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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>CIDA Standard</th>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Students will be able to articulate a global view and integrate considerations of social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in their work</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate awareness of the role of interior designers in the design process and the value of integrated design practices and can effectively collaborate with multiple disciplines in developing design solutions</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental principles and processes that define the profession of interior design and the value of interior design to society</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Students will be able to apply knowledge of human experience and behavior to designing the built environment.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Students will be able to employ all aspects of the design process to creatively solve a design problem.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Students will be able to communicate effectively in both oral and written formats.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Students will be able to apply knowledge of history and theory of interiors, architecture, decorative arts, and art when solving design problems.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Students will be able to apply elements and principles of design.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Students will be able to use color effectively in communication and design work.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Students will be able to develop design solutions that integrate furnishings, products, materials, and finishes.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Students will be able to use effectively the principles of lighting, acoustics, thermal comfort, and indoor air quality in relation to environmental impact and human wellbeing.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of interior construction and its interrelationship with base building construction and systems.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Students will be able to formulate designs that are in compliance with laws, codes, standards, and guidelines that impact human experience of interior spaces.</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and relevant school plan:

The Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) reaccredited the Bachelor of Arts program in Interior Design in 2011. The Interior Design program has maintained continuous accreditation since 1985. The program’s main mission is to 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 and with the Council for Interior Design Qualifications (CIDQ) areas of knowledge for qualifying candidacy to sit for the professional exam certifying interior designers. Many of our students take the exam after school – we prepare them for eligibility upon graduation and with two to three years of work experience in the field. Additionally, we uphold the university’s mission toward providing an education that fosters inquiry and self-discovery in the programmatic, schematic and design development stages of our learning outcomes. Furthermore, the Interior Design program’s studio and lecture courses teach students to be ethical and responsible designers as defined in CIDA standards.
Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements:

Course Assessment

**Internship (ID-400)** requires students to complete 120 hours at a firm/company in the design industry. The course provides an experiential understanding of the interior design practice.
- There were three sections of ID-434 taught during the assessment year.
- Interior design faculty assessed reflection essays completed by each enrolled student. Data is aggregated across all sections to access student learning outcomes defined by the Interior Design program.
- The *Collaboration* SLA was assessed in this course.

**Senior Capstone II (ID-409)** is a senior level design studio where students design individual projects based on evidence collected and analyzed in Senior Capstone I (ID-408). Student projects are self-identified, researched, and developed under faculty supervision. Project practice areas often include healthcare, education, hospitality, and retail.
- There were three sections of ID-409 taught during the assessment year.
- Interior design faculty assessed the capstone project completed by each enrolled student. Data is aggregated across all sections to access student learning outcomes defined by the Interior Design program.
- Both *global context* and *human-centered design* SLAs were assessed in this course.

**Business Procedures (ID-434)** is a senior level survey of interior design business practices. The course provides a broad understanding of business ethics, professional organizations, and procedures.
- There were two sections of ID-434 taught during the assessment year.
- Interior design faculty assessed project books completed by each enrolled student. Data is aggregated across all sections to access student learning outcomes defined by the Interior Design program.
- The *Business Practices and Professionalism* SLA was assessed in this course.

**Student Exit Survey**

Students that completed ID-409 during the assessment year were provided an exit survey where they were asked to self-report their competence in all four SLAs.
- 16 of 20 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:

- Site supervisor surveys for ID-400 could not be modified to include prompts that would assess student understanding of the collaboration SLA.
- CIDA modified the accreditation standards effective January 2016. The ID curriculum was design in support of the 2014 CIDA standards. Significant changes in the CIDA standards are not fully evident in the teaching objectives throughout the curriculum. These will be address after our reaccreditation visit (Fall 17) and program review (Fall 18).
Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Outcome 1: Students will capably use quantitative and qualitative skills to evaluate and assess project goals and objectives</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Outcome 2: Student projects demonstrate the ability to evaluate the health, safety, and welfare in the built environment and apply findings to the final design solution.</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Outcome 3: Student establish critical thinking skills to synthesize previously learned knowledge in programming, research, codes application, and schematic design to the capstone project.</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
<td>No planned improvement for this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Outcome 4: Student projects demonstrate the ability to evaluate various design theories, thinking styles, future concepts, and developmental processes in the evolution of their design projects.</td>
<td>Interior Design faculty will look closer at this standard to determine why Reston Center student performance is different than main campus student performance.</td>
<td>After closer examination of the data, the department believes that although the percentage of students underperforming was twice as large at Reston, the quantity of students underperforming was actually less. We attribute this difference to lower cohort sizes at Reston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 Outcome 5: Student projects establish effective design response skills using written, oral, and visual techniques.</td>
<td>There is an opportunity to look at this outcome assessment and identify appropriate ID elective coursework to run at Reston Center.</td>
<td>The department created an advanced point-to-point elective that runs simultaneously on both main campus and at Reston. ID-416 focuses on outcomes similar to this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

Critical Area 1 Learning Outcomes:

**Comments**: Clearly these outcomes are highly driven by the CIDA. Any room for a MU-specific outcome? Outcomes should be stated as, “Students should be able to…”

**Program Response**: We consulted with Ann Boudinot last academic year and revised our learning outcomes to more holistically reflect CIDA standards. The decision at that time was to limit program outcomes to the 12 CIDA standards related to knowledge acquisition and application. It is our understanding that the revised outcomes are appropriate for a professionally accredited program like Interior Design.

