## Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name**: MGD  
**Assessment Year**: 2008-09

### Student Learning Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Oral Communication</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Presentation of portfolio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>85% of population scoring Competent or higher, with 33% earning a Pro rating</td>
<td>Benchmarks were exceeded, with some question regarding sample size.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of Technology</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Judged portfolio review</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 year, though technology has been reviewed as a program outcome for 5 years</td>
<td>90% of population scoring Competent or higher, with 33% earning a Pro rating</td>
<td>&quot;Competent&quot; benchmark was exceeded, but &quot;Pro&quot; was not; good historical comparison though.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concept / Effectiveness</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Judged portfolio review</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>&quot;Competent&quot; benchmark was exceeded, but &quot;Pro&quot; was not; good historical comparison as well.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design / Composition</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Judged portfolio review</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>&quot;Competent&quot; benchmark was exceeded, but &quot;Pro&quot; was not; poor historical comparison</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Describe the Learning Outcome That You HaveMeasured

- GE, Discipline or Other: Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay
- Number of Students Assessed: 13
- # of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed: 2
- Measurement Standard: Report the Results of Your Data Analysis
- Strength of Results: Strong: Exceeds Benchmark, Neutral: Meets Benchmark, Weak: Misses Benchmark

Recommendation: Complete this Assessment Overview Table after you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
Program / Discipline Assessment Report

Program/Discipline: Multimedia, Graphic Design and Illustration (MGD prefix)
Responsibility: Tom DeMoulin

Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:
The mission of the Multimedia, Graphic Design, and Illustration (MGDI) Department is two-fold. First, it must facilitate student learning in the field of professional visual communication using sound educational principles. Second, it must meet the needs of the business community by providing a relevant and current curriculum that educates competent graphic designers. MGDI is committed to using learner-centered strategies, making effective use of instructional resources, and continuously assessing student academic achievement for the purpose of ongoing improvement.

Program/Discipline's Assessment History:
By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?
The program has been assessed since 2002. During that time, a number of outcomes have been reviewed using many different tools. Consistently, some outcomes such as Use of Technology have scored well, causing little change in that part of the curriculum. Other outcomes such as Concept / Solution and Design / Composition have improved over time due to extra focus due to assessment. Curriculum changes include more concept-oriented projects, which emphasize project research and planning, as well as implementing more stringent design instruction, such as teaching grid systems in layout classes. In addition, we've begun grading for preparation, which we believe aids both the design and concept processes.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?
Minimally, students who have taken multiple courses in the program demonstrate an awareness of the importance of these outcomes, while completers generally score at a competent level in all the outcomes.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
None. We're continually concerned that the rapid change in technology may cause us to focus primarily on that outcome at the expense of others, but the department hasn't yet observed problems.

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)
The advisory committee is informed annually of the program's assessment results. Faculty is informed during both the hiring process and at meetings. Knowing the departmental outcomes helps instructors focus on the big picture. Finally, students are usually informed of overall outcomes and how they've performed as a group during advising. In addition, many project rubrics are divided by programmatic outcomes.

Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary
Previous Academic Year: 2008-09 Note: Due to a number of issues, the methods and outcomes slated for the 2008-09 academic year in last year's Plan were modified at the last minute. A plan was executed that met the requirements of the report (i.e.: two gen ed outcomes and two program outcomes measured one way). The methods outlined here do not match those stated in the 2008-09 Plan published on the web. Benchmarks remain the same.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome Title</strong>: General Education: Oral Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Description</strong>: The ability to verbally describe and defend design solutions to a potential employer or client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general education definition for Communication is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate a college-level ability to read and to communicate effectively through speaking, writing, listening, and artistic expression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) 85% of the population was to earn a Competent or Professional rating, with at least 33% rated Professional.
2) Rationale: The benchmark has served as a challenging goal with other outcomes, so it was applied to Oral Communication, when that outcome was introduced last year.

