Arapahoe Community College

2014-2015

MULTIMEDIA, GRAPHIC DESIGN, ILLUSTRATION

DESIGN / COMPOSITION: DEMONSTRATE AN UNDERSTANDING OF HOW THE PRINCIPLES AND ELEMENTS OF DESIGN ARE UNITED DESIGN.

Assessment Author(s) Tom DeMoulin

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 project. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation will focus on the most designs such as strong typography, "pop", "a-ha" ingenuity, etc.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional level (professional experience), the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify their previous MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 – 9 previous MGD courses... lowered for Advanced students (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). (Concurrently enrolled students are not included in the results.

Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with various levels of prior MGD coursework performed on this measure.

Measure 1 Sample Size: 24

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure. For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 9 MGD courses completed), we should see a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among students classified as Intermediate (3 – 9 MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 9 MGD courses completed), we should see a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating.

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 proficiency in the field.
This Discipline Outcome was: Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

Above is a graph showing student performance in Design/Composition for multiple projects compared to previous years. Instead of having instructors assess their own students, students assessed all projects. In contrast to previous years, as students gained training in their discipline, their performance noticeably improved. Indeed, advanced students (6) only received one Professional rating.

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

While Intermediate students did surpass a *Professional* rating beyond 33% (3 of 8 students earned this rating).

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

The data does not compare favorably to Fall 2013 results. That said, there was a prior bias toward their more advanced students as they rated their work. This year's report included an independent reviewer. (Note that the reviewer did rate one of his own classes with scores removed.)

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)?

Missed 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 does throw into question how instructors rate their own students' performance. If all instructors followed the rubric when awarding ratings. However, the amount of students assessed limits the amount of bias from the evaluator. If just one more Advanced student had attained a *Professional* rating, it would be more likely that the benchmark was met.

As with previous reports, this year’s assessment seems to ask more questions than it answers. What do you need to consider to determine the sample size to be statistically sound? (Probably more than 24.) What does each "professional" work? An adjustment that should probably be made would be to use a larger sample size to get more reliable data.

3) How will your assessment affect your program?

The report introduces a warning flag that will serve as a good opening for communication. If your program, it seems logical that all instructors would be on the same page when it comes to the benchmark.
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Results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

CONCEPT / SOLUTION: DEVELOP CONCEPTS THAT ADDRESS TARGET AUDIENCES AND FIT WITHIN PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 1 Description:**
Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to the design problem for a given project. In an attempt to normalize the variety of projects, they concentrate on qualities relevant to most concepts such as employing an interesting conceptual parameters.

After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify their previous MGD courses, determines the student's level: Advanced level (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience), Intermediate level (3 - 9 previous MGD courses), or Lowered (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). (Concurrently enrolled students who have completed at least one previous MGD course can be classified as Advanced level.)

Results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with varying levels perform on this measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Sample Size:</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 9 MGD courses), we should attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among Intermediate students (3 – 9 MGD courses completed), we should see more students achieving a Competent level, with a further 33% reaching a Professional rating.

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.

Please select

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Discipline Outcome was:</th>
<th>Missed benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Measure 1
Results:

Above is a graph showing student performance in Concept/Solution for multiple projects compared to previous years. Instead of having instructors assess their own students, all projects were assessed. In contrast to previous years, as students gained training in these projects, performance noticeably improved. Indeed, advanced students (6) received no Professional ratings.

rubric_concept.pdf

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

As with the Design outcome, Intermediate students did surpass a Professional rating. Advanced students (6) were rated at the Professional level and two actually received a Professional rating.

2) How does the data

The data does not compare favorably to Fall 2013 results. That said, there was a pronounced bias toward their more advanced students as they rated their work. This year's report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>compare to the previous year, if applicable?</td>
<td>independent reviewer. (Note that the reviewer did rate one of his own classes with self-removal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>Missed benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>The assessment does throw into question how instructors rate their own students' performance when followed the rubric when awarding ratings. However, the amount of students assessed may not be statistically sound. (Probably more than 24.) What does each &quot;professional&quot; work? An adjustment that should probably be made would be to use a larger sample size to support the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support,</td>
<td>The report introduces a warning flag that will serve as a good opening for communication. With a strong program, it seems logical that all instructors would be on the same page when it comes to quality improvement. As stated earlier, the assessment process itself may have been somewhat subjective. Major curricular changes aren't advised at this time. Instead, more outside evaluation and department participation in the assessment process are suggested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNICATION: THE ABILITY TO VERBALLY DESCRIBE AND DEFEND DESIGN SOLUTIONS TO A POTENTIAL EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Type:</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure 1 Description: | Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to their work in critique. In an attempt to normalize the variety of project presentation qualities relevant to most presentations such as research of competition, client analysis, and results, instructors are given a rubric to apply. After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, the course's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify their department's level (Advanced (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience), Intermediate level (3 - 9 previous MGD courses), Lowered first year students (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience), Concurrently enrolled students), results are then compiled across courses, providing a picture of how students with varying levels of experience are performing.

| Measure 1 Sample Size: | 24 |

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

For students classified as Advanced (previous completion of more than 9 MGD courses), they will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among students who have completed (3 – 9 MGD courses completed), and Intermediate students (3 – 9 MGD courses completed), we should see similar results.

