**Assessment Overview**

Discipline/Program Name __MGD________________ Assessment Year __2010-11______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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. Communication (Oral)</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Presentation of portfolio to three assessors (2 faculty and 1 working designer)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>85% of population scoring Competent or higher, with 33% earning a Professional rating</td>
<td>73% scored Competent or higher; 27% scored a Professional rating</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Portfolio review by three assessors (2 faculty and 1 working designer)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 years this method; 7 years overall</td>
<td>Same as 1, except 90% of population</td>
<td>82% scored Competent or higher; 37% scored a Professional rating</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design / Composition</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Portfolio review by three assessors (2 faculty and 1 working designer)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>91% scored Competent or higher; 37% scored a Professional rating</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concept / Solution</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Portfolio review by three assessors (2 faculty and 1 working designer)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Same as 1</td>
<td>82% scored Competent or higher; 18% scored a Professional rating</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured</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>Number of Students Assessed</td>
<td>SLO, Discipline or Other</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>Number of Students Assessed</td>
<td># of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed</td>
<td>Measurement Standard</td>
<td>Report the Results of Your Data Analysis</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark Neutral: Meets Benchmark Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (MGD) 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. MGD 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 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 because of assessment. Curriculum changes include more concept-oriented projects, emphasis on research and planning, as well as increasing design standards by teaching complex methods such as grid systems, for example. In addition, we’ve graded for preparation, which we believe aids both the design and concept processes. At the same time, the program has continually revised the assessment process in an attempt to make sure we are evaluating at a professional level.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?
The biggest change in student learning is that the department has become aware that some outcomes (Design and Concept) are more difficult to meet than others, causing a greater focus in these areas. Consequently, students have performed at a higher level in these areas.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
None from a student-learning standpoint. Because of the consistently low number of students involved with the process, the validity of the assessment process is a constant concern. We try use these results along with other performance markers, such as mid-point portfolio reviews, to get a better idea of how students are performing.

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.)
Aside from administration, the MGD advisory committee and MGD faculty are informed annually of the results. The advisory committee may suggest possible changes in outcomes depending on market conditions. Faculty is presented this information primarily to keep the big picture in mind, as courses tend to be rather granular and insulated from one another.
Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary
Previous Academic Year: 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 1</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type (choose one):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Discipline/Program</td>
<td>The ability to verbally describe and defend design solutions to a potential employer or client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ SLO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Communication</td>
<td></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?

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

**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?

- Students must demonstrate an ability to verbalize design concepts to an authority on the subject. 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.
- This evaluation occurred once, at the end of the academic year.
- 11 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.)

### 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?

### 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?

---

Above is a graph showing student performance. Since all but one student met with multiple reviewers their scores were averaged, creating two extra "quasi" categories, labeled Not Comp to Comp and Comp to Pro.

1. Group performance was lower than the stated benchmarks on both fronts. 27% scored a Professional rating and only 73% scored Competent or higher. That said, with only 11 students, each one represented 9% of the score, so had one student been evaluated differently, the scores would have been 36% and 82%, which must be considered.
2. A higher percentage earned Professional ratings this cycle (27% to 6%), but fewer scored Competent or higher (73% to 81%). The sample size was much higher for the previous cycle: 16 to 11.
3. Although the plan stated that surveys would be added for this year, they weren’t. Consequently, this is Not Applicable.
## Outcome #: 2

**Outcome Type** (choose one):
- [ ] Discipline/Program
- [x] SLO
- [ ] Other

If **Student Learning Outcome** (choose one):
- [x] Technology

### Outcome Title: Technology

**Outcome Description:**
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 anecdotal though, since the product and not the process is being assessed.)

### Benchmark for success

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 six previous years. With this in mind, more of the student population is expected to meet the wider benchmark.

### Description of assessment process:

1. Same process as for Outcome 1. Below is the rubric for technology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not Competent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Demonstration</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 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. 11
### 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.

### 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 larger benchmark of 90% of students reaching a **Competent** rating. However, the other benchmark of 33% earning a **Professional** rating was met.

2. The data are comparable. The previous year missed the 33% **Professional** rating but met the 90% rating. Of note, of the 16 students of previous year, one failed to earn a **Competent** rating; this cycle, two students did. However since the sample only consisted of 11 students, the effect was proportionally larger.

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. Last cycle’s performance was rated as **Neutral**. Given the ambiguity between reaching the two benchmarks this cycle and the similarity in performance compared to the previous year, **Neutral** is the obvious choice.

