Date Received  

**Discipline Annual Assessment Report Form: Fall 2011 Update**  
**DUE NO LATER THAN December 15, 2011**

**Directions:** Please complete a form for each of the programs within your Division. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths. **Send the report form via email to dcoleman@chaminade.edu.**

1. **Program Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Humanities and Fine Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>INTERIOR DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted by</td>
<td>Joan Riggs, ID Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/email</td>
<td>739-8574   <a href="mailto:jriggs@chaminade.edu">jriggs@chaminade.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>December 20, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **According to the Assessment Plan for this program, what were the planned assessment activities for this Assessment Cycle?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes assessed for this academic year</th>
<th>How was the assessment performed</th>
<th>Where are these results stored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a Program, we need to try to assess all 5 Program Outcomes as the work product at each level touches on many, if not all outcome criteria.</td>
<td>A ‘common program rubric’ was to be employed at the end of each course to assess the <strong>body of work</strong> for each student in the course. This same rubric is used to assess the 200 level Practicum. This was the first time using the common rubric and it’s a bit wieldy. Next semester we will deliberate on its effectiveness.</td>
<td>Ultimately, the results will be stored in LiveText (LT). Most faculty did paper versions of the rubric. For each course, an LT ‘assignment’ will need to be made and the rubric can be attached. Then the boxes can be checked, scores calculated and data derived. If the Humanities secretary has time to do this, that would be great. Otherwise, this will be one of the first assignments for the ID secretary in January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some, not all ID faculty submitted assessment material at this writing. However,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted assessment material is stored in the Program Coordinator’s ‘dropbox’ account file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This semester we also took an in-depth look at how our courses align with the CIDA Standards. Since we can link our PO’s to the CIDA standards, this is the first step in recognizing the connection – or not!</td>
<td>after review of the assessments submitted, it appears there may be a bit of confusion on use of the rubric, its intentions and the connections between CUH-ID PO’s and the CIDA Standards. This will be reviewed early in the Spring 2012 semester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 LEVEL EXAM Written &amp; Practicum exam given to assess student readiness for admission to the major.</td>
<td>Each faculty member followed the CIDA matrix (provided by CIDA) and marked the criteria they felt their course addressed either on a primary level or a supplemental level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIDA matrix illustrates the course alignments – where we’re strong and where we have some weaknesses. This will be reviewed with the CIDA consultant in February. Copies are found in the Program Coordinator’s ‘dropbox’ account file and in the ID Program Faculty Binder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six ID students took both the written and practicum sections of the exam. One ID student took the practicum for the 2nd time. The written exam was given the Monday following final exams. The following 2 days, each student was given 90 minutes to present their practicum project, receive critiques and for the jurors to complete their assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Exam was given and scored on paper; filed in Program Coordinator’s office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum presentations were assessed by jurors using the ID Program rubric, in written format. The scores were input in LT and data can be derived.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
230 course instructor and the Program Coordinator juried all 7 presentations. Additional jurors included upper division ID students, recent ID graduates and ID professionals. from there. The input process is taxing because most jurors do not have LT accounts so multiple rubrics (with a juror number) were uploaded to the assignment in order to provide electronic access to the data.

3. **Summary of aggregate data collected**: Include a summary table or statement of the data collected during the assessment process. (x% of students achieved the outcome(s) assessed) Attach a copy of the assessment tool you used to collect the data.

For individual course summaries, see the respective course assessments submitted by each faculty member.

Any LT data (except Joan’s course) will need to be input by the secretary to be hired after the first of the year.

As a result of reviewing the faculty assessment reports that were provided and observation during the semester of student work, it appears the majority of stated outcomes (from syllabi) were met or exceeded by the majority of students in the courses. How that translates to the broader 5 PO’s will be determined when the data can be input in LT.

The newest faculty ID 416 Commercial Studio and ID 312 Presentation Methods were very well received by students. Neither of them have submitted a course assessment to date, but from observation and student input, there was good progress made and it was successful semester.

4. **Results, conclusions, and discoveries**. What are the results of the planned activities listed above? What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results?
### Results, conclusions, and discoveries

#### ASSESSMENT
I believe the faculty, as a whole, is beginning to see and better understand the connections between the Course Outcomes – Program Outcomes – CIDA Standards. It does get a bit complicated, at times, since they are not word-for-word associations. We will continue to refine to the tool through all-faculty input.

#### CIDA STANDARDS
The exercise of aligning their courses with the CIDA Standards’ criteria was enlightening and, I believe, has directed some adjustments, if not changes in their respective course content and perhaps delivery. (confirm this after all assessments are in) In general, the exercise determined the Program aligns quite well over the 14 academic criteria. It indicated weakness in some technical areas – building systems, acoustics and thermal comfort and in the need for a more thorough understanding of sustainability. The Business course was not thoroughly addressed, nor was Lighting, as it was not taught this semester and we’re between instructors.

#### DISCOVERIES at the 200 LEVEL:
- Students need more direction in basic presentation board organization and quality. **Targeted Courses:** 201, 205 & 211
- Increase student understanding of construction documentation. **Targeted Courses:** 202, 217 & 230
- Increase student initial understanding of building systems, acoustics, and thermal comfort. **Targeted Courses:** 202, 211, 217 & 230
- ID 216 – Design Principles - Students were introduced to and caught-on to PhotoShop & Illustrator very quickly and improved their comprehension and expression of Elements & Principles substantially. This will affect course content in subsequent Presentation & CAD courses. **Targeted Courses:** 216, 217, 312 & 319
- ID 205 – Color – Students require more structure in maintaining deadlines and using studio time wisely.

