Arapahoe Community College

2013-2014 Multimedia, Graphic Design, Illustration Assessment Plan Data

Learning Outcome
Communication: The ability to verbally describe and defend design solutions to a potential employer or client.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Measure 1 Description:
Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to each student's verbal presentation of their work in critique. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation concentrate on qualities relevant to most presentations such as research of competition, client analysis, and audience analysis.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, rubrics are submitted to the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify the student as either Entry level (0 - 2 previous MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 - 10 previous MGD courses) or Advanced (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with various levels of experience performed.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
86

Measure 1 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience, at least 85% will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among the Entry-level (0 – 2 MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 10 MGD courses completed), we should see a progression toward these goals.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
This benchmark has historically served as a challenging goal and also is a good indicator of student success.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
Above is a graph showing student performance in oral communication during critiques. As students gained training in the program, their performance improved as predicted. Advanced students (8) didn’t receive any *Not Competent* ratings, splitting evenly between *Competent* and *Professional* ratings. Entry-level (48) and intermediate (30) students followed suite, showing steady performance improvements. Attached is the rubric used for assessing performance.

**Measure 2 Results:**

rubric_comm.pdf

---

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

Both intermediate and advanced students exceeded the 33% *Professional* benchmark and no advanced or intermediate students scored a *Not Competent* rating, meaning that the group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either *Competent* or *Professional* ratings. Even entry-level students almost met the *Professional* benchmark with a score of ~29%.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The data compares very favorably with 2012. A greater percentage of advanced students earned a *Professional* rating this year. In both years, no advanced students earned a *Not Competent* rating. This year, intermediate as well as advanced students exceeded the benchmark and no intermediate students earned a *Not Competent* rating either.
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
NA

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The assessment shows that the department is doing its job teaching students how to describe and defend their design solutions. As with last year, the department will stay on course with its curricula, teaching strategies and assessment methods to see if the trend continues. There are a few issues of concern though, as mentioned with the other outcomes.

As with last year, the high percentage of Professional ratings across the board (~37%) warrants an examination of how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 32 of the 86 students received this highest rating (comparable to a first year-professional), while only 9 (~10.5%) received a Not Competent rating. Since instructors are rating their own students with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias may be occurring. The department attempted to mitigate this somewhat this year with the assessment coordinator determining student experience by parsing transcripts after graded rubrics were submitted rather than the instructor polling students directly, but that may not be enough to counter-balance familiarity.

Second, the sample size dwindles rather dramatically from entry-level (48) to intermediate (30) and finally advanced students (8). This is natural given the small amount of students with more than 10 previous MGD courses. If the department were to adjust the advanced rating to include 9 or more previous classes, it would pick up 6 more assessments from the intermediate group, making it more comparable and its results not so subject to the performance of a single student. This makes more sense, as 9 classes indicate the equivalent of three terms with three classes and roughly a 70% completion of required classes for the degree. (If this had been done this year, four of these assessments rated Competent rather than Professional, adjusting the advanced student Professional rating downward from 50% to ~43%.)

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome

Design / Composition: Demonstrate an understanding of how the principles and elements of design work in concert to develop a unified design.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Other

Measure 1 Description:
Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to each student's design for that project. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation concentrate on qualities relevant to most designs such as strong typography, "pop", "a-ha" ingenuity, etc.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, rubrics are submitted to the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify the student as either Entry level (0 - 2 previous MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 - 10 previous MGD courses) or Advanced (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with various levels of experience performed.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
117

Measure 1 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience, at least 85% will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among the Entry-level (0 – 2 MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 10 MGD courses completed), we should see a progression toward these goals.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
This benchmark has historically served as a challenging goal and also is a good indicator of student success.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
Above is a graph showing student performance in Design/Composition for multiple projects. As in previous years, as students gained training in the program, their performance improved as predicted. Advanced students (8) didn't receive any Not Competent ratings, with the remaining splitting evenly between Competent and Professional ratings. Entry-level (78) and intermediate (31) students were behind advanced students as predicted, except that a slightly larger percentage of intermediate students (~55%) earned Professional ratings. Both intermediate and advanced students exceeded the benchmark. Attached is the rubric used for assessing performance.

