Expected Outcome 1: Consolidate and expand a creative design research culture enabling faculty and students to produce recognized scholarship that contributes to new ways of thinking in landscape architecture/design skills

Student is able to develop appropriate design solutions for diverse community situations.

Assessment Method 1: Faculty, external critic, and community review of student work.

Assessment Method Description
Observation and analysis of student work from each course, across a range of assessment types and grade outcomes, using rubric below. The courses assessed were Thesis Studio V in Fall 2013 and Thesis Studio VI in Spring 2013. Thesis Studio is an indicator class that reflects program objective achievement. These studios involved students in self-directed community-based designs. Student work is reviewed twice each semester. The reviews take the form of pin-ups or power point presentations where students justify and communicate the proposed outcomes of their designs.

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Conceptual Considerations</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Craftsmanship</th>
<th>Integrative Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New concepts are explored in original ways.</td>
<td>Analysis demonstrates rigor and highly developed understanding of scope.</td>
<td>Clear connection between ideas &amp; their investigation through careful manipulation of design representation</td>
<td>New &amp; complex issues are successfully integrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual basis of project demonstrates clear grasp of</td>
<td>Sophisticated &amp; attentive design decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seamless integration of depiction &amp; depicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex issues (histories, social context, ecological issues). Project is fully developed and expresses excitement and wonder.</td>
<td>apparent throughout process. Logical, confident &amp; iterative procedure generates design outputs that can be described &amp; evaluated in terms of the process.</td>
<td>&amp; materials. Excellent craftsmanship displays thought &amp; care. Clear demonstration of the importance of the artifact in design production. Attentiveness to the aesthetic of making.</td>
<td>marshalling &amp; conjoining of the physical, the conceptual &amp; the representational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Complex issues are adequately integrated. Project is well-developed &amp; design outcomes show understanding of issues.</td>
<td>Process demonstrates adequate grasp of problems and issues. Clear use of iterative method. Source data employed throughout. Project process remains within the confines of the known.</td>
<td>Good quality work, with moderate appeal. Engagement with materiality of representation needs further work. Outputs would improve with greater attentiveness to quality craft.</td>
<td>Design production shows real understanding of issues, problems, resources, &amp; process, but does not quite bring them all together in a unified articulation of design intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Project exhibits an inherent lack of engagement. The necessary components are gathered but are related and explored only</td>
<td>Clear &amp; effective process never fully developed. Tentative and ill-defined methodology. Tendency to change approach to approach without fully</td>
<td>Crafted dimension of production distracts from design intent. Sloppy, ill-managed articulation of the artifact as an object. Ideas remain</td>
<td>Project remains on the level of a collection of disparate ideas &amp; forms, weakly integrated or developed, and only marginally related to the site, situation, or program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficially.</td>
<td>Investigating any one method, suggesting uncertainty, with respect to iterative procedures.</td>
<td>Untransformed by the act of making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is inadequately developed in all areas.</td>
<td>Inadequate development of project. Muddied thinking about process. Little or no clear methodological procedure utilized. No connection between design output and design process.</td>
<td>Poor quality of negligible craftsmanship. No sense of the development of an aesthetic. Outputs are uninspiring, timid, and uncared for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy reliance on found materials.</td>
<td>Project shows little or no regulation by means of conceptual thinking.</td>
<td>Little to no sense of the project as an interactive condition. Outcome does not relate to program, site or context. Failure of understanding with respect to the nature of design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

98% of students received a grade of A or B in Thesis Studio through Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters. 45% of students in Thesis Studio received an A grade, 48% received a B grade and <1% received a C grade thereby meeting expectations for their overall design performance.

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

Existing Student Development Framework (showing how student performance should develop during two years of study, and criteria for measurement) has been updated. Studio Progression Framework has been updated.

**Additional Comments**

Rubrics don’t adequately measure design creative. New rubrics will continue to be developed and reflected upon.
Expected Outcome 2: Produce professional landscape architects who have the requisite creative and adaptive capacities to become disciplinary leaders/ employment.
Graduating students will secure employment in a disciplinary field or further their education in the field within three months after graduation.

Assessment Method 1: Survey of graduating students

Assessment Method Description
Students are surveyed three months after graduation in order to ascertain their status with regard to membership in a professional society and employment.

Findings
19% of graduating students secured employment in a disciplinary field or further their education in the field within three months after graduation. 87% employment in a disciplinary field or further their education in the field within six months after graduation.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Employer Survey has been developed and will be implemented in 2015 (delayed due to Program Chair leaving).

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 3: Produce professional landscape architects who have the requisite creative and adaptive capacities to become disciplinary leaders/ membership in professional society.
Graduating students will become full members of the professional American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) within three months after graduation.

Assessment Method 1: Survey of graduated students

Assessment Method Description
Students are surveyed three months after graduation in order to ascertain their status with regard to professional society membership and employment.
Findings
100% of graduating students became full members of ASLA within two months after graduation.

--ASLA gives a free one-year membership to graduating students.
--Graduating students must sign up within 60 days after graduation to qualify for free one-year professional membership.
--ASLA Job Search is a free job service tool available to full members.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Up to date member information (Member Search) is available to all full members including name, home and work address, phone and website. This information is retrievable and good for further metrics.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 4: Produce professional landscape architects who have the requisite creative and adaptive capacities to become disciplinary leaders/portfolio of work.

Graduating students will produce a creative and professional portfolio of work (for job interviews).

Assessment Method 1: Faculty review of student work.

Assessment Method Description
All program faculty review graduating student portfolios. The portfolio class review takes the form of pin ups or power point presentations where students communicate their portfolio design and proposed class outcomes.

Rubric:
Findings

**Outcome One**
45% of students performed with excellent ability
48% of students performed with good ability
1% of students performed with fair ability
1% of students performed with poor ability

**Outcome Two**
32% of students performed with excellent ability
32% of students performed with good ability
32% of students performed with fair ability
1% of students performed with poor ability

**Outcome Three**
19% of students performed with excellent ability
68% of students performed with good ability
1% of students performed with fair ability
1% of students performed with poor ability

Findings show that >50% of students can achieve the design and implementation (print) requirements for portfolio production.
How did you use findings for improvement?
A formal portfolio class currently doesn’t exist. Class is taught as a directed elective. Develop curriculum for a portfolio class.

Additional Comments