#### DISCOVERIES re: 200 LEVEL EXAM
The six students taking both sections passed both sections – this is a strong class. The student re-taking the practicum failed it a second time. Faculty will be meeting with the student to determine next steps to be taken.

The majority of the six scored >100% of the expected assessment range (all ‘3’s on our Program rubric). When a comparison was made by which the expected highest outcome became ‘4’s on the Program rubric, five of six would still have passed (albeit 70% - 90% range) and one would have likely have been conditionally passed. These results will be reviewed by the faculty in the Spring.

Jurors from outside the Program were generally more gracious in their scoring than faculty and peers. Many commended the level of work being presented at an early
stage of the Program.

DISCOVERIES at the 300 LEVEL:

- **ID 317** - Students entered a national competition with a service learning project. Student projects were well done but this is more than a lecture course can expect. There wasn’t enough time to adequately devote to the project AND the usual course work. Would not do this again. This particular course will be a studio course beginning Fall 2012 (ID 370).
- **ID 312** – very good hand-drawing/rendering skills gained. The introduction of Google Sketch-Up and the ability to use projects from other course(s) as the ‘subject’ of the exercises resulted in a higher level of quality in ID 230/Practicum presentations of those students who took 230 & 312 concurrently.
- **ID 355** – ID students must balance time commitments with the various courses they have. ID 355 seems to be the course to suffer. ID students need to use studio time wisely and benefit from the mentoring afforded them. This hands-on course forces students to review their personal values, be creative with existing materials and think critically about how the these three ‘chords’ intertwine in many of life’s decision-making and problem-solving situations.
- Identified CIDA Weaknesses – in the 300 concentration courses there is a need to increase student understanding of building systems, acoustics, thermal comfort & sustainability. **Targeted Courses: 317/370, 319, 321, 325 & 384**

DISCOVERIES at the 400 LEVEL:

**ID 416** – Senior Studio - Commercial

- Students spoke highly of the instructor’s expertise and were given choices of type of project(s) for the semester.
- The opportunity to work on the final project with a mainland company (Anthropologie) who will be opening a store in Waikiki was awesome. Presenting online and teleconferencing (introduction, preliminary design & final presentation) was a work-world scenario in the academic arena.
- Multiple projects (4) were required to simulate a workplace environment where many projects are worked on simultaneously. Although this is good in concept, we need to review this (as a faculty) and be sure the outcomes are being met and that the rigor and thoroughness expected by CIDA is accomplished at the 400 level/capstone course.
- Electronic presentations and submissions were made for all projects which may be difficult to display for the accreditation visit. Faculty will need to discuss this.

PROGRAM OUTLOOK

- I believe the Program is on the right track academically as we move toward accreditation.
- Faculty has been diligent in meeting monthly this last semester.
- The renovated facilities and additional faculty seem to have improved morale.
We’re still ‘settling-in’ to the facilities and corrections, changes and/or improvements will be on-going as we continue to meet the needs of faculty and students in delivering a quality ID education as well as producing quality deliverables, and ultimately quality graduates.

2012 – LOOKING AHEAD
CIDA Consultant Visit in February (20th – 22nd)
• Collect and organize sufficient artifacts for assessment and accreditation
• Prepare binders for each course to be reviewed by Consultant, and later, site visitors
• Faculty Data Forms – ready for review by Consultant
On-Going Preparation for Accreditation
• Increase faculty meeting time and/or frequency as needed
• PAR (Program Assessment Report) – all faculty will play a role in preparing this document as we determine how our Program meets or exceeds the CIDA standards and where that “evidence” can be readily found.
• ID secretary to begin work in early to mid-January.

5. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

Program changes were already in progress and this process confirmed our direction.
• We have cohorted ID 201 Fundamentals, ID 202 Drafting and ID 205 Color as beginning courses for students entering the Program as a result of seeing the increased success of student taking Drafting simultaneously with Fundamentals. This allows for earlier introduction to AutoCAD, which improves use and skill-levels over the life of the Program.
• ID 205 Color – course content will be reviewed; time provided for projects will be re-assessed; increased structure and/or deadlines will be enforced to prepare students for professional practice.
• We have expanded the ID 317 Universal Design lecture course to a studio-length course to expand the content and scope of work for projects addressing this critical topic.
• We have added ID 384 Sustainability in Design as a required course, as a result of recognizing a lack of comprehensive understanding on students’ part (even tho we touch on Sustainability in many courses) and the importance this topic carries with CIDA.
• We have introduced PhotoShop and Illustrator in the ID 216 Design Principles course which has increased creativity on the part of the students and will effectively increased skill levels in conjunction with AutoCAD.

• We now require ID 335 Socio-Cultural Aspects of Design as a pre-major requirement as this is critical to cross-cultural understanding and a major criteria point for CIDA

6. **Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries.** How and with whom were the results shared?

   An electronic copy of this report will be shared with the ID Faculty and the Dean of Humanities.