classes. Studio courses focus on independent inquiry and critical thinking, and lecture classes provide supporting information and skills. Interior Design offers two masters programs leading to a Master of Arts in Interior Design. The first-professional program is for people who do not have a degree in Interior Design, whereas the post-professional MA is for people with degrees Interior Design or Architecture. The first-professional MA program has been CIDA (Council for Interior Design Accreditation) since 2005. CIDA accredits only first-professional programs.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

The 2013-2014 SLO’s were revised in keeping with the revision of the graduate programs and in keeping with accreditation standards. They were revised early in 2015 after the program revision was passed. The new SLO’s developed from three outcomes, first, the 2014 revision of the First Professional Masters program; second, deficiencies identified in Visiting Team Report from the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) 2011; and third, the Fall 2014 Three Year Progress Report required by CIDA.

Implemented in fall 2015, the revision of the first professional masters program closely matches the structure and content the earlier revision of the bachelors program. This was undertaken to more effectively address changes in practice and new CIDA accreditation standards. The MA program revision differs from the BA one in its greater emphasis upon increased rigor through higher cognitive levels of learning, course requirements, and a stronger emphasis upon evidence-based design. The latter is becoming more prevalent in interior design practice and is in keeping with masters-level education at Marymount.

The 2011 CIDA visiting team found that student work fell below the required level of achievement for Indicators within four Standards, which are listed below.¹ CIDA requires progress reports addressing weaknesses for all accredited programs. The Fall 2014 Progress Report described steps taken for improvement, the effectiveness of these steps, and what outcomes would demonstrate progress. To demonstrate progress and effectiveness, the department decided that student learning assessment should include these specific standards and indicators. This would enable the department to define steps taken to improve these areas and to evaluate the effectiveness of these steps and the outcomes that demonstrate progress toward meeting these expectations in preparation for the 2017 CIDA reaccreditation visit. Consequently, the 2013-2014 Student Learning Outcomes were revised to address CIDA standards. A closer look at that the outcomes, showed that they were too broad to assess effectively, so performance standards based upon CIDA indicators were used in Outcomes 1 (A & B), 3 and 4.

Review of student work remains the direct indicator for SLO's. Since the revised program was implemented in fall, 2015, the same two courses were assessed as in 2013-2014. Instructors from ID 581 and ID 699 reviewed student work using the rubric in the Appendix. ID 581, Masters Studio II, was the second graduate studio (2nd year; 2nd semester; ID 606 replaced it) and focused on office planning. ID 699, Thesis or Design Research Project II, remains as the capstone course of the both first-and post-professional programs. In the first course, ID 698, students identify their own research programs that address some part of a design practice area, such as healthcare. They collect and analyze data and apply the findings to their design projects in ID 699.

For an indirect measure, the department conducted an email exit survey of the 8 graduates. Using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), the alumni were asked to respond to each of the 4 SLO's assessed this year. The difference between the number theses assessed (6) and the student self-assessment (7) is because two students chose to write research theses. The department decided to send all the spring 2015 graduates as an assessment of the program.

The strength of the assessment lies in its evaluation of student work as a direct outcome and the exit survey as an indirect measure. Both provide different pictures of student learning. All SLO's can be assessed through specific characteristics evident in student work. This is in line with and supports our accreditation because CIDA requires direct evidence from student work to support findings of the program's self-study.

One weakness is that work of only 8 students was evaluated because of a small number of cohorts. Next year's assessment will include more students as our numbers have increased.

The 2015-2016 assessment will help assess the effectiveness of the revised program. The main programmatic changes were in the architectural graphics courses (changed from 2 to 3) and the lower level studios (changed from 1 to 2). A stronger foundation in graphics and interior design should improve outcomes in upper level studios and in thesis. The additional studios offer students more opportunity for creativity, while learning the application of color and building foundational knowledge and skills for later studios (human factors, building codes, universal design). Additionally, a construction documents course was added; this addressed a weakness found in 2013-2014. And individual components of data collection and analysis using typical research methods in Interior Design (Observation, Behavior Mapping, Surveys, Case Studies) were

added to the three Graduate Practice Studios. Students first learn these methods first semester, first year in ID 500. Then they apply them in their studios.

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

The 2013-2014-assessment report had minimal recommendations for improvement because a program revision was planned. The new program would require different Student Learning Outcomes. The weakness in Learning Outcome 4 was addressed in a new course, ID 545, Construction Documents.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
SLOs were revised in keeping with the program revision and CIDA Progress report	Revision of the curriculum and learning outcomes	First and Post professional curricula were revised and first offered fall 2015.
Learning outcome 4, although met, indicated some weakness	New course ID 545 addresses construction documents.	It, however, is not assessed.

