

INTERIOR DESIGN 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: Interior Design

B2. Report author(s): Jim Kenney, Professor

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 161 majors

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
X	9. Team work
X	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Interior Design Program has been accredited by CIDA (Council for Interior Design Accreditation) since 1991. Collaboration (CIDA Standard 5) is a required standard the curriculum must meet and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals, Team Work (PLO #9) and Problem Solving (PLO #10) all have a common basis in team structured learning outcomes. Multiple student survey results and the results of a faculty review of student work produced in Intd 163 will be the focus of the PLOs assessed in 2013-14.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X*	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* We are aware of Lumina's Degree Profile Matrix (DQP) and we are indirectly in compliance with many of the Degree Profile Criteria. The DQP is used in part, by CIDA, to frame the accreditation standards we are currently in full compliance with.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce

	/develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

In Spring 2012, using an in-direct method of data collection, Professor Kenney began formally administering and collecting student survey results in two upper division studio courses, IntD 163 and IntD 173. Both studio courses typically offer team-based learning experiences as a course component. *Team Work Survey Pre-Design* and *Team Work Survey Post-Design* are student-based surveys administered in the aforementioned courses, intended to help plan and assess the team structure course component (PLO 9). Using a direct-method with an evaluation rubric, a *Problem Solving / Team-Based Assessment Rubric* was developed and administered for the first time at the Department of Design's Annual Spring Show, the evaluation addressed problem solving for the IntD 163 team based project from Spring 2014 (PLO 10). To review the indirect-method survey instrument (PLO 9) and the direct-evaluation method instrument (PLO 10), see *Attachments 1-3*.

One of the goals as students advance from IntD 163 into IntD 173, is to ensure the successful outcome of progressively larger scale and more complex design problems. Small teams ranging from 2-4 students are most common in both studios. Project types vary but typically involve mixed-use, hospitality and/ or medical office facilities.

The *Team Work Survey Pre-Design* is administered prior to the selection of teams with the intent to involve the individual student in the process of team selection, tasks and responsibilities, and to help them understand the importance of the individual's role and responsibilities in meeting both individual obligations and in shared team responsibilities. As a result of the survey, if a consensus is reached on a particular point(s), students will have a say in the structuring of teams and in the assignment of tasks and responsibilities.

Using the same criteria, the second survey *Team Work Survey Post-Design*, administered following the project submission / critique, is intended to identify project and experiential outcomes resulting from the team experience. Both surveys address the following criteria:

- Team Selection
- Scheduling and Deadlines
- Tasks and Responsibilities
- Cooperation and Sharing
- Expected Outcomes

For the first time, this May, faculty formally assessed student outcomes for IntD 163, based on specific criteria related to the design solution as well as visual materials produced for its presentation. As is common practiced in our program area, student projects are critiqued typically with other faculty and invited professional guests, then evaluated for grade assignment by the instructor of record. To comply with CIDA site-visit accreditation requirements, selected projects are retained by the program and used at the time of the accreditation site visit to verify stated compliance with CIDA Standards. Retained projects are also used for subsequent studio classes as examples of exemplary work and are shown at the Department of Design's Annual Spring Show. To review the pre and post-design survey results (PLO 9) and faculty evaluation results (PLO 10), see *Attachments 4-6*.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First **PLO 9: Team Work**

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second **PLO 10: Problem Solving**

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? **2**

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
X	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based

	projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
X	8. Other measure. Specify: Final course project.

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Faculty assessed student outcomes using a direct method of evaluation. Student work that was evaluated consisted of a single project: the space planning, design and presentation for an 11,000 SF Medical Office Tenant Space located in a mid-rise Class A Office Building in the Houston Medical Center was the subject. The following software / visual components were used to portray the design solution in a manner consistent with today's professional practice expectations:

- AutoCAD, hand crafted drawings and models / Program analysis, BOMA standards and Floor Plans
- SketchUp / Representational form studies in 3D
- Podium / Photo-realistic renderings
- Photoshop / Display of furniture and finish selections and presentation layouts

Projects were assessed based on ten criteria and were evaluated numerically using a three-point scoring system: 3 Points = Exemplary, 2 Points = Meets Standard and 1 Point = Below Standard.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
X	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
--	------------------------

	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

Two (2) team-based projects from IntD 163 Fall 2013 were selected and three (3) team-based projects from IntD 163 Spring 2014 were selected. Total enrollment for both sections = 38 students. Each project was assigned two students per team, this represents 27% of the student population from both classes. As previously stated in response to Q 3.3, student projects are critiqued typically with other faculty and invited professional guests, then evaluated for grade assignment. For CIDA site-visit accreditation requirements, selected projects are retained by the program and used at the time of the accreditation site visit to verify stated compliance with CIDA Standards. Retained projects are also used for subsequent studio classes as examples of exemplary work and are shown at the Department of Design's Annual Spring Show. As the IntD 163 studio faculty for both semesters, I was responsible for selecting five projects for assessment that I believed to be a fair cross-section of student outcomes and meet the aforementioned requirements.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
X	7. Others, specify: Faculty developed survey

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

All students registered in Section 1 IntD 163 fall 2013 and all students registered in Section 1 IntD 163 Spring 2014 were surveyed. Response rate was 100%.