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 students' ability to communicate effectively.

Please select

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Learning Outcome was:</th>
<th>Surpassed benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Measure 1 Results: | |
|--------------------| |
Above is a graph showing student performance in oral communication during critique or Professional. Advanced students (9) easily exceeded the benchmark, as did intermediate used for assessing performance.

rubric_comm.pdf

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

All three levels of students exceeded the 33% Professional benchmark and no student that the entire group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either Competent or Professional rating either.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year,

The data compares favorably with 2013. A greater percentage of advanced students both years, intermediate as well as advanced students exceeded the benchmark an Competent rating either.
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#### Tk20 CampusWide

**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... As with last year, the department will stay on course with its curricula, teaching strategy trend continues. There are a few issues of concern though, as mentioned with the ot...

As with the previous two years, the high percentage of *Professional* ratings across the... how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 17 of the 24 students received a... (first year-professional), while no student at any level received a *Not Competent* rating.

...students with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias... to mitigate this with the Design and Concept outcomes. A similar strategy may be ne...

Second, the small sample size of 24 is of concern. However, with the high degree of rubric is the larger issue.

**3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate**

Curricular changes based on this report are unwarranted, as there is nothing in the r...

That said, the process itself needs to be further scrutinized, as mentioned above. It... students (at all levels) are presenting their work at a professional level in the somew... are, then training for this outcome within the department is unnecessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1 Type:</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measure 1 Description: | Instructors are given a rubric to apply for any one project in their own course(s) related to design problem and synthesis in order to create design briefs, thumbnails, and other relevant artifacts. The rubric allows for normalization of the variety of project presentations, points of evaluation concentrate on quality of research and drawings toward a strategic direction, drawings showing clear solution, and a project brief summarizing the problem and analyzing the competition.
| Measure 1 Sample Size: | 24 |
| 1) Describe the benchmark for this measure. | After instructors rate each student as either Not Competent, Competent, or Professional, the department's assessment coordinator, who looks up each student's transcript to identify their level (Advanced (previous completion of more than 9 MGD courses), Intermediate level (3 - 9 previous MGD courses... lowered for concurrently enrolled students (more than 10 MGD courses or professional experience). (Concurrently enrolled students will attain a Competent rating with at least 33% reaching a Professional rating. Among previous MGD courses completed) and Intermediate students (3 – 9 MGD courses completed), we should see: |
| 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 learning. |
| This Learning Outcome was: | Surpassed benchmark |
| Measure 1 Results: | |
Above is a graph showing student performance in information management (specific projects. This is the second year for tracking this outcome and students followed a structured training in the program, their performance improved. Advanced students (9) completed projects with 44% (4) receiving Competent ratings and 56% (5) receiving Professional rating. Students progressed as predicted. Of note is that this is the only outcome this year that as students complete more MGD classes, they would perform better. Attached is the rubric_infomgmt.pdf

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

All student levels exceeded the 33% Professional benchmark and no students score group easily met the 85% bar for attaining either Competent or Professional ratings.

2) How does the data compare to the

The data compares favorably. While 2014's students didn't score as sky high in the was rated Not Competent, which was the case for a few 2013 students.
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 preliminary research. There is no reason to alter curricula and teaching strategies as is just the second year of assessing Information Management though, so further inst help to ensure instructors are measuring the same thing.

As with the Communication outcome, the high percentage of Professional ratings ac examination of how instructors are employing the rubric. Across skill levels, 11 of the (comparable to a first year-professional), while none received a Not Competent ratin with the assessment embedded within their own projects, a familiarity bias may be o mitigate this somewhat with the Concept and Design outcomes this year. A similar s

As was also suggested with the other outcomes, the small sample size of 24 studen participation in the assessment process is prudent.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or

Curricular changes based on this report are unwarranted, as there is nothing in the r That said, the process itself needs to be further scrutinized, as mentioned above. St competition, a strategy statement ("brief"), and multiple directions, all drawing toward and it requires training and instruction. The absence of a Not Competent rating seen came so late in the term that training had been introduced and embraced.
| **stimulate**
| student
| learning? | Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary |
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