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

New Learning Outcomes were created and put into the catalog early in 2015. They are assessed in this report although the new courses are not. The Assessment Committee noted that Outcome 4 in the 2013-2014 was not removed from the Catalog in 2014-2015. That particular outcome is no longer assessed.

Outcomes and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 1: Comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems through A) multiple concepts that synthesize information gathered during programming and B) demonstration of creative thinking through presentation of a variety of ideas, approaches, and concepts

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

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
A) Direct measure; student work was assessed by the studio and thesis instructors	Rubric uses a 0-3 point scale. Values: 0-no evidence 1-minimal evidence 2-adequate evidence 3-strong evidence Standard: 80% of students must obtain a 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met.	Assessment rubrics distributed to faculty of ID 581 (Master Studio II) and ID 699 (Thesis or Design Research Project II); faculty assessed students' final projects using 0-3 value scale Two students assessed in ID 581; 6 in ID 699; all were in the first professional masters program.	1) Student scores recorded by class in a table for analysis. See appendix 2) 100% of students received a 2 or 3 on this outcome. The outcome was met as shown in the students' abilities to generate multiple design concepts or design responses to synthesize information collected during programming
B) Direct measure; student work was assessed by the studio and thesis instructors	Rubric uses a 0-3 point scale. Values: 0-no evidence 1-minimal evidence 2-adequate evidence 3-strong evidence Standard: 80% of students must obtain a 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met.	Assessment rubrics distributed to faculty of ID 581 (Master Studio II) and ID 699 (Thesis or Design Research Project II); faculty assessed students' final projects using 0-3 value scale Two students assessed in ID 581; 6 in ID 699; all were in the first professional masters program.	1) Student scores recorded by class in a table for analysis. See appendix. 2) 87.5% of students received a 2 or 3 on this outcome. The learning outcome was met as shown in the student work showing creative thinking through presentation of variety of ideas, approaches, and concepts
Indirect Measure: Exit Survey	Students asked to respond to a 5-point Likert scale 5 = Strongly agree	7 out of 8 of the 2015 graduate responded (87.5% response rate) to the email survey	1) Student answers recorded in table for analysis. See appendix 2) 100% of students strongly agreed or agreed. The learning

	4= Agree 3= Neutral 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree Standard: 80% of students would strongly agree or agree		outcome was met.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------

Interpretation of Results

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

This department’s threshold for success exceed by 20% (A) and 12.5% (B) in both assessed outcomes using a direct measure of student work. The threshold for success was exceeded by 20% in the indirect measure.

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

A) All 8 students received either a 2 or 3 value (strong to adequate evidence), showing this to be a programmatic strength. Both 581 students’ work showed strong evidence (3), while 1/3 of the thesis students received 3’s. Thesis students were not required to include their process work, which would have shown multiple concepts. There was some evidence of process on the project presentation boards and thesis books. Improvement would include more 3’s (strong evidence) among the graduate students.

B) Out of the work assessed for eight students, 7 (87.5%) received a 2 or a 3 value (strong to adequate evidence), which is above the 80% threshold. One thesis student’s work showed only minimal evidence (1) of multiple ideas, approaches & or concepts; four showed adequate evidence (2); and one showed strong evidence (3), whereas both ID 581 students’ work showed strong evidence (3). Thesis students were not required to include their process work—sketches, diagrams, matrices, etc.—which are evidence of multiple ideas, approaches, or concepts. There was some evidence of multiple ideas on the project presentation boards. Improvement would include no 1’s and more 3’s among the graduate students.

Data from the indirect measure supports the findings of program strength in direct measure since all students strongly agreed or agreed (57% and 43% respectively) that they both comprehended and were able to use the design process.

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

This year, all studio and thesis students will be required to save their process work to better demonstrate this outcome in the 2017 CIDA visit. Previously, this was not required for thesis. Process work will show multiple concepts and creative solutions through multiple ideas, approaches, and concepts. Additionally, thesis books could be reviewed for process work. Students are required to show their work in the books but not necessarily on the presentation boards, which have limited space.



The 2016 SL Assessment will include a lower level (ID 605) interior design studio (2nd year, 1st semester) and thesis (3rd year, 2nd semester). More student work will be assessed as our numbers have increased. No other program or curricula changes are planned.