2. It’s apparent the department needs a larger sample size. However, since this outcome has been phased out for the coming year, that point is somewhat moot. Monitoring technological aptitude will continue though, whether or not it is part of the formal assessment process, since technology plays such a huge part in our industry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome #:</strong> 3</th>
<th><strong>Outcome Title:</strong> Design / Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type (choose one):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Discipline/Program</td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of how the principles and elements of design work in concert to develop a unified design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ SLO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other</td>
<td></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?

**Outcome Description:**

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 eight years.

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review)?

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. Same process as for Outcome 1. Below is the rubric for design / composition:**

<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. Since the results of a design may be judged rather subjectively, the use of multiple, experienced evaluators help normalize ratings, though in some student cases, only a single evaluator had the opportunity to review a portfolio. This method, as do the others, relies on data from graduating students. It is hoped that some of the skill displayed has to do with training within the program, but the continued 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. 11
### 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.

### 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?

### 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?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Students met both benchmarks: 85% or higher earning a *Competent* rating with at least 33% gaining a *Professional* rating.
2. One student (9%) this cycle was rated *Not Competent* whereas no students from the previous cycle received that rating. However, this cycle, 37% met the *Professional* rating, while only 19% received that rating the previous cycle.
3. NA

1. While the benchmarks were met, the low sample size (11) and use of single evaluators for some students taint the results, as with the other outcomes. For this reason, a **Neutral** rating is prudent.
2. The department is improving its emphasis on design. No software classes are taught with just a how-to, “press this button” methodology; design assignments make up all coursework. That said, focus in this area must continue as entry-level, non-design production work becomes less available in the industry. In addition, a larger sample size must be evaluated to add validity to the results.
### Outcome Title: Concept / Solution

**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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type (choose one):</th>
<th>Discipline/Program</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

**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. Same process as for Outcome 1. Below is the rubric for concept / effectiveness:

<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>

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. As with the 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. 11
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.

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 failed to meet the benchmark, whether it was the larger goal of 85% of the population scoring at least Competent, or the smaller one of 33% of the population obtaining a Professional rating. From a numbers perspective, if one more student had earned a Competent rating, the 85% mark would have been met. In a similar fashion, if two more students had been rated Professional by more than one evaluator, the 33% mark would have been met. (27% were rated Professional by one evaluator, but missed the wider consensus.)

2. When compared to the portfolios from last cycle, the results are similar. Neither the Competent (85%) rating nor the Professional (33%) rating were met in either case. Since the previous cycle had a larger sample size (16 vs. 11) and had multiple evaluators for each student, those results are probably more valid.

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. Since the benchmarks were not met, this is the only rating that can be made. Again though, this result is heavily influenced by the small sample size.

2. Major changes in curriculum should not be made based on the results of 11 students being evaluated by one, two, or three evaluators. Concept should continue to be scrutinized. Really though, the assessment process should be reworked to obtain a larger sample.
Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

- Current Academic Year: 2011-2012

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

Communication (same), Personal Development (new), Design/Composition (same), Concept/Solution (same)

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

It’s apparent that the current assessment method, while beneficial for assessing graduating students’ work, has problems with validity because of its small sample size. If the purpose of assessment is to be able to make decisive program-wide changes based off of the results, the method must be changed to capture more samples. To this end, the program will revert to a system used in 2007-08 to capture department-wide statistics, rather than information from just one class.

Outcomes 1, 3, and 4: Instructors will periodically assess one specific outcome using a department-wide rubric with an applicable project. Students will be polled to identify their level within the department: entry (0 – 2 courses), intermediate (3 – 10 courses), advanced (more than 10 courses.) Students will also polled about occupation, in order to filter graphic designers who were only taking a class to update skills.

Outcome 2: In the fall term, students will be asked to complete a questionnaire about their goals for specific courses at the beginning of the term. At the end of the term, instructors will assess their progress based on results vs. stated goals. This will be done in order to make the assessment method a direct measure rather than an indirect measure, which would occur if the students were to answer a survey at the end.

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

Outcomes 1, 3, and 4: Same benchmarks as used previously for students classified as Advanced (i.e.: 85% Competent and 33% Professional). Among the Entry-level and Intermediate students, we should see a progression toward these numbers, indicating that students are learning these skills in the program, rather than just bringing the skills to the program. While this second phenomena is predicted, it will not be used when determining whether the benchmarks were actually met. Only the Advanced student work will be used for this purpose.

Outcome 2: For the new outcome of Personal Development, a rating system including Professional doesn’t make sense. Consequently, 75% will be used as the benchmark to determine group success.

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.)

No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.