Critical Area 2 Assessing Outcomes:

**Comments (outcome measures)**: Measures were appropriate for outcomes being assessed

**Program Response**: no response required.

**Comments (collection of student work)**: Consider using multiple judges, and not only the “faculty teaching” the course. (ID-305 and ID-409)

**Program Response**: Logistics this past year made it difficult (again) to have multiple judges for each assessed standard. We will discuss as a faculty how to include external critics in our next program assessment report.

**Comments (analysis)**: Good use of tables. Good use of demonstrating achievement between Jr. and Sr. year. Thank you for distinguishing between Reston and Main Campus.

**Program Response**: We will continue to use this format to present our assessment.
Critical Area 3 Improving Curriculum:

Comments (making curricular improvements): You conclude “no curricula improvements” Please note that the assessment process should fully explore opportunities for improvement. Possible solutions might include raising the performance standards. Would like to see that the University Assessment process helps you improve your curriculum. The own analysis in the report shows that improvements are being considered.

Program Response: The program agrees with this feedback. As part of our self-study for our Fall 17 reaccreditation visit, the department has identified curricular improvements that address both the goals of our accrediting body and the mission of the program. Because this year’s assessment report aligns with accreditation standards, the department is already using the data to identify/address areas for improvement in the curriculum.

Comments (implementing improvements): Improvements were all related to new curriculum.

Program Response: no response needed.

Comments (addressing recommendations): We appreciate your response to all comments.

Program Response: We thank you all for your thoughtful comments.
Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 1:

*Students will be able to articulate a global view and integrate considerations of social, cultural, economic, and ecological contexts in their work*

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outcomes of ID-409 capstone projects were measured by Interior Design faculty.  
Standard rubrics used by all faculty provide direct measures with categorical data. | 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome.  
Faculty teaching ID-409 and the department chair complete standard rubrics at the completion of the semester.  
Students in this assessment are in fourth-year interior design studios. The population includes both transfer and non-transfer students. The population includes students taking courses at and Reston Center on main campus. | **19** students were assessed for this learning outcome across three difference course sections.  
**95%** of students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome.  
**Reston and Main Campus**  
**80%** of Reston students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome.  
**100%** of main campus 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-409 during the reporting year.  
| 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome.  
| Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-409 Senior Capstone II.  
| The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA.  
| **16** students responded to this survey question.  
| **100%** of students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
| **100%** of Reston and main campus students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
| *See table 1 for reported evaluations and analysis.* |
### Table 1

**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students** (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):
The learning outcome was achieved in the course assessment at Reston Center AND on main campus.

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

**Strength**: Student projects exceeded the performance standard by 15%. 68% of students performed at a “superior” level of understanding. Data shows similar achievements levels when disaggregated based on cohort and based on campus.

**Opportunities**: Self-reported student responses from the exist survey trends down from faculty assessment. This could indicate that students do not fully understand this standard as it relates to their performance in senior capstone.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome**:
Because this standard shows a significant student achievement (68%) at a “superior level” the program will make no changes to the curriculum. This is in large part because we are currently collecting evidence of student achievement for our Fall 17 reaccreditation visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-409</th>
<th>Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Unacceptable Outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXIT SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Unacceptable Outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Outcome 2: 
*Students will be able to demonstrate awareness of the role of interior designers in the design process and the value of integrated design practices and can effectively collaborate with multiple disciplines in developing design solutions.*

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

<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. |

Outcomes of ID-400 reflection essays were measured by Interior Design Academic Internship Mentor. 

80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome.

The academic internship mentor in ID-400 evaluated two separate written prompts where students were asked to describe the “value of integrated design practice” and different methods of “collaboration” at their internship site.

The population includes both transfer and non-transfer students.

12 students were assessed for this learning outcome across three different semesters.

92% of students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome in the collaboration essay.

75% of students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome in the integrated design practice areas essay.

*See table 2 for reported evaluations and analysis.*

Outcomes were also measured with an exit survey of students that completed ID-409 during the reporting year.

80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome.

Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-409 Senior Capstone II.

The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA.

15 students responded to this survey question.

100% of students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.

100% of Reston and main campus students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.

*See table 2 for reported evaluations and analysis.*
TABLE 2

**Interpretation of Results**

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

The learning outcome was achieved when students responded to the “collaboration” writing prompt. The learning outcome was not met when students were asked to respond to the “practice areas” writing prompt.