**Description of assessment process**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) Graduating students presented portfolios of their best work to outside evaluators (working designers). The evaluators scored each student's oral presentation as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional using the criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Competent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>During interview, the student's oral presentation has a NEGATIVE impact on your perception of the portfolio.</td>
<td>During interview, the student's oral presentation has a NEUTRAL impact on your perception of the portfolio.</td>
<td>During interview, the student's oral presentation has a POSITIVE impact on your perception of the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics: The student fails to either define the project problem or link the solution to any of the points below:</td>
<td>Characteristics: The student may either define the project problem or link the solution to some of the points below:</td>
<td>Characteristics: The student defines the project problem and links the solution to ALL of the points below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research of competition</td>
<td>• Research of competition</td>
<td>• Research of competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Client analysis</td>
<td>• Client analysis</td>
<td>• Client analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audience analysis</td>
<td>• Audience analysis</td>
<td>• Audience analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Students must demonstrate an ability to verbalize design concepts to an authority on the subject, whom they do not know. Obviously some students will have more innate skill at "selling" their work, but the inherent novelty of the situation mixed with its real-world application requires both oral skill and confidence in design terminology beyond what a student could make up without training.
3) This evaluation occurred once, at the end of the academic year.
4) 13 students (the graduating class) made up the sample.
Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

Below is a graph showing student performance. Since many students met with multiple reviewers their scores were averaged, creating a "quasi" fourth category, labeled *Comp to Pro*. Note that no averaging occurred between the categories of *Not Competent* and *Competent*, obviating the need for a fifth category. In an attempt to weed out individual evaluator preferences, scores of students who were evaluated by only one evaluator were removed from a second set of bars (in red).

What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

1) Group performance exceeded the benchmark, whether all students were represented or only students who were evaluated by multiple evaluators.
2) When compared to a similar portfolio presentation done by the previous class, a greater range of 2007-08 students earned a *Professional* rating, but that group also had a number of *Not Competent* ratings. In
### Student performance summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?</td>
<td>addition, faculty performed those older evaluations, so the comparison is a bit of a wash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome #: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type (choose by bolding):</th>
<th>Outcome Title: General Education: Use of Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Program; General Ed; Other</td>
<td>Outcome Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration of craft using current tools and technologies. (Since the great majority of this work is completed using computers, students are ostensibly evaluated on their ability to use current software. This evaluation is somewhat anecdotal though, since the product and not the process is being assessed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The general education definition for Use of Technology is: Students will use appropriate and current technologies to collect, retrieve, organize, and process information from various sources and produce original work in various ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark for success</th>
<th>1) 90% of the population was to earn a Competent or Professional rating, with at least 33% rated Professional. 2) Rationale: Historically, students have done better with technology outcomes when compared to other outcomes during five previous years. With this in mind, more of the student population is expected to meet the wider benchmark.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark. 2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Graduating students presented portfolios of their best work to outside evaluators (working designers). Evaluators scored each student portfolio as either *Not Competent*, *Competent*, or *Professional* using the criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Competent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Aside from the physical presentation of the portfolio, the majority of items have moderate problems with neatness and craft. Characteristics: • Obvious spelling errors • Sloppy pen work • Jaggy images • Other items associated with sloppy computer work</td>
<td>Aside from the physical presentation of the portfolio, most of the items are neatly produced and appear well crafted. The portfolio appears on par with other student portfolios you've seen. Characteristics: • No obvious spelling errors • Competent pen work • No jaggy images</td>
<td>Aside from the physical presentation of the portfolio, the entire portfolio is neatly produced and well crafted. Characteristics: • &quot;Wow, this person knows what she's doing!&quot; • From a technical standpoint, the student appears ready to compete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) The evaluators were experienced with hiring based on portfolio work. The artifacts people generate during the design process do yield information about that designer's technical ability to the trained eye. For instance, the way a package is cut and assembled reveals whether the designer understands die cuts and live areas. A poorly generated curve indicates the designer hasn't reached a proficient level using the Beziér Pen tool. A pixilated image reveals that the designer may not understand the importance of high-resolution imagery. Finally, a novice portfolio will suffer these defects by default. In short, if a designer receives a professional rating here, the experienced evaluator knows the student is "market-ready."

