Expected Outcome 1: Competence in working with industry

Graduate students must successfully complete an industry collaborate project as part of the required INDD7910 Industry Practicum course. Competence is measured in the student's ability to undertake a project and finish it according to the industry standard.

Assessment Method 1: Evaluation of industry level performance

Assessment Method Description

All graduate students are required to complete the INDD 7910 Industry Practicum class. In most cases, students will be taking the class during their second semester of their first year, given that there is an industry sponsor working with the class. A component of successful completion is the final presentation to the industry that the class collaborates with. Both the faculty member and the representatives from the industry will evaluate the work of the student on a (5.0) point scale. A score of (5.0) represents the highest level of performance. Evaluation of the student is based on the following criteria:

1. Research
2. Development (problem solving, sketching, and model making)
3. Manufacturability / Implementation
Findings

All the assessment forms were filled by the industry sponsors specifically to the graduate students who worked on their projects at the end of the semester. These sponsors observed and worked with individual student throughout the whole semester. Therefore, the assessment is done in the perspective of the sponsors to indicate whether the students' performance is satisfactory or not in industry's standard.

The overall result is 4.1, slightly more than "Exceeds Expectations"
therefore it is considered satisfactory as a whole.

The break-down average scores:

Research 3.9 indicates that there is room for improvement in the area of research in terms of the industry which is focused on practicality.

Development 4.4 indicates in all these projects the sponsors were very pleased with the whole process of how the final design is derived.

Implementation 4.0 indicates students' final design "Exceeds Expectations" in terms of manufacturability and readiness for production, though there is still room for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Industry Sponsor</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>1. Research</th>
<th>2. Development</th>
<th>3. Implementation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>PlayCore</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>PlayCore</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>PlayCore</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>PlayCore</td>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Toong</td>
<td>Charbroil</td>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Windham</td>
<td>Center for Disability Research &amp; Service</td>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Windham</td>
<td>Center for Disability Research &amp; Service</td>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Spring 2014</td>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 3.9 4.4 4.0 4.1

How did you use findings for improvement?
The overall score sheet will be distributed to the faculty who teach the class and encourage them to direct the students to focus on research aspects of their projects.

Expected Outcome 2: Develop a research proposal for graduate study
Each student will demonstrate the ability to identify a design research topic effectively through the development of a research proposal that demonstrates a structured and rational research process for the approval of his or her graduate committee.

Assessment Method 1: Evaluation of the literature review section of the research proposal

Assessment Method Description
All graduate students are required to complete the INDD7010 Orientation class. An essential component of successful completion is the finished
research proposal for the two-year graduate study. Students are required to discuss their proposal with minimal of three graduate faculty members as the process of forming their graduate committees. The literature review section of the proposal is evaluated in terms of writing style. The evaluation is done on a 5.0 point scale based on the following aspects:

1. Synthesis
2. Methodology
3. Significance
4. Search & Selection
5. Breadth & Scope
6. Style & Format
7. Mechanics

**SIGD**

School of Industrial and Graphic Design

Date of Assessment: ____________________________

Name of Faculty Assessor: _______________________

Name of Student being Evaluated: __________________

Evaluation Ranking Below:
Assessment is based upon the average of individual student performance within the group of current graduate students.

**Evaluation criteria: (circle one)**

1. Synthesis.
   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

2. Methodology.
   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

3. Significance.
   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

4. Search & Selection.
   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

5. Breadth & Scope.
   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable

   (5) Exemplary, (4) Exceeds Expectations, (3) Meets Expectations, (2) Marginal, (1) Unacceptable
Findings

In Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, 8 graduate students’ literature review of their research proposal were being evaluated. Out of the (5.0) point scale, the average score of Synthesis was (4.1); Methodology was (4.1); Significance was (4.4); Search & Selection was (4.5); Breadth & Scope was (4.4); Style
& Format was (3.6); and Mechanics was (3.6). The overall average score of the seven criteria was (4.1). The lowest scores were in style and format (3.6) and mechanics (3.6).

**How did you use findings for improvement?**
The result of evaluation and comments was given to individual student for improvement. In the past, the evaluation was done by a paid outside reader who teaches in the ESL program and specializes in writing style. This year is the first time the evaluation being done by the instructor. The instructor will emphasize the common weakness of those two aspects with lowest scores and meet with individuals who have difficulty in these areas. Since the first language of the instructor is not English, it will be best for the program to resume using the outside reader to help the language part of the course.

**Additional Comments**

**Expected Outcome 3: Improve oral presentation skills**

Graduate students must successfully complete an oral presentation as part of the required terminal INDD7990 Thesis course. Improvement is sought in the student’s ability to orally communicate and defend a hypothesis with supporting evidence as part of their final thesis presentation.

**Assessment Method 1: Review of required oral presentation performance**

**Assessment Method Description**

All graduate students are required to complete the INDD 7990 Thesis class. A component of successful completion is the oral defense of the thesis. Graduate committees will continue to evaluate, on a (5.0) point scale, the oral presentation of a student’s thesis defense. A score of (5.0) represents the highest level of performance. Evaluation of the presentation is based on the following criteria:

1. Organization.
2. Language.
3. Delivery Techniques.
5. Central Message.

Findings
Between August 2012 to August 2013, there were 9 graduate students’ thesis oral examination being evaluated with this assessment method. Out of the (5.0) point scale the average score of Organization was (4.1); Language was (3.8); Delivery Techniques was (4.0); Supporting Material was (4.0), and Central Message was (4.0). The overall average of all five criteria was (4.0).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2012 – August 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 4.1 2.8 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0

How did you use findings for improvement?
All aspects of the assessment have room to be improved. The final overall result was distributed to all graduate faculty members so that we all know the area(s) students need to improve upon. With the increase of international students in our graduate program, it was foreseen that language might be the weaker area for some of the students. The graduate faculty has decided to require students to give formal intermediate presentations to their committee as work-in-progress report as well as rehearsal. Committee will critique and advice at the end of these intermediate presentation.

Additional Comments