Discipline	Course Number	Title
Graphic Design Technology	290	GDT 290 01/09/2019-Professional Practices
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts	Ingrid Ankerson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

   3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

   5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Produce a comprehensive portfolio of graphic design in line with career goals.

- Assessment Plan

  o Assessment Tool: Portfolio assessment using a rubric

  o Assessment Date: Winter 2010

  o Course section(s)/other population: all

  o Number students to be assessed: random selection of 50% of the enrolled students

  o How the assessment will be scored:

  o Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

o   Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2018, 2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	26

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students in both semesters were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The GDT program is a daytime in-person program. This class is only offered FTF during the day.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

As a capstone class, I developed a rubric based on the program's outcomes in addition to those of this class. Students were assessed on this rubric by members of the design community as well as educators both at this institution as well as at EMU and CCS. As an instructor I also used a rubric to grade each student's portfolio. Only one student in the course of two years did not succeed.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes
Overwhelmingly students were successful in developing a portfolio that were in-line with career goals. With the exception of the single student in two years who didn't complete their portfolio and failed the class, every other student did. Nearly 99% of students as assessed by outside reviewers were "ready for entry-level employment or a 4-year degree."

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students are extremely successful in this outcome. It is a semester-long project, and in the end, students are very ready to enter the industry.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

While I realize there is always room for improvement, it's difficult to conceive of a way to improve results as students are very motivated and successful in this class. But it is important for faculty to stay up-to-date with industry trends and continue making connections within the industry to make sure we are accurate in our assessments.

Outcome 2: Produce self-promotional personal identity package and marketing collateral.

- Assessment Plan

  - Assessment Tool: Assessment of self-promotional pieces using a rubric

  - Assessment Date: Winter 2010

  - Course section(s)/other population: all

  - Number students to be assessed: random selection of 50% of the enrolled students

  - How the assessment will be scored:

  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

  - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2018, 2017	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
30	26

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed for more complete data.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

This is a daytime FTF class only.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The outcome was primarily assessed with a rubric by faculty. Their personal identity system was also assessed by outside reviewers in the design industry as well as faculty at EMU and CCS.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Based on instructor and outside reviewers 98% of students were successful in creating an average or above-average personal identity and self-promotional piece. As this is a capstone class that culminates with a public portfolio show and then going on the job market, students are extremely serious and dedicated to achieving this outcome. I am not surprised by this outcome.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Again, students are very, very successful here. They are interested in leaving the program to get work and know how important this is to achieving this goal.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

For continued improvement (or to make sure we don't slide), I think it's important to make sure we include web presence as part of their identity. Students develop websites, but to stay on-trend, they also need to engage in social media or tactics other than print collateral.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

   There was no previous report with intended changes.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

   This course is absolutely meeting the needs of students. Anecdotally, I hear from many educators and design professionals that our students' portfolios and identity packages are much better than any other students' in the area. I'm not surprised by the success of our students. I believe the high stakes of this class (being reviewed by industry professionals as well as the desire to get a job upon completion) are a big reason why students succeed.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

   We give updates at our department meetings.

4.
   Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

   The rubric I attached was for more than just the two outcomes of this class, but I thought it would be helpful to see an overview of everything students were assessed on by industry professionals. Each student was assessed by more than one reviewer, hence why the numbers are much higher than the actual enrollment of the class.

III. Attached Files

   GDT Assessment Rubric

Faculty/Preparer: Ingrid Ankerson **Date:** 04/15/2019
Department Chair: Ingrid Ankerson **Date:** 04/15/2019
Dean: Eva Samulski   **Date:** 04/16/2019

Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron   **Date:** 05/17/2019