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Expected Outcome 1: Comprehensive Design Solution

Interior Architecture students will demonstrate the ability to develop a comprehensive design solution to an interior architecture design problem.

Assessment Method 1: Program Faculty and external reviewers with experience in the field will review the design proposals developed by each student.

Assessment Method Description

The program faculty and external reviewers, such as practitioners and educators from interior architecture, interior design, art, and/or architecture, will review the final design proposals and work produced over the course of the semester by all students in the capstone studio (ARIA 4030). The review will include an assessment of the student’s ability to effectively employ a comprehensive well-reasoned interior architecture design solution that demonstrates the understanding of spatial complexities, integration of sustainable systems and materials, and the relationship between human behavior and the built environment. A rubric will be used to administer the assessment of 13 students in the 2014 summer semester. The rubric will include a point system scale to assess the comprehensive design solution criteria. The 1-5 point scale includes; 1 unacceptable, 2 acceptable, 3 average, 4 above average and 5 exceptional. Following the review, program faculty will meet to interpret the findings.
Assessment Rubric
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**Student:**

**Academic term/year:**

**Course:** ARIA 4030

---

### Findings

The comprehensive design solution assessment includes 7 questions for a total of 35 points.

28.46 average score for the area of comprehensive design as determined by the faculty and outside reviewers
Feedback from the four faculty and four external reviewers indicated a high level of student proficiency to develop a comprehensive and well-reasoned design solution to the interior architecture capstone project. The quality of the solution demonstrated the understanding of spatial complexities, consideration of the existing physical and the relationship between human behavior and the built environment.

The weaknesses include developing the comprehensive design to further integration of sustainable systems and material use in relation to the overall approach to the project design.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

While the target level of student proficiency was reached the weak areas will be addressed by requiring a detailed written and graphic explanation of how sustainable systems, more specifically defined as indoor environmental qualities, and material use are integrated with the overall design approach for the final requirements of the capstone project. The term sustainable systems in the assessment criteria will be replaced with indoor environmental qualities, which better reflects the comprehensive design solution criteria.
Expected Outcome 2: Graphic Representation
Interior Architecture students will demonstrate proficiency with the graphic representation of an interior architecture project through use of drawings, models, and other media.

Assessment Method 1: Assessment of graphic representations of the capstone project as presented at conclusion of ARIA Thesis studio by program faculty and external reviewers.

Assessment Method Description
ARIA Program faculty and external reviewers, such as practitioners and educators from interior architecture, interior design, art, and/or architecture, will review student presentation materials developed as a requirement of the capstone studio (ARIA 4030) completed by all students within the cohort each summer. The review will include an assessment of the effectiveness of the communication of design intent, proficiency in use of representational media (drawings, models, etc.), craft and precision realized in each chosen media, and the development of explanatory images and visualization of the overall design proposal.

Faculty participating in the review will provide verbal feedback to the faculty of record for the studio, students, and other participating reviewers in a public session devoted to the review and critique of student work. In addition a rubric will be used to administer the assessment of 13 students in the 2014 summer semester. The rubric will include a point system scale to assess the graphic representation criteria. The 1-5 point scale includes; 1 unacceptable, 2 acceptable, 3 average, 4 above average and 5 exceptional. Following the review, program faculty will meet to interpret the findings.
Findings

The graphic representation assessment includes 8 questions for a total of 40 points.

31.93 average score for the area of graphic representation as determined by the faculty and outside reviewers

32 average score for the area of graphic representation as determined by the faculty

31.87 average score for the area of graphic representation as determined by the outside reviewers
Feedback from the participating four faculty and four external reviewers indicated a high level of student proficiency in the graphic representation of the interior architecture project through the craft and precision of drawings and physical models. The highest level of response was the ability to utilize and integrate physical models with photography representational media. The photographs of the physical models provided explanatory images and visualization of proposed lighting, acoustic or thermal performance in the design proposal. The quality of the work was of a quality consistent with academic expectations.