Learning Outcome 2: Select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication;

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes X No

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

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Direct measure because student work was assessed by the studio and thesis instructors.	Rubric uses a 0-3 point scale. Values: 0-no evidence 1-minimal evidence 2-adquate evidence 3-strong evidence Standard: 80% of students must obtain a 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met.	Assessment rubrics distributed to faculty of ID 581 (Master Studio II) and ID 699 (Thesis or Design Research Project II); faculty assessed students' final projects using 0-3 value scale Two students assessed in ID 581; 6 in ID 699; all were in the first professional masters program.	1) Student scores recorded by class in a table for analysis. 2) 100% of students received a 2 or 3 on this outcome. The learning outcome was met.
Indirect Measure: Exit Survey	Students asked to respond to a 5-point Likert scale 5 = Strongly agree 4= Agree 3= Neutral 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree Standard: 80% of students would strongly agree or agree	7 out of 8 of the 2015 graduate responded (87.5% response rate) to the email survey	1) Student answers recorded in table for analysis. See appendix 2) 71% of students strongly agreed or agreed so the learning outcome was not met.

Interpretation of Results

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



This department's threshold for success was exceeded by more than 20% of the student work in a direct measure. The indirect measure did not meet the standard by 9%.

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

All students assessed by the faculty received a 2 or 3 value (adequate to strong evidence), exceeding the department's expectations. A slight improvement in use of color was evident between the two classes. Both ID 581 students' work received a 2 (adequate). Seven out of 8 thesis students received a 3; one received a 2. The thesis students had had 2 additional studios in which to develop color skills.

Student work covered a variety of different interior environments from workplaces, to residences, to permanent supportive housing. Color was used functionally and behaviorally for wayfinding and differentiation of spaces and aesthetically and culturally to indicate sustainable materials and a sustainable or green interior environment.

Student self-assessments did not match that of the faculty by a small margin (9%). Although the majority (5), strongly agreed or agreed (43% and 29%) that they could apply color based on various factors, there was one neutral and one disagree response.

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

In the revised program, color theory and application is specifically addressed in three studios: Studio I & 2 and Sketching and Rendering (ID 122), and student color is covered in all other studios. Additionally, thesis students are required to create design recommendations, which could include color, and annotate them on their floor plans and other drawings. Student self-assessment should improve. No other program or curricular changes are planned.

Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate knowledge of the impact of building systems and interior construction on design solutions, specifically distribution systems and vertical circulation;

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes X No

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

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Direct measure because student work was assessed by the studio and thesis instructors.	Rubric uses a 0-3 point scale. Values: 0-no evidence 1-minimal evidence 2-adquate evidence 3-strong evidence Standard: 80% of students must obtain a 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met.	Assessment rubrics distributed to faculty of ID 581 (Master Studio II) and ID 699 (Thesis or Design Research Project II); faculty assessed students' final projects using 0-3 value scale Two students assessed in ID 581; 6 in ID 699; all were in the first professional masters program.	1) Student scores recorded by class in a table for analysis. 2) 87.5% of students received a 2 or 3 on this outcome.
Indirect Measure: Exit Survey	Students asked to respond to a 5-point Likert scale 5 = Strongly agree 4= Agree 3= Neutral 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree Standard: 80% of students would strongly agree or agree	7 out of 8 of the 2015 graduate responded (87.5% response rate) to the email survey	1) Student answers recorded in table for analysis. See appendix 2) 86% of students strongly agreed or agreed so the learning outcome was met.

Interpretation of Results

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



This department's threshold for success was exceeded by 12.5% of the students. This outcome is a direct measure as it assesses student work for knowledge of the impact of building systems upon interiors. Specifically assessed were distribution systems such as, such as HVAC or plumbing and vertical circulation, such as stairs and/or elevators. The threshold for success was exceeded by 6% in the indirect measure. Student self-assessment also met the outcome.

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

Seven students received a 2 or 3 (adequate or strong evidence) on this outcome. One thesis student received a 1 (minimal). Thesis students received the two 3's; both students in ID 581 received 2s. This indicates a slight improvement in thesis over the studio course as 3 out of 6 thesis students received 2s. There is room for improvement—more 3's and no 1's—in this SLO as it is an important aspect of Interior Design professional practice.

Seven alumni responded strongly agree or agree There. There was one neutral response. This is in line with the findings on the direct measure.

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

This SLO remains part of ID 605 in the revised program. However, this is a 2nd year, first semester studio so scores could remain at a majority of 2s (adequate). Starting in spring 2016, thesis will be taught as a studio class so work should begin to demonstrate stronger evidence of the impact of building systems and interior construction. Stronger documentation of this SLO will also be required on thesis projects. No other program or curricular changes are planned.