3) This review occurred once, at the end of the academic year.

4) 13 students (the graduating class) made up the sample.
Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

Notes in the Results section of Outcome 1 are applicable here.

![Bar Chart: Gen Ed: Use of Technology]

What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) Group performance did not exceed the benchmark set for Professional rating (33%), but all students did earn at least a Competent rating, meeting the larger benchmark of 90%. These results occurred whether all students were represented or only students who were evaluated by multiple evaluators.
2) This outcome was not evaluated in the previous year. Technical ability has been evaluated previously though, with strong student performance. However, methods and ratings were different enough to prevent meaningful comparison.
3) NA
1) While the benchmark for the *Professional* rating was not achieved, it is important to consider sample size and the new evaluation method (i.e.: outside evaluators assessing final portfolios vs. instructors assessing formative projects). In addition, no *Not Competent* ratings were delivered. Therefore, this outcome is rated **Neutral**.

2) Doing outside assessment of graduating portfolios has raised the bar. This assessment method will be repeated for the coming year, in order to develop a historical reference. At the same time, a signal has been sent by some in the profession that our graduating students may not be as ready as we had thought in the technical arena. More stringent evaluation of technical methods is in order, especially in the higher-level courses.

---

**Outcome #: 3**

**Outcome Title: Concept / Effectiveness**

**Outcome Type** (choose by bolding):

- **Discipline/Program:** General Ed; Other
- If General Education outcome (choose by bolding):
  - **Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork**

**Outcome Description:**
Develop concepts that address target audiences and fit within production constraints of the client.

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

- **85%** of the population was to earn a *Competent* or *Professional* rating, with at least **33%** rated *Professional*.
- Rationale: The benchmark has served to be challenging goal over the past six years.

**Description of assessment process:**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?

1) Graduating students presented portfolios of their best work to outside evaluators (working designers). Evaluators scored each student portfolio as either *Not Competent, Competent*, or *Professional* using the criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Competent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concept/Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>In terms of concept, very few of the projects the student presents appear to be billable solutions. The portfolio is NOT on par with other student portfolios you've seen.</td>
<td>In terms of concept, you consider a few of the projects the student presents to be potentially billable. The great majority of the other items appear on par with other student portfolio items you've seen.</td>
<td>In terms of concept, you consider many of the project solutions the student presents in his/her portfolio to be potentially billable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) How many students made up the sample size?

Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept / Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp to Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All Students (13)
- Only Students w/Multiple Evaluators (9)

Notes in the Results section of Outcome 1 are applicable here.

2) A project-based method embeds the importance of concept within the design. For example, a project may be technically well crafted and have a stellar design, but may not solve the client's needs or address the target audience. While these issues could be addressed theoretically, the results may not be as applicable. As with the Use of Technology outcome, the default result from a novice tends to produce an unwanted result, in this case not addressing audience or client needs, as the beginning designer may be more concerned with software use or being "artistic." As previously mentioned, the evaluators are experienced with hiring based on portfolio work, and can determine whether the work is on an academic level or possibly billable (a.k.a. "market-ready" or professional).
3) This review occurred once, at the end of the academic year.
4) 13 students (the graduating class) made up the sample.
**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

| 1) | Group performance exceeded the benchmark, whether all students were represented or only students who were evaluated by multiple evaluators. |
| 2) | When compared to a similar portfolio presentation done by the previous class (2007-08), results were comparable. The data differs a bit due to the "quasi" fourth category, but the difference is negligible. |
| 3) | NA |

**Student performance summary**

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

| 1) | Rating: **Strong**. Since the benchmarks were met and the data compares well to the previous year, success in this area is well documented. |
| 2) | In terms of curriculum and teaching, no major change is warranted. In terms of assessment, the sample size of graduating students compared to the entire program is still small. It might be warranted to assess with a second method, comparing performance across multiple courses. |