Measure 2 Results:

rubric_design.pdf

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

Both intermediate and advanced students exceeded the 33% Professional benchmark and no advanced students scored a Not Competent rating, meaning that the group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either Competent or Professional ratings.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

The data compares favorably with 2012. A greater percentage of advanced students in 2012 earned a Professional rating, but a small percentage also earned a Not Competent rating that year. This year, intermediate as well as advanced students exceeded the benchmark.
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
NA

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
The assessment shows that the department is doing its job teaching design to students. As with last year, the department will stay on course with its curricula, teaching strategies and assessment methods to see if the trend continues. There are a few issues of concern though.

As with last year, the high percentage of Professional ratings across the board (~30%) warrants an examination of how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 35 of the 117 students received this highest rating (comparable to a first year-professional), while only 12 of the 117 received a Not Competent rating. Since instructors are rating their own students with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias may be occurring. The department attempted to mitigate this somewhat this year with the assessment coordinator determining student experience by parsing transcripts after graded rubrics were submitted rather than the instructor polling students directly, but that may not be enough to counter-balance familiarity.

Second, the sample size dwindles rather dramatically from entry-level (78) to intermediate (31) and finally advanced students (8). This is natural given the small amount of students with more than 10 previous MGD courses. If the department were to adjust the advanced rating to include 9 or more previous classes, it would pick up 6 more assessments from the intermediate group, making it more comparable and its results not so subject to the performance of a single student. This makes more sense, as 9 classes indicate the equivalent of three terms with three classes and roughly a 70% completion of required classes for the degree. (Had this been in place this year, 4 of the 6 new advanced assessments would be rated Competent instead of Professional, lowering the advanced overall rating from 50% to ~43%).

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome
Concept / Solution: Develop concepts that address target audiences and fit within production constraints of the client.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Other

Measure 1 Description:
Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to each student's concept to solve the design problem for a given project. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation concentrate on qualities relevant to most concepts such as employing an interesting or unique tactics and addressing a project's parameters.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, rubrics are submitted to the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify the student as either Entry level (0 - 2 previous MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 - 10 previous MGD courses) or Advanced (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with various levels of experience performed.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
103

Measure 1 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience, at least 85% will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among the Entry-level (0 – 2 MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 10 MGD courses completed), we should see a progression toward these goals.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
This benchmark has historically served as a challenging goal and also is a good indicator of student success.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
Above is a graph showing student performance in concept/solution for multiple projects. As students gained training in the program, their performance improved as predicted. As with the Design/Composition outcome, no advanced students (8) received a Not Competent ratings. They earned 25% Competent ratings (2) and 75% receiving Professional ratings (6). Entry-level (64) and intermediate (31) students followed suit, showing steady performance improvements. Attached is the rubric used for assessing performance.

Measure 2 Results:

rubric_concept.pdf

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
Both intermediate and advanced students exceeded the 33% Professional benchmark and no advanced students scored a Not Competent rating, meaning that the group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either Competent or Professional ratings.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
The data compares favorably with 2012. A greater percentage of advanced students this year earned a Professional rating with none earning a Not Competent rating. Last year, a few advanced students earned a Not Competent rating. This year, intermediate as well as advanced students exceeded the benchmark.
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
NA

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The assessment shows that the department is doing its job teaching students how to develop strong concepts in order to solve graphic design problems. As with last year, the department will stay on course with its curricula, teaching strategies and assessment methods to see if the trend continues. There are a few issues of concern though.