Learning Outcome 4: Understand and apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces, particularly through fire detection and suppression;

Is this outcome being reexamined? Yes X No

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

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
Direct measure because student work was assessed by the studio and thesis instructors.	Rubric uses a 0-3 point scale. Values: 0-no evidence 1-minimal evidence 2-adequate evidence 3-strong evidence Standard: 80% of students must obtain a 2 or 3 for the outcome to be met.	Assessment rubrics distributed to faculty of ID 581 (Master Studio II) and ID 699 (Thesis or Design Research Project II); faculty assessed students' final projects using 0-3 value scale Two students assessed in ID 581; 6 in ID 699; all were in the first professional masters program.	1) Student scores recorded by class in a table for analysis. 2) Only 25% of students received a 2 or 3 on this outcome. The learning outcome was not met in evidence of fire detection and suppression.
Indirect Measure: Exit Survey	Students asked to respond to a 5-point Likert scale 5 = Strongly agree 4= Agree 3= Neutral 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree Standard: 80% of students would strongly agree or agree	7 out of 8 of the 2015 graduate responded (87.5% response rate) to the email survey	1) Student answers recorded in table for analysis. See appendix 2) 57%% of students strongly agreed or agreed so the learning outcome was not met.

Interpretation of Results

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

This department's threshold for success was not met in either the direct measure or indirect measures.

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

Only the work of the two students in ID 581 showed evidence of fire detection and suppression, the two indicators chosen by the department to assess this year. Their work was showed strong evidence (3). None of the thesis work showed any evidence.

Strongly agree responses in the exit survey were 57% answered strongly agree (4 out of 7, a majority) but there were 2 neutral responses (29%) and 1 disagree (14%). According to the student self-assessment, this is the weakest aspect of the program. The finding cannot be compared to the direct indicators however.

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

This particular outcome has not been a specific requirement in thesis projects. Starting in spring 2016, thesis will be taught as a studio class, so work should begin to demonstrate stronger evidence of the laws, codes, and guidelines particularly in fire detection and suppression. Reflected ceiling plans, which help show fire detection and suppression are now required in thesis projects. Reinforcing this SLO in thesis also will likely boost student knowledge in laws, codes and standard in the exit survey. No other program or curricular changes are planned.

Appendices

Outcome 1: Comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems through a) generation of multiple design concepts or design responses to programmatic requirements and b) generation of creative solutions that enhance the human experience in interior environments

Direct Measure

A. Generation of multiple design concepts or design responses to programmatic requirements

ID 581		
Student	Point Value	100% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	

ID 699		
Student	Point Value	33.33% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	
Student 3	2.0	66.67% Adequate Evidence
Student 4	2.0	
Student 5	2.0	
Student 6	2.0	

B. Generation of creative solutions that enhance the human experience in interior environments

ID 581		
Student	Point Value	100% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	

ID 699		
Student	Point Value	16.7% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	2.0	66.6% Adequate Evidence
Student 3	2.0	
Student 4	2.0	
Student 5	2.0	
Student 6	1.0	16.7% Minimal Evidence

Outcome 1: I can comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems and generate creative solutions that enhance the human experience in interior environments.

Indirect Measure:

Exit Survey	
Student 1	4
Student 2	4
Student 3	5
Student 4	5
Student 5	4
Student 6	5
Student 7	5
ABOVE neutral (4 or 5)	100%
Neutral or above (3, 4, or 5)	100%
Strongly Agree: 4 responses	57%
Agree: 3 responses	43%
Neutral: 0 responses	0%
Disagree: 0 responses)	0%
Strongly Disagree: 0 responses	0%

Outcome 2: Select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication

Direct Measure:

ID 581		
Student	Point Value	100% Adequate Evidence
Student 1	2.0	
Student 2	2.0	

ID 699		
Student	Point Value	83.3% Strong evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	
Student 3	3.0	
Student 4	3.0	
Student 5	3.0	
Student 6	2.0	16.7% Adequate Evidence

Outcome 2: I can select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication.

Indirect Measure:

Exit Survey	
Student 1	2
Student 2	3
Student 3	4
Student 4	5
Student 5	5
Student 6	5
Student 7	4
ABOVE neutral (4 or 5)	71 %
Neutral or above (3, 4, or 5)	86%
Strongly Agree: 3 responses	43%
Agree: 2 responses	29%%
Neutral: 1 response	14%
Disagree: 1 response	14%
Strongly Disagree 0 responses	0%

Outcome 3: Demonstrate knowledge of the impact of building systems and interior construction on design solutions

Direct Measure:

ID 581		
Student	Point Value	100% Adequate Evidence
Student 1	2.0	
Student 2	2.0	

ID 699		
Student	Point Value	33.3% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	50% Adequate Evidence
Student 3	2.0	
Student 4	2.0	
Student 5	2.0	16.7% Minimal Evidence
Student 6	1.0	

Outcome 3: I have knowledge of the impact of building systems and interior construction on design solutions.