**Outcome #: 4**

| Outcome Type (choose by bolding): **Discipline/Program**; General Ed; Other If General Education outcome (choose by bolding): Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork | Outcome Title: Design / Composition |
| | Outcome Description: Demonstrate an understanding of how the principles and elements of design work in concert to develop a unified design. |

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

| 1) | **85%** of the population was to earn a *Competent or Professional* rating, with at least **33%** rated *Professional*. |
| 2) | Rationale: The benchmark has served to be challenging goal over the past seven years. |
1) Graduating students presented portfolios of their best work to outside evaluators (working designers). Evaluators scored each student portfolio as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional using the criteria below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Competent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Composition</td>
<td>The work presented consistently has problems with element selection and coordination throughout the portfolio. (Characteristics: elements on pages not only do not work together to create a whole—they conflict; poor type selection.)</td>
<td>Most of the work presented uses elements that appear purposefully chosen and placed on the page. (Characteristics: designs are stable &amp; predictable; may be over-worked in places; “if-only” thoughts come to mind while reviewing.)</td>
<td>Design elements appear purposefully chosen and placed on the page. The designs work as a whole because of coordination between design elements and principles. (Characteristics: strong typography; design pops; “a-ha” ingenuity; design has what it needs to communicate and does so in a unified way.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Obviously, design is best evaluated from the creation of a design, rather than the completion of an essay or answering questions in an exam. While the results may be judged rather subjectively, the use of multiple, experienced evaluators help normalize ratings. This method, as do the others, does rely solely on data from graduating students. It is hoped that some of the skill displayed has to do with training within the program, but the lack of a "pre" test does add some question as to when students learned their design skills.

3) This review occurred once, at the end of the academic year.

4) 13 students (the graduating class) made up the sample.
**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

Notes in the *Results* section of Outcome 1 are applicable here.

![Bar Chart](image)

**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) The department met the larger benchmark of 85% of student projects rating above *Competent*, but did not meet the *Professional* benchmark of at least 33%.
2) The data compares poorly to the previous year (2007-08), in which nearly 50% of the projects rated at the *Professional* level, using two separate methods. It is important to note again that 2008-09 group did use outside evaluators, so the comparison is somewhat apples to oranges. Very similar rubrics were used though.
3) NA
Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) Rating: Weak. Given the overall success of meeting the wider benchmark, it is tempting to rate this outcome as Neutral, but that would be inaccurate. As said previously, outside evaluators are sending a signal that our students haven't performed to the level we had expected.

2) The department needs to redouble its effort in teaching design principles and concepts. Instructors will be asked to specifically evaluate design element usage and principle application. In addition, this assessment will be repeated at year-end to see if any change has occurred. As mentioned earlier, a second method that compares formative work might also be useful.

---

Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

Current Academic Year: 2009-2010

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

Outcomes are the same.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

Method 1 will be the same as 2008-09 (end-of-year portfolio review of graduating student work, with the student's presentation being used for the Oral Communication outcome).

Method 2 will use the same strategy as Method 1 from 2007-08, in order to gain a wider sample size and include a variety of student experience levels. Instructors will periodically be asked to assess one specific outcome using an upcoming project. They will use a rubric to evaluate a single outcome, similar to the one shown in the Summary section.

To determine beginning, intermediate and advanced students, students will be asked to declare how many MGD courses they are taking and have taken when they are evaluated. Faculty involved with assessment will then divide the students based on the following credit levels: Entry: 0 – 2 courses; Intermediate: 3 – 10 courses; Advanced: more than 10 courses. (Students will also be polled as to occupation, in order to filter graphic designers who are only taking a class here or there to update skills.)

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

Benchmarks are the same. The only addition is that Method 2 will expect student success to increase as they move through the program (i.e.: Advanced students will score higher ratings than Intermediate students, and Intermediate students will perform at a higher level than Entry level students.)

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)

Yes  No