<NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT/MAJOR OR MINOR>

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

- **Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.**
- **Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections.**
- **Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports**
- **It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.**
- **A curricular map should be should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).**

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I.   LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Rachel Beth Egenhoefer, Current Design Program Director – rbegenhoefer@usfca.edu

Liat Berdugo, Soon to be Design Program Director - lberdugo@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

c) Design Major and Minor

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor programs. – No Changes

Design Major:
By combining a holistic approach to design with a passion for justice, students create stunning work that inspires change. Our program is built around the idea that today's designers must be able to work comfortably and effectively across a broad range of media — print, digital, interactive, product, information — with an eye toward the greater good. Our students in the Design Major develop the skills to independently and collaboratively design critical and thoughtful messages, interfaces, and public spaces.

Design Minor:
By combining a holistic approach to design with a passion for justice, students create stunning work that inspires change. Our program is built around the idea that today's designers must be able to work comfortably and effectively across a broad range of media — print, digital, interactive, product, information — with an eye toward the greater good. Our students in the Design Minor are introduced to the skills to independently and collaboratively design critical and thoughtful messages, interfaces, and public spaces.

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. PLOs (Major/Graduate/Certificate)

No changes.

Design Major PLOs
1. Generate design work through methodologies of process, production, and experimentation.

2. Synthesize design research and scholarship in history, theory and criticism.

3. Demonstrate fluency with diverse medias and technologies, along with the ability to accommodate new technologies as they emerge.

4. Articulate the role of design and the function of the designer as a leader in the social, cultural, and political landscape.

5. Engage in the practice of design professionalism and collaboration.

Design Minor PLOs
1. Generate design work through methodologies of process, production, and experimentation.

2. Synthesize design research and scholarship in history, theory and criticism.

3. Demonstrate fluency with diverse medias and technologies, along with the ability to accommodate new technologies as they emerge.

3. **State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019. What rubric did you use?**

PLO 2: Synthesize design research and scholarship in history, theory and criticism in regards to the design program major.

See attached rubrics that analyzed:

1. Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design
2. Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology
3. Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism

Students were rated on a scale of 4-1: 4= excellent, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

Two full-time faculty members, one assistant professor and one associate professor, ranked each of these criteria for one project each from two different courses. The first project was a final term paper pertaining to design history that was assigned within a 100-level history lecture course. The second project was a design project that required sustained research over half of a semester that was assigned within a 200-level design studio course.

We evaluated each project separately on a scale of 1 (Poor) to 4 (excellent), and the scores were averaged.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section asks you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,

b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this question, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Results (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Level: Design History	Percentage of Students: 15 total
Complete Mastery of the outcome	33.33%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	40%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	20%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	6.66%

Level: Typography	Percentage of Students: 11 total
Complete Mastery of the outcome	81.81%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	18.18
Mastered some parts of the outcome	0
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	0

V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

All full time Design faculty met to review these results and talk about next steps. We all agreed that we want to find ways to improve our students writing and historical knowledge across the curriculum. Based directly on the assignments used here we decided on the following action items:

History of Design course: Meet with faculty teaching this course to make sure the course has some critical component either in the assignment evaluated or another assignment. The critical component seemed weakest as it was left out in most of the papers evaluated. Some possible solutions for this might also include providing more examples of good theoretical criticism or helping students to scaffold their assignments. It was also noted that the majority of students paper's seemed Eurocentric, based off of the syllabi provided there are more global conversations, but just an observation that may need to be addressed.

Typography course: For studio classes that have research components, like Typography, can we improve the student's abilities to locate relevant source material, evaluate the selected sources, and prepare cogent synopsis of material gathered, and by more progressive scaffolding that focuses on different aspects of the research process. Faculty discussed the idea of having a comprehensive evaluation across all sections of a given a course, or other mechanisms to ensure all students regardless of instructor receive a similar experience.

In addition to these specific courses the Design Faculty also has agreed to look at the current Course Learning Outcomes for all required courses as they relate to our Program Learning Outcomes to look for areas of improvement in the wider curriculum.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

None.

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

    We are still evaluating our recent curriculum changes and the effectiveness of all PLOs in our curriculum. Looking Big Picture we want to ensure that students are learning what we are promising as well as being prepared for a career post-graduation. As stated above a big project this year will be mapping CLOs to PLOs and looking for ways to improve individual courses as they relate to one another. We are also looking closely at ways we Introduce, Develop and Master these skills and how that idea is communicated to part-time faculty, so they understand the larger Design curriculum as well as their own individual class.

- **Big Picture (Minor):**

The same is true for the Minor. The challenge for the Minor is that they only take the same introductory courses as our majors – so we want to make sure everyone – both majors and minors have a solid understanding in our 3 intro courses.

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

None.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

PLO 2: Synthesize design research and scholarship in history, theory and criticism.

PROJECT	Noopur Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Stuart Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Average Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Noopur Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Stuart Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Average Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Noopur Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism	Stuart Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism	Average Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism	STUDENT AVERAGE
	4	3.5	3.75	4	3.5	3.75	3	3	3	3.5
	4	3	3.5	4	2	3	3	3	3	3.166666667
	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.666666667
	4	3	3.5	3	2.5	2.75	2	2	2	2.75
	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.333333333
	3	2	2.5	3	1	2	2	2	2	2.166666667
	3	1	2	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1.666666667
	4	4	4	4	3	3.5	4	4	4	3.833333333
	3	4	3.5	3	4	3.5	3	2	2.5	3.166666667
	3	4	3.5	3	4	3.5	4	4	4	3.666666667
	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	2.666666667
	4	4	4	3	4	3.5	4	4	4	3.833333333
	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	2.666666667
	4	1	2.5	4	4	4	2	1	1.5	2.666666667
			3.125			2.9666667			2.25	2.780555567
			Average			Average			Average	

SCALE = 1: poor, 4: excellent

PLO 2: Synthesize design research and scholarship in history, theory and criticism.
Type Specimen Poster

PROJECT	Noopur	Stuart	Average	Noopur	Stuart	Average	Noopur	Stuart	Average		STUDENT AVERAGE	
	Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Identification, visually and verbally, of key concepts in the history of design	Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Demonstration, visually and verbally, of key concepts in design methodology	Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism	Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism	Evaluation, through personal expression, of principles pertaining to design criticism			
	3	3	3	4	3.5	3.75	4	4	4		3.583333333	4
	4	3	3.5	3	3.5	3.25	4	4	4		3.583333333	3
	4	3.5	3.75	4	3.5	3.75	3	3	4		3.611111111	4
	4	3	3.5	3	3	3	4	4	4		3.5	3
	4	3	3.5	4	4	4	4	4	4		3.833333333	3
	4	3	3.5	3	4	3.5	4	4	4		3.666666667	4
	4	2.5	3.25	4	4	4	4	4	4		3.75	2
	4	2.5	3.25	3	3	3	4	4	4		3.416666667	4
	4	3.5	3.75	4	2.5	3.25	4	4	4		3.666666667	4
	3	2	2.5	4	3	3.5	4	4	4		3.333333333	2
	4	3	3.5	4	3.5	3.75	4	4	4		3.75	4
												4
												3
			3.363636364 Average			3.522727273 Average			4 Average		3.443181818	3

SCALE = 1: poor, 4: excellent