As with last year and with the design outcome, the high percentage of Professional ratings across the board (~37%) warrants an examination of how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 38 of the 103 students received this highest rating (comparable to a first year-professional), while only 12 of the 103 (~12%) received a Not Competent rating. Since instructors are rating their own students with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias may be occurring. The department attempted to mitigate this somewhat this year with the assessment coordinator determining student experience by parsing transcripts after graded rubrics were submitted rather than the instructor polling students directly, but that may not be enough to counter-balance familiarity.

Second, the sample size dwindles rather dramatically from entry-level (64) to intermediate (31) and finally advanced students (8). This is natural given the small amount of students with more than 10 previous MGD courses. If the department were to adjust the advanced rating to include 9 or more previous classes, it would pick up 6 more assessments from the intermediate group, making it more comparable and its results not so subject to the performance of a single student. This makes more sense, as 9 classes indicate the equivalent of three terms with three classes and roughly a 70% completion of required classes for the degree. (If this had been done this year, four of these assessments rated Competent rather than Professional, adjusting the advanced student Professional rating downward from 75% to ~57%.)

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome

Information Management: The ability to research and plan relevant design solutions for a given problem. This includes collating company, competitor, and industry research and synthesizing that information into artifacts such as design briefs, thumbnails, and preliminary rough drawings.

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Other

Measure 1 Description:

Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to each student’s research of the design problem and synthesis in order to create design briefs, thumbnails, and rough drawings. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation concentrate on qualities relevant to most planning such as the marriage of research and drawings toward a strategic direction, drawings showing multiple possibilities and moving toward a clear solution, and a project brief summarizing the problem and analyzing the competition.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, rubrics are submitted to the department’s assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify the student as either Entry level (0 - 2 previous MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 - 10 previous MGD courses) or Advanced (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with various levels of experience performed.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience, at least 85% will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among the Entry-level (0 – 2 MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 10 MGD courses completed), we should see a progression toward these goals.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
This benchmark has historically served as a challenging goal and also is a good indicator of student success.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
Above is a graph showing student performance in information management (specifically in preliminary research) for multiple projects. Although this is the first year for tracking this outcome, students followed a similar trajectory to other outcomes this year. As they gained training in the program, their performance improved as predicted. Advanced students (8) did not receive any Not Competent ratings, with 25% (2) receiving Competent ratings and 75% (6) receiving Professional ratings. Entry-level (54) and intermediate (31) students progressed as predicted. Attached is the rubric used for assessing performance.

Measure 2 Results:

rubric_infomgmt.pdf

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
All student levels exceeded the 33% Professional benchmark and no advanced students scored a Not Competent rating, meaning that the group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either Competent or Professional ratings.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
NA. First year this outcome was measured.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

On the surface, the assessment shows that the department is doing its job teaching information management in the form of preliminary research. There is no reason to alter curricula and teaching strategies at this point in time based on the findings. However, since this is the first year the department measured this outcome, further instruction on use of the associated rubric might be helpful to ensure instructors are measuring the same thing.

As with other outcomes, the high percentage of Professional ratings across the board (~45%... highest of the 4 outcomes) warrants an examination of how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 42 of the 93 students received this highest rating (comparable to a first year-professional), while only 13 of the 93 (~14%) received a Not Competent rating. Since instructors are rating their own students with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias may be occurring. The department attempted to mitigate this somewhat this year with the assessment coordinator determining student experience by parsing transcripts after graded rubrics were submitted rather than the instructor polling students directly, but that may not be enough to counter-balance familiarity.

Second, the sample size dwindles rather dramatically from entry-level (54) to intermediate (31) and finally advanced students (8). This is natural given the small amount of students with more than 10 previous MGD courses. If the department were to adjust the advanced rating to include 9 or more previous classes, it would pick up 6 more assessments from the intermediate group, making it more comparable and its results not so subject to the performance of a single student. This makes more sense, as 9 classes indicate the equivalent of three terms with three classes and roughly a 70% completion of required classes for the degree. (If this had been done this year, all but one of these new assessments rated Professional, adjusting the advanced student Professional rating upward from 75% to ~79%.)

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date for implementation of the action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.) |

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