The exit survey shows 100% achievement for this learning outcome.

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

**Strength:** Student essays exceeded the performance standard by 12% on collaboration. Student surveys show that students rate themselves which a higher understanding of collaboration in practice than their work suggests they understand.

**Opportunities:** Students have more difficulty discussing the value of integrated design practice. There are opportunities to create more formal assignments in the internship semester to better prepare students.

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

The department will identify where topics related to integrated design practice should be placed in the curriculum prior to the internship experience.
Outcome and Past Assessment

Learning Outcome 3: Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental principles and processes that define the profession of interior design and the value of interior design to society.

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

<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. |
| Outcomes were measured by Interior Design faculty teaching ID-434. | 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome. | Faculty teaching ID-434 assessed the final project book from this course at the completion of the semester. | 29 students were assessed for this learning outcome across two difference course sections.  
97% of students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome in the collaboration essay.  
Reston and Main Campus  
100% of Reston Center students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome in the collaboration essay.  
95% of main campus students demonstrated “adequate” or better evidence for this learning outcome in the collaboration essay.  
See table 3 for reported evaluations and analysis. |
| Outcomes were also measured with an exit survey of students that completed ID-409 during the reporting year. | 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating “adequate”, “strong”, or “superior” evidence for this learning outcome. | Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-409 Senior Capstone II.  
The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA. | 16 students responded to this survey question.  
94% of students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
100% of main campus students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
67% of Reston center students reported “adequate” or better understanding of this learning outcome. |
**Academic Year:** 2015-16  
**Program:** Interior Design (BA)

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID-434</th>
<th>Unacceptable Outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXIT SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Campus</th>
<th>Reston Center</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Evaluated</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unacceptable</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate (3)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong (4)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior (5)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acceptable</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students** (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*): The learning outcome was achieved on main campus and at Reston Center in faculty assessment but was not achieved in Reston Center student responses to the exit survey.

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

**Strength:** Student projects exceeded the performance standard by 27%. The assessment shows significant growth in outcomes between junior (ID-305) and senior (ID-409) year. Students on main campus also self-report understanding of this outcome at 100% on main campus.

**Opportunities:** 33% of students at Reston Center report inadequate understanding of this outcome in the exit survey. Interior Design faculty will look closer at this standard to determine why Reston Center student performance is different than main campus student performance.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:** Because this standard shows a significant student achievement (72%) at a “superior level” the program will make no changes to the curriculum. This is in large part because we are currently collecting evidence of student achievement for our Fall 17 reaccreditation visit.
### Outcome and Past Assessment

**Learning Outcome 4:** Students will be able to apply knowledge of human experience and behavior to designing the built environment.

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

<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. |
| Outcomes of ID-409 capstone projects were measured by Interior Design faculty. Standard rubrics used by all faculty provide direct measures with categorical data. | 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome. | Faculty teaching ID-409 and the department chair complete standard rubrics at the completion of the semester. Students in this assessment are in fourth-year interior design studios. The population includes students taking courses at and Reston Center on main campus. | 19 students were assessed for this learning outcome across three difference course sections.  
95% of students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome.  
**Reston and Main Campus**  
80% of Reston students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome.  
100% of main campus students demonstrated "adequate" or better evidence for this learning outcome.  
See table 4 for reported evaluations and analysis. |
| Outcomes were also measured with an exit survey of students that completed ID-409 during the reporting year. | 80% of students will be assessed as demonstrating "adequate", "strong", or "superior" evidence for this learning outcome. | Students respond to prompt in Exit survey upon completion of ID-409 Senior Capstone II. The survey asked students to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the SLA. | 16 students responded to this survey question.  
100% of students reported "adequate" or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
100% of Reston and main campus students reported "adequate" or better understanding of this learning outcome.  
See table 4 for reported evaluations and analysis. |
Academic Year: 2015-16
Program: Interior Design (BA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Unacceptable Outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
<td>Total Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXIT SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Evaluated</th>
<th>Unacceptable Outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak (1)</td>
<td>Inadequate (2)</td>
<td>Total Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

**Interpretation of Results (outcome 4)**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**
The learning outcome was achieved in the course assessment at Reston Center AND on main campus.

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**
**Strength:** Student projects exceeded the performance standard by 15%. 63% of students performed at a “superior” level of understanding. Data shows similar achievements levels when disaggregated based on cohort and based on campus.

**Opportunities:** Human Centered Design is at the core of what we teach throughout our student sequence. There is an opportunity in future years to measure achievement across multiple studios to determine where and how students grow in their achievement of this objective.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:**
Because this standard shows a significant student achievement (63%) at a “superior level” the program will make no changes to the curriculum. This is in large part because we are currently collecting evidence of student achievement for our Fall 17 reaccreditation visit.