Arapahoe Community College
2016-2017 Multimedia, Graphic Design, Illustration Assessment Plan Data

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

Assessment Author(s)
Tom DeMoulin

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Measure 1 Description:
Students in MGD 289 (Capstone) will meet with multiple industry professionals in early March to assess progress on their professional portfolios. After meeting each student, the reviewer will fill out a survey asking their opinion about the student's demonstrated design abilities. The student will be rated as follows: professional level, competent at the college level, not competent at the college level. The reviews for each student will then be tabulated and averaged. (3/21/17 note: reviewers actually marked a rubric from 1 - 5. Since multiple reviewers were involved, this change was made to better calculate averages. The assessment coordinator then applied the tags of "professional" to averaged scores of 4.5 and above, "college competent" to averages 2.5 and higher, and "not competent" to averages below 2.5.)
Since these students are completing the MGD AAS, these findings should present the program with a good understanding of how well it is meeting industry needs.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
9

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

85% of students earn an averaged "College Competent" rating, with a third averaging a "Professional" rating.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

These benchmarks have been used historically. What is different this year is that we have multiple outside reviewers and only MGD 289 students are being assessed.

One caveat is that this is a "work in progress" review, so the ratings might be less favorable than a review of completed work.

This discipline outcome was
Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

The above chart shows each student's execution of design when showing their work to between four and six reviewers. Reviewers marked a rubric from 1 to 5, with 1 being unprepared and 5 being nearly ready for interview (professional). Reviewers scored students in five design areas 1) typography; 2) image selection;
3) composition; 4) unity of student's collection of work; 5) novelty of student's collection of work. All reviews were averaged for each of the five areas. The five averaged scores were then averaged for a composite Design score for each student. Any average above 4.5 is viewed as "professional".

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

The department met one part of the benchmark with 100% of students scoring at least a "college competent" rating (3 of 5) rather than just 85%. However, only 2 of 9 students (22%) were rated at a "professional" level (above 4.5 rating), so the benchmark was technically missed.

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

The data compares pretty well. Last year, 100% of advanced students met the "college competent" rating, with about 37% going on to receive the higher "professional" ratings. This year, all advanced students met the "college competent" rating, with two of nine (22%) being rated "professional". Since this year's sample size was so small, literally one student's performance was the difference in meeting the benchmark.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Not applicable.

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?

Unknown. This was a much more efficient form of assessment (checking performance in a Capstone course rather than across multiple classes). It also addresses a need for the department to assess by degree, as the only students in Capstone (MGD 289) are seeking an AAS in graphic design. That said, the small number of students assessed could greatly skew results. (Had one extra student received an average above 4.5, the benchmark would have been met.) The great thing about this assessment process is that four to six reviewers looked at each student's work, which addresses previous questions about instructor bias when evaluating their own students. The major issue though is whether assessment will continue in its current form at all, pending the review by HLC.
3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Although the benchmark was technically missed, students appear to be on track in terms of design development. As a group, they averaged 4.06 in design, meaning that the group was slightly closer to "professional" than "college competent". Instruction will be made aware of this slight miss and continue focusing on design in all classes.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Discipline Outcome

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

Assessment Author(s)

Tom DeMoulin

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Portfolio evaluation

Measure 1 Description:

Students in MGD 289 (Capstone) will meet with multiple industry professionals in early March to assess progress on their professional portfolios. After meeting each student, the reviewer will fill out a survey asking their opinion about the student's demonstrated abilities with developing concepts and solutions. The student will be rated as follows: professional level, competent at the college level, not competent at the college level. The reviews for each student will then be tabulated and averaged. (3/21/17 note: reviewers actually marked a rubric from 1 - 5. Since multiple reviewers were involved, this change was made to better calculate averages. The assessment coordinator then applied the tags of "professional" to averaged scores of 4.5 and above, "college competent" to averages 2.5 and higher, and "not competent" to averages below 2.5.)
Since these students are completing the MGD AAS, these findings should present the program with a good understanding of how well it is meeting industry needs.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

9

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

85% of students earn an averaged "College Competent" rating, with a third averaging a "Professional" rating.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

These benchmarks have been used historically. What is different this year is that we have multiple outside reviewers and only MGD 289 students are being assessed.

One caveat is that this is a "work in progress" review, so the ratings might be less favorable than a review of completed work.

This discipline outcome was

Met benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

![Concept Average Among 9 Students](chart.png)

The above chart shows each student's performance at conceptual development when showing their work to between four and six reviewers. Reviewers marked a rubric from 1 to 5, with 1 being unprepared and 5 being nearly ready for interview (professional). Reviewers scored students in three concept areas.
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

The department exceeded one part of the benchmark (at least 85% scoring a "college competent" rating (3)... 100% exceeded) and met the second part of the benchmark with three or nine students (33%) being rated at a "professional" level (above 4.5 rating).

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

The data compares favorably. Last year, 87% of advanced students met the "college competent" rating, with just under 30% going on to receive the higher "professional" rating. This year, all students met the "college competent" rating with three of nine students (33%) going on to receive the "professional" rating.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Not applicable.