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

A Space Planning, Design and Presentation rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess 5 team-based projects (10 students) selected from one required upper-division studio courses offered once in Fall 2013: IntD 163 and again, Spring 2014. The faculty assessment committee is made up of all four full-time faculty members, each of whom reviewed all five studio-based projects. To determine the final scores, the average score was taken for each criterion and used as our final data.

This is the first time that our interiors program has used a rubric in this context, the Space Planning, Design and Presentation rubric to explicitly and directly assess our students' teamwork and problem solving skills. We have discovered excellent insight into students' team work and problem solving abilities. We plan to include more team-based and individual student projects in our program's future assessment plan.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? **3**

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses					X
2. Modifying curriculum					X
3. Improving advising and mentoring					X
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					X
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					X
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					X
7. Annual assessment reports					X
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information					X

10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring					X
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

N.A.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

N.A.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

N.A.

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)

	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
X	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

Our current assessment plan is to maintain alignment with CIDA Standards and maintain our accreditation standing. Our program has been accredited since 1991 and our goal is to remain fully accredited.

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012 Based on CIDA requirements
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: IntD 181 and IntD 183

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

A7. Name of the academic unit: **Interior Design**

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: **Design**

A9. Department Chair's Name: **Andrew Anker**

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: **2**

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: **3**

A12.1. List all the name(s): **Graphic Design, Interior Design and Photography**

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? **2**

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: **0**

A13.1. List all the name(s): **NA**

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? **NA**

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: **0**

A14.1. List all the names: **NA**

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: **0**

A15.1. List the name(s): **NA**

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one

assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the na

Name of each diploma concentration: _____

Attachment #1 Survey (Black) and Attachment # 4 Results (Red)

Team Work Survey (Student Pre-Design)

Name (Optional): _____

Objectives: To identify students' concerns and expectations related to working on a team based studio design project.

Directions: This questionnaire contains statements about teamwork. Next to each question, indicate by writing the number of the response (shown below) you feel most appropriately expresses your concerns / expectations.

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

Questionnaire:

1. What is the best way to select a design team?

47% A. The Instructor should be responsible for assigning design teams.

8% B. There should be a random drawing of names.

45% C. Students should be able to pick their own teammates.

2. How should a design team deal with scheduling and meeting deadlines?

59% A. Without a point system, the Instructor should “encourage” students to be prepared for each project review. There should be no penalties for missing weekly deadlines.

24% B. With a point system, the Instructor should assign points for each review. Points are given to an individual’s preparedness (not teams).

17% C. With a point system, the Instructor should assign points for each review. Points are given to a team’s preparedness (not individuals).

3. What is the best way to divide tasks and responsibilities?

47% A. The Instructor should be responsible for the division of responsibilities and assigning individual students with specific tasks.

46% B. Division of tasks and responsibilities should be undertaken by each design team and assigned based on the student’s individual strengths and weakness thereby ensuring the best possible end-product.

7% C. Division of tasks and responsibilities should be by lottery thereby ensuring all tasks are assigned in a fair and unbiased manner.

4. How should a design team deal with cooperation and sharing?

- 34%** A. Each team member should be responsible for decisions made as it pertains to their specific tasks and designated spaces. Individual team member should step up and take the lead in decisions that affect the broader scope of the project.
- 42%** B. Each team member should be responsible for decisions made as it pertains to their specific tasks and designated spaces. Teams collectively (not individuals) should be responsible for the broader scope of the project with their teammates.
- 24%** C. Each team should have an agreed upon “team leader”. The team leader should be responsible to oversee the broader scope of the project and receive extra credit points for taking on the added responsibilities that comes with a leadership role. In the event of a team’s disagreement, the team leader has the deciding vote.
-

5. As an end-product, what should team members expect in terms of quality and quantity of work produced?

- 100%** A. Design teams will work on a project of greater size and complexity than that expected of an individual student and the end-product of the team effort will be substantially bigger and better than anything one student could produce. I believe I will be a better designer due in part to the sharing of skills, strategies and techniques with my teammates.
- 0%** B. Design teams will work on a project of similar size and complexity to that expected of an individual student and the end-product of the team effort will be comparable to what one individual student could produce. I believe I can produce results as good if not better as an individual than with a teammate.
-

Attachment #2 Survey (Black) and Attachment # 5 Results (Red)

Team Work Survey (Student Post-Design)

Name (Optional): _____

Objectives: To identify project and experiential outcomes resulting from working on a team based studio design project.

