

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE & PRODUCT DESIGN

Assessment Plan for Student Learning Outcomes SPRING 2004

A. College, Department, and Date of this Submission

College of Architecture Planning and Design
Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design
Spring 2004

B. Contact Person for the Assessment Plans

Robert Bullock, Associate Professor

C. Degree Program

Bachelor of Interior Architecture and Product Design (5-year curriculum)

D. Assessment of Student Learning Three-Year Plan

The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design has the following two Accrediting Agencies:

- 1) Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research (FIDER)
 - Accredited since 1974.
 - Most recently in June 2000, valid until 2006.
 - The standards (SLOs) prescribed by FIDER are copied and attached to this document.

- 2) National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
 - Accredited since 1999.
 - Most recently in 2004, valid until 2014.
 - This is a joint accreditation through the cooperation of programs in three colleges involved the Department of Art in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Interior Design Program in the College of Human Ecology, and the Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design in the College of Architecture and Planning.

In addition to the two accrediting agencies, there are assessment programs in place for the Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design that review the plans and products of the students and faculty. These are the following methods:

- The Students – annual survey
- The Faculty – semester course evaluations and Studio Coordination Committee
- The Professional Advisory Board – bi-annual critique of the program and goals
- The Internship Evaluations done by Employers –annual evaluations
- Employer Demand for our graduates

The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design is rated third in the nation by *Greenway's Almanac of Architecture & Design 2005/Sixth Edition* in the article "America's Best Interior Design Schools 2005". The 6th annual *DesignIntelligence 2005* considers the Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design second for "Top 40 Editor's Picks: 2005 Analysis of Interior Design Programs."

1. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design (IAPD) will focus on the following two learning outcomes in the three-year assessment plan:

- (1) Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of **effective communication through the use of drawings, graphics, and written presentation.**
- (2) Students will demonstrate their understanding of **critical and creative thinking of space planning, lighting, exhibition, product design, signage/communication, and implementation within a built environment.**

Special rationale for selecting these learning outcomes (optional):

- The two SLOs listed above were selected due to the nature of the IAPD curriculum and the outcomes (i.e. indirect and direct measures). These measures are intended to illustrate a variety of student work within the IAPD curriculum over the next several years. The future collected SLO data will illustrate student learning from the majority of the IAPD studios and coursework, which gives an overview of student learning.

University-wide SLOs (Undergraduate Programs)						
Program SLOs	Knowledge	Critical Thinking	Communication	Diversity	Academic /Professional Integrity	Program SLO is conceptually different from university SLOs
(1) Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of effective communication through the use of drawings, graphics, and written presentation.	X	X	X		X	
(2) Students will demonstrate their understanding of critical and creative thinking of space planning, lighting, exhibition, product design, signage/communication, and implementation within a built environment.	X	X	X		X	

2. How will the learning outcomes be assessed? What groups will be included in the assessment?

Learning Outcomes	Measures			Who will be assessed?
	Direct	Indirect	Not Sure	
(1) Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of effective communication through the use of drawings, graphics, and written presentation.	Portfolio studio assignment (3 week project). [Attached is the Rubric used to grade in the 2004 fall semester]. Student will compile a professional portfolio using their work from previous courses.	Students' confidence ratings on the portfolio project using a teval format after the portfolio's submittal. Employer reports on students, the portfolio, and student knowledge from the interview process and during internship.		All fourth year IAPD students will be assessed during the fall semester.
(2) Students will demonstrate their understanding of critical and creative thinking of space planning, lighting, exhibition, product design, signage/communication, restraints of budget, and implementation within a built environment.	KSU Open House IAPD Exhibition. Instructor(s) will use a rubric to grade student work for Open House.	Student self-reflection. Faculty evaluations. IAPD Advisory Board evaluations. Open House Visitor comments.		All third year IAPD students enrolled in IAPD Workshop I will be assessed during the spring semester. IAPD student work representing various IAPD courses from second to fifth year studios.

Students' final studio exercises are reviewed by the instructor(s). Additionally, typically outside critics are asked to critique work at mid and final critiques.

The following is the meaning for each letter grade within the IAPD curriculum:

A = Outstanding work. The submitted project is fully developed and well-communicated (verbally, written, and/or graphically). The innovative design solution illustrates a significant depth of understanding of the project requirements. The submitted work illustrates an unusual or unique solution and the full potential of the problem has been demonstrated. Craft is excellent.

- B = Good work.** The submitted project illustrates an above average depth of understanding. The project solution has exceeded all requirements of the project description. The project demonstrates an above average clarity of idea, execution, and presentation.
- C = Average work.** The submitted project adequately satisfies the project statement. The project solution lacks some depth of understanding and development and innovation is lacking. Craft is just adequate.
- D = Poor work.** The project solution is extremely weak and lacks depth, understanding, and innovation. Craft is weak and inappropriate to the studio expectations.
- F = Unacceptable work.** The project does not resolve the problem statement. The project shows a lack of understanding and demonstrates skill inappropriate to studio expectations.

(Any student in the IAPD curriculum who "double Ds" in any studio must retake one studio for a higher grade.)