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)?

Met 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?

Unknown. This was a much more efficient form of assessment (checking performance in a Capstone course rather than across multiple classes). It also addresses a need for the department to assess by degree, as the only students in Capstone (MGD 289) are seeking an AAS in graphic design. That said, the small number of students assessed could greatly skew results. The great thing about this assessment process is that four to six reviewers looked at each student's work, which addresses previous questions about instructor bias when evaluating their own students. The major issue though is whether assessment will continue in its current form at all, pending the review by HLC.
3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Students appear to be on track in terms of developing strong conceptual solutions. This information will be shared with instruction with the goal of continuing to improve the connection between conceptual development and successful design.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

---

Learning Outcome

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

Assessment Author(s)

Tom DeMoulin

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Portfolio evaluation

Measure 1 Description:

Students in MGD 289 (Capstone) will meet with multiple industry professionals in early March to assess progress on their professional portfolios. After meeting each student, the reviewer will fill out a survey asking their opinion about the student's demonstrated communication skill in presenting their work. The student will be rated as follows: professional level, competent at the college level, not competent at the college level. The reviews for each student will then be tabulated and averaged. (3/21/17 note: reviewers actually marked a rubric from 1 - 5. Since multiple reviewers were involved, this change was made to better calculate averages. The assessment coordinator then applied the tags of "professional" to averaged scores of 4.5 and above, "college competent" to averages 2.5 and higher, and "not competent" to averages below 2.5.)
Since these students are completing the MGD AAS, these findings should present the program with a good understanding of how well it is meeting industry needs.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

9

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

85% of students earn an averaged "College Competent" rating, with a third averaging a "Professional" rating.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

These benchmarks have been used historically. What is different this year is that we have multiple outside reviewers and only MGD 289 students are being assessed.

One caveat is that this is a "work in progress" review, so the ratings might be less favorable than a review of completed work.

This learning outcome was

Surpassed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

The above chart shows each student's performance at discussing and defending their designs with between four to six reviewers. Reviewers marked a rubric from 1 to 5, with 1 being unprepared and 5 being nearly ready for interview (professional). Reviewers scored students in two areas 1) how each student advocated for their own design solutions; 2) whether the student moved beyond technical "nuts and bolts"
descriptions and instead spoke conceptually about how the work addressed the design problem. All reviews were averaged for each of the two areas. The two averaged scores were then averaged for a composite Communication score for each student. Any average above 4.5 is viewed as "professional".

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

The department exceeded both parts of the benchmark, at least 85% scoring a "college competent" rating (3), with 33% of students being rated at a "professional" level (above 4.5 rating). All students met or exceeded the "college competent" rating, with four of the nine being rated at a "professional" level.

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

The data compares favorably. Last year, 100% of advanced students met the "college competent" rating, with over 40% going on to receive the higher "professional" ratings. This year, four of nine students met this rating, or about 44%.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

Not applicable

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?

Unknown. This was a much more efficient form of assessment (checking performance in a Capstone course rather than across multiple classes). It also addresses a need for the department to assess by degree, as the only students in Capstone (MGD 289) are seeking an AAS in graphic design. That said, the small number of students assessed could greatly skew results. The great thing about this assessment process is that four to six reviewers listened to each student pitch their work, which addresses previous questions about instructor bias when evaluating their own students. The major issue though is whether assessment will continue in its current form at all, pending the review by HLC.
3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

Students appear to be on track in terms of understanding how to display their work to unknown, outside parties. This validates the current instructional direction for communication.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

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.

Assessment Author(s)
Tom DeMoulin

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Portfolio evaluation

Measure 1 Description:
Students in MGD 289 (Capstone) will meet with multiple industry professionals in early March to assess progress on their professional portfolios. After meeting each student, the reviewer will fill out a survey asking their opinion about the student's demonstrated abilities to plan their solutions with industry research,
design briefs, and initial drawings. The student will be rated as follows: professional level, competent at the college level, not competent at the college level. The reviews for each student will then be tabulated and averaged. Since these students are completing the MGD program, this should present the program with a good understanding of how well it is meeting industry needs.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

9

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**

85% of students earn an averaged "College Competent" rating, with a third averaging a "Professional" rating.

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**

These benchmarks have been used historically. What is different this year is that we have multiple outside reviewers and only MGD 289 students are being assessed.

One caveat is that this is a "work in progress" review, so the ratings might be less favorable than a review of completed work.

**Measure 1 Results:**

Results for this outcome were not collected during this calendar year. During the scheduled visit with reviewers, there was not enough time to examine planning materials in addition to reviewing portfolios. This was an error in planning rather than execution. As such, recording whether the benchmark was met or missed does not make sense.

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

Not applicable. Outcome not measured.

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

NA

3) **If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?**

NA

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?

Obviously, assessment planning needs to be revised for various reasons, the largest of which is the impact of HLC's report, which is unreleased at this time.

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

NA

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

Wait for HLC report and modify assessment process as necessary.

Person/ Group responsible for action

Tom DeMoulin

Target Date for implementation of the action

03/15/2018

Priority

Medium

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

Unknown at this time.