Directions: This questionnaire contains statements about teamwork. Next to each question, indicate by writing the number of the response (shown below) you feel most appropriately expresses your concerns / expectations.

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

Questionnaire:

1. What method was used to select a design team?

(Check only one option)

A. The Instructor was responsible for assigning design teams.

B. There was a random drawing of names.

C. Students self-selected their own teammates.

Address the selection / formation of design teams

(Assign a value 1-5)

*The method used to select and form design teams was structured fairly and resulted in equally competent teams. **89% of students agreed or strongly agreed***

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

2. How did the design team deal with scheduling and meeting deadlines?

(Check only one option)

A. Without a point system, the Instructor “encouraged” students to be prepared for each project review. There were no penalties for missing weekly deadlines.

B. With a point system, the Instructor assigned points for each review. Points were given to an individual’s preparedness (not teams).

C. With a point system, the Instructor assigned points for each review. Points were given to a team’s preparedness (not individuals).

Address how well the design team dealt with scheduling and deadlines:

(Assign a value 1-5)

_____ As a design team, scheduled reviews and project deadlines were considered manageable and organized. As a design team we were motivated to stay on-track for the duration of the project. **79% of students agreed or strongly agreed.**

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

Comments (Optional):

3. How did the design team deal with the division of tasks and responsibilities?

(Check only one option)

A. The Instructor was responsible for the division of responsibilities and assigning individual students with specific tasks.

B. The division of tasks and responsibilities was established by the design team and assignments were made based on the student's individual strengths and weakness, thereby ensuring the best possible end-product.

C. Division of tasks and responsibilities was done by lottery thereby ensuring all tasks were assigned in a fair and unbiased manner.

Address how the design team dealt with the division of tasks and responsibilities:

(Assign a value 1-5)

_____ The division of tasks and project responsibilities was appropriate, fair and balanced and helped to ensure a successful end-product. **63% of students agreed or strongly agreed.**

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

Comments (Optional):

4. How did the design team deal with cooperation and sharing?

(Check only one option)

A. Each team member was responsible for decisions made as it pertained to their specific tasks and designated spaces. Individual team member took action and took the lead in decisions that effected the broader scope of the project.

B. Each team member was responsible for decisions made as it pertained to their specific tasks and designated spaces. Teams collectively (not individuals) were responsible for the broader scope of the project with their teammates.

C. Each team had an agreed upon "team leader". The team leader was responsible in overseeing the broader scope of the project and received extra credit points for taking on the added responsibilities that came with the leadership role. In the event of a team's disagreement, the team leader had the deciding vote.

Address how the design team dealt with cooperation and sharing:

(Assign a value 1-5)

_____ Team members individually demonstrated responsibility in making decisions as it pertained to assigned responsibilities and designated spaces. Teams maintained a fair and balanced approach to making decisions as it pertained to the broader scope of the project. **76% of students agreed or strongly agreed.**

1 = Absolutely disagree / Not in favor of.

2 = I have concerns / objections

3 = I am neutral and will accept the outcome

4 = Agree / Approve

5 = Absolutely agree / Strongly in favor

Comments (Optional):

5. As an end-product, what should team members expect in terms of quality and quantity of work produced?

(Check only one option)

A. Design teams worked on a project of greater size and complexity than that expected of an individual student and the end-product of the team effort was

Attachment # 6 Results: Problem Solving / Team-Based Assessment Rubric

A *For a team structured, second semester, junior level studio project, the **space planning / design solution** demonstrates appropriate:*

1. *Program size, and scope and level of complexity.* **2.2 / 3.0**

- 2. *Creativity / overall design solution.* **2.3** / 3.0
- 3. *Functional and regulatory compliance.* **2.1** / 3.0
- 4. *Color, material and furnishing selections.* **2.0** / 3.0
- 5. *Lighting solutions.* **2.1** / 3.0

B. *For a team structured, second semester, junior level studio project, the **presentation** demonstrates appropriate:*

- 1. *Standards and graphic conventions.* **2.5** / 3.0
- 2. *Design intent, clarity and focus.* **2.4** / 3.0
- 3. *Level of detail and complexity.* **2.5** / 3.0
- 4. *Graphic composition.* **2.2** / 3.0
- 5. *Rendering quality.* **2.7** / 3.0

C. *Fall 2013 Overall Team Scores:*

- Team #1* **2.5** / 3.0
- Team #2* **2.3** / 3.0

Spring 2014 Overall Team Scores:

- Team #1* **2.4** / 3.0
- Team #2* **2.1** / 3.0
- Team #2* **2.5** / 3.0