The weaknesses include the development of explanatory images and the ability to integrate advanced computer-modeling technologies in the overall representation composition that strengthen the overall design proposal.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

While the target level of student proficiency was reached the weak area of the development of explanatory images will be addressed by greater emphasis on the clarity of diagrams and contextual drawings and giving feedback on the overall graphic representation composition in earlier critiques prior to the final presentation with reviewers.

The weak area of advanced computer-modeling will be addressed by continued exploration of innovative methods of graphic representation that prioritize material surface drawings, physical modeling and digital photography to effectively communicate the overall design intent. The term computer-modeling technologies in the graphic representation assessment criteria will be replaced with the term modeling, which better reflects the breadth of innovative physical and computer technology methods used in developing a visual response to the design solution.

---

**Expected Outcome 3: Oral Presentation**

Interior Architecture students will demonstrate ability to make an oral presentation of their capstone project that exhibits the ability to articulate and clearly communicate their approach to solving the design problem.

**Assessment Method 1:** Program faculty and external reviewers will evaluate oral presentations made by each student as a part of the review of student work developed in the capstone studio (ARIA 4030) each summer.

**Assessment Method Description**

ARIA Program faculty and external reviewers, such as practitioners and
educators from interior architecture, interior design, art, and/or architecture, will review student oral presentations delivered as a requirement of the capstone studio completed by all students within the cohort each summer. The review will include an assessment of the clarity of the communication of design intent, effectiveness of the arguments used to explain their approach to the problem, and their ability to respond effectively to reviewer questions and critique. A rubric will be used to administer the assessment of 13 students in the 2014 summer semester. The rubric will include a point system scale to assess the oral presentation criteria. The 1-5 point scale includes; 1 unacceptable, 2 acceptable, 3 average, 4 above average and 5 exceptional. Following the review, program faculty will meet to interpret the findings.

Assessment Rubric
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Student:  
Academic term/year:  
Course: ARIA 4030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criteria</th>
<th>points (circle one)</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student’s ability to make an oral presentation of their capstone project that exhibits the ability to articulate and clearly communicate their approach to solving the design problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criteria</th>
<th>Program Faculty</th>
<th>External Reviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clarity of the communication of design intent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of a concise but layered position statement that clearly communicates the approach in solving the design problem</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness of the arguments and supporting material to used explain their approach to the problem</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness of organizational structure of overall material including introduction, clear transitions and strong conclusion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to respond effectively to reviewer questions and critique</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date:  
Program Faculty:  
External Reviewer:

**Findings**

The oral presentation assessment includes 5 questions for a total of 25 points.

20.16  average score for the area of oral presentation as determined by the faculty and outside
Feedback from the four participating faculty and four external reviewers indicated a high level of student proficiency in the oral presentations of the interior architecture capstone project. The reviewers noted the proficient development of a concise but layered position statement that clearly communicates the student’s approach in solving the design problem. The quality of the oral presentation was of a quality consistent with academic expectations.

The weaknesses include the effectiveness of organizational structure of the overall material including introduction, clear transitions and strong conclusion as well as the effectiveness of the arguments and supporting material used to explain their approach to the problem.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**
While the target level of student proficiency was reached the weak areas will be addressed by requiring a written paper outlining the organizational structure of the overall material including the supporting arguments and giving feedback on oral presentations in earlier critiques prior to the final presentation with reviewers.

**Overall findings averages**

The eight reviewers answered 20 questions about the student’s performance in the areas of comprehensive design solution, graphic representation and oral presentation.

Each of the 20 questions received a score between 1 and 5. 100 points would be a perfect score.

- **81.75** average score for the 13 students as determined by the faculty and outside reviewers
- **82.7** average score for the 13 students as determined by the faculty
- **80.8** average score for the 13 students as determined by the outside reviewers
- **99** average highest score as determined by the faculty and outside reviewers
- **100** highest score as determined by the faculty
- **98** highest score as determined by the outside reviewers
59.5 average lowest score as determined by the faculty and outside reviewers
58 lowest score as determined by the faculty
61 lowest score as determined by the outside reviewers