3. When will these outcomes be assessed?

Learning Outcomes	Timetable for Assessment Learning Outcomes			A point of comparison or a baseline?
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	
(1) Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of effective communication through the use of drawings, graphics, and written presentation.	Interior Architecture Studio IV Fall 2005	Interior Architecture Studio IV Fall 2006	Interior Architecture Studio IV Fall 2007	Data will be gathered after the project is taught, e.g., about mid-way through the fall semester. A three-year comparison will be created after the 2007 fall semester.
(2) Students will demonstrate their understanding of critical and creative thinking of space planning, lighting, exhibition, product design, signage/communication, resiratants of budget, and implementation within a built environment.	IAPD Workshop I (2 workshop classes) KSU IAPD Open House Exhibition 2006 (in April)	IAPD Workshop I (2 workshop classes) KSU IAPD Open House Exhibition 2007 (in April)	IAPD Workshop I (2 workshop classes) KSU IAPD Open House Exhibition 2008 (in April)	Data will be gathered during and after the IAPD Open House Exhibition is offered, e.g., every April. A three-year comparison data created after the 2007 spring semester.

The IAPD faculty is continuously assessing and evaluating its curriculum, content, and sequencing within its required course work to improve student learning. There is a Studio Coordination Committee that reviews the sequence studio throughout an academic year. The IAPD faculty works directly with its Advisory Board for currency within the profession and industry. Finally, the Program of Interior Architecture and Product Design are assessed by the two accrediting agencies (FIDER and NASAD).

3. (Continued) when and in what format will the results of the assessment be discussed?

Faculty Involved/Format of Discussion	Timetable for Assessment Learning Outcomes			Format for the results
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	
(1) Portfolios will be reviewed and evaluated by the IAPD Studio V instructor(s). Then IAPD faculty and studio coordination members will review and interpret the portfolios for student performance. When the portfolios and information is ready, discussions with faculty will occur at monthly department meetings.	Data collection of portfolios.	Data collection continues.	Compile, review, and discuss results from the previous three years within the IAPD faculty.	<p>Assessment will happen over a three-year period from fall 2005 to 2007 and a three-year comparison of portfolios will be created after the 2007 fall semester.</p> <p>Based on these results, faculty will decide whether changes are needed and how these changes will take place.</p> <p>Then future portfolios will be compared to the three-year baseline.</p>
(2) The KSU IAPD Open House Exhibition will be reviewed and evaluated by IAPD Open House coordinator, IAPD students and faculty, IAPD Advisory Board, and visitors during the Open House exhibition. Then IAPD faculty will review and interpret data collected. When the information is ready, discussions with faculty will occur at monthly department meetings.	Data collection of exhibition.	Data collection continues.	Compile, review, and discuss results from the previous three years within the IAPD faculty.	<p>Assessment will happen over a three-year period from spring 2005 to 2007 and a three-year comparison of portfolios will be created after the 2008 spring semester.</p> <p>Based on these results, faculty will decide whether changes are needed and how these changes will take place.</p> <p>Then future KSU IAPD Open House Exhibition data will be compared to the three-year baseline.</p>

4. What is the unit's process for using assessment results to improve student learning?

Learning Outcomes	Improvement plan
<p>(1) Students will be able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of effective communication through the use of drawings, graphics, and written presentation.</p>	<p>By compiling a baseline and evaluating student performance during the three-year period, IAPD faculty will have a better understanding of IAPD students' strengths and weaknesses throughout the curriculum. Faculty will discuss the results and changes that may be needed if significant weaknesses of student learning are discovered in the studio projects showcased within the student portfolios.</p> <p>Additionally, the reports from employers on students' portfolio during the interview process will provide valuable insight into students' learning and indicate strengths and weaknesses within the IAPD curriculum.</p> <p>The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design will be able to examine overall student learning and performance (compared to the three-year baseline) in the IAPD curriculum in future years.</p>
<p>(2) Students will demonstrate their understanding of critical and creative thinking of space planning, lighting, exhibition, product design, signage/communication, restraints of budget, and implementation within a built environment.</p>	<p>By compiling a baseline and evaluating student performance during the three-year period, faculty will have a better understanding of students' strengths and weaknesses in our overall curriculum. Faculty will discuss the results and changes that may be needed if significant weaknesses are discovered based on the exhibition, project displayed, student self-reflections, IAPD faculty and IAPD Advisory Board evaluations, and KSU IAPD Open House visitor comments.</p> <p>The Department of Interior Architecture and Product Design will be able to examine overall student learning and performance (compared to the three-year baseline) in the IAPD curriculum in future years.</p>

Department: IA #PPD

Evaluative Rubric for Degree Program Assessment Plans

Degree Program Title: B of IA #PPD

Assessment Plan Elements	Very Good 4	Acceptable 3	Developing 2	Undeveloped 1	Score For Each Element
<i>Student learning outcomes</i>	At least two SLO's are clearly stated using the proper format.	At least two SLO's are stated but with some lack of clarity.	SLO's are stated but unclear regarding one or more critical aspects.	SLO's are not stated in an acceptable format.	4
<i>Assessment method for each outcome</i>	Multiple assessment measures are identified for each outcome.	At least one assessment measure is identified for each outcome.	Assessment measures are identified for some outcomes.	Assessment methods are not identified or inadequately described.	3
<i>One-half or more of the methods are direct measures</i>	At least one-half of assessment measures are direct.			Fewer than one-half of the measures are direct measures.	4
<i>Groups to be included</i>	Groups are clearly identified.			Groups are not identified.	4
<i>Timeline for assessment implementation for next three years</i>	There is a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next three years.	The plan is somewhat clear but has some areas that are incomplete.	Some parameters have been established but a clear timeline is not evident.	There is not a stated implementation plan.	4
<i>Process for data presentation and discussion</i>	The process for the interpretation, presentation, and discussion of the data is clearly described, including who will be involved and timing.	The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	Some aspects of the process are described.	There is no stated plan.	4
<i>Process for implementing revisions based on assessment results</i>	The process for implementing revisions based on assessment results is clearly described.	The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	Some aspects of the process are described.	There is no stated plan.	4