Indirect Measure:

Exit Survey	
Student 1	5
Student 2	3
Student 3	4
Student 4	5
Student 5	4
Student 6	5
Student 7	5
ABOVE neutral (4 or 5)	86 %
Neutral & above (3, 4, or 5)	100%
Strongly Agree: 4 responses	57%%
Agree: 2 responses	29%%
Neutral: 1 response	14%
Disagree: 0 responses	0%
Strongly Disagree: 0 responses	0%

Outcome 4: Understand and apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces, particularly through fire detection and suppression

Direct Measure:

ID 581		
Student	Point Value	100% Strong Evidence
Student 1	3.0	
Student 2	3.0	

ID 699		
Student	Point Value	100% No Evidence
Student 1	0	
Student 2	0	
Student 3	0	
Student 4	0	
Student 5	0	
Student 6	0	

Outcome 4: I understand and can apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces.

Indirect Measure

Exit Survey	
Student 1	2
Student 2	3
Student 3	5
Student 4	5
Student 5	3
Student 6	5
Student 7	5
ABOVE neutral (4 or 5)	57%
Neutral & Above (3, 4, or 5)	86%
Strongly Agree: 4 responses	57%%
Agree: 0 responses	0%%
Neutral: 2 responses	29%
Disagree: 1 response	14%
Strongly Disagree: 0 responses	0%

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

INSTRUCTIONS TO FACULTY

The interior design department has committed to annually assess student learning in ID 581 and 699.

Faculty teaching these courses need to complete the rubric below at the end of the semester. One rubric should be completed for each student enrolled in your course.

IF you have questions, please contact Bridget May

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Course/Semester: ID 581, Spring 2015	Instructor:	Student:
---------------------------------------------	-------------	----------

<i>The final project for the semester/studio shows the student can:</i>				
Comprehend and use all aspects of the design process to identify and explore design problems through a) generation of multiple design concepts or design responses to programmatic requirements and b) generation of creative solutions that enhance the human experience in interior environments	0	1	2	3
Select and apply color principles and theories with regard to the functional, behavioral, aesthetic, and/or cultural needs of users of interior environments and in aspects of visual communication	0	1	2	3
Demonstrate understanding that design solutions affect and are affected by building distribution (HVA, plumbing) and interior construction systems (staircases, elevators)	0	1	2	3
Understand and apply laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that affect the design of interior spaces, particularly through fire detection and suppression	0	1	2	3

- 0** Student work provides no evidence of this knowledge or skill
- 1** Student work shows minimal evidence of this knowledge or skill
- 2** Student work shows adequate evidence of this knowledge or skill
- 3** Student work shows strong evidence of this knowledge or skill

¹ CIDA Standards and Indicators identified by the team IN 2011 as not being met were:

Standard 4. Design Process

Entry-level interior designers need to apply all aspects of the design process to creative problem solving. Design process enables designers to identify and explore complex problems and generate creative solutions that support human behavior within the interior environment.

Students are **able** to:

- d) synthesize information and generate multiple concepts and/or multiple design responses to programmatic requirements.
- e) demonstrate creative thinking and originality through presentation of a variety of ideas, approaches, and concepts.

Standard 10. Color and Light

Entry-level interior designers apply the principles and theories of color and light.

Student work demonstrates **understanding** of:

- a) color principles, theories, and systems.

Standard 13. Interior Construction and Building Systems

Entry-level interior designers have knowledge of interior construction and building systems.

Student work demonstrates **understanding** that design solutions affect and are impacted by:

- c) distribution systems including power, mechanical, HVAC, data/voice telecommunications, and plumbing.
- d) energy, security, and building controls systems.
- e) the interface of furniture with distribution and construction systems.
- f) vertical circulation systems.

Standard 14. Regulations

Entry-level interior designers use laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that impact the design of interior spaces.

Student work demonstrates **understanding** of laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that impact fire and life safety, including:

- e) detection: active devices that alert occupants including smoke/heat detectors and alarm systems.
- f) suppression: devices used to extinguish flames including sprinklers, standpipes, fire hose cabinets, extinguishers, etc.

Students select and **apply** appropriate:

- i) accessibility guidelines.