Discipline	Course Number	Title
Graphic Design Technology	100	GDT 100 11/21/2016-Typography I
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts	Ingrid Ankerson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Create typographic designs using graphic design software focusing on typeface selection, creative and dynamic use of display type, formatting and organization, development and use of grid structures.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Portfolio of work from the course

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2014

    o Course section(s)/other population: all

    o Number students to be assessed: All if one section; 20 randomly selected if two or more sections are offered.

    o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 2.5 (of 4) or better on the portfolio evaluation.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: full-time departmental faculty

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)
	2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
21	18

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.

18 out of 21 students were assessed because three withdrew from the class.

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.

All students assessed in this report were in the only section of the class offered this semester. The class was daytime, face-to-face.

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

I assigned four projects that were evaluated on a rubric worth 50 points total. The rubric graded use of typography (appropriate choices, attention to typographic detail) and overall design success (use of grid structure and design principles)

I then converted the points into percentages.

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

The master syllabus states that the standard of success used is that "75% of the students will score 2.5 (of 4) or better on the portfolio evaluation." 2.5 of 4 is 63% when converted to percentages.

Each of my four projects assessed this same outcome and I had only one student who was below the 63% threshold in one instance. Otherwise:

Project 1- 17/18 scored 75% or above

Project 2- 16/18 scored 75% or above

Project 3 - 17/18 scored 75% or above

Project 4 - 17/18 scored 75% or above

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

> Students achieved a high level of success largely in part to the fact that each project has 2-3 critiques along the way. Each of these learning outcomes are discussed and they have a chance to correct and refine before turning in work for the final grade.

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 there is always room for improvement, I believe the structure of critique and refinement works well and allows students to succeed eventually where they may not have initially. However, I think the standard for success needs to be raised to at least 75% and that the assessment need not be based on a four point scale.

Outcome 2: Apply basic principles of design in completing typographic assignments.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Portfolio of work from the course

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2014

    o Course section(s)/other population: All

    o Number students to be assessed: All if one section; 20 randomly selected students if two or more sections are offered.

    o How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric.

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students will score 2.5 (of 4.0) or better on the portfolio evaluation.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time departmental faculty

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)
	2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
21	18

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.

18 out of 21 students were assessed because three withdrew from the class.

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.

All students assessed in this report were in the only section of the class offered this semester. The class was daytime, face-to-face.

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

I assigned four projects that were evaluated on a rubric worth 50 points total. The rubric graded use of typography (appropriate choices, attention to typographic detail) and overall design success (use of grid structure and design principles)

I then converted the points into percentages.

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

The master syllabus states that the standard of success used is that "75% of the students will score 2.5 (of 4) or better on the portfolio evaluation." 2.5 of 4 is 63% when converted to percentages.

Each of my four projects assessed this same outcome and I had only one student who was below the 63% threshold in one instance. Otherwise:

Project 1- 17/18 scored 75% or above

Project 2- 16/18 scored 75% or above

Project 3 - 17/18 scored 75% or above

Project 4 - 17/18 scored 75% or above

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

Again, students achieved a high level of success because the course is structured so there are 2-3 critiques along the way.

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.

> This outcome does not differ enough from the first outcome; they are one in the same. Again, I believe the standard of success needs to be raised, but more than anything, I think this outcome could be folded into the first. Both are about choosing appropriate type and using design principles for successful results.

Outcome 3: Recognize and identify typographic anatomy, measurements and classification.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Departmental exam questions

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2014

    o Course section(s)/other population: all

    o Number students to be assessed: All if one section; 20 randomly selected if two or more sections are offered.

    o How the assessment will be scored: Answer key and departmentally developed rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 2.5 (of 4) or higher on departmental exam questions.

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Full-time departmental faculty

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)
	2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
21	18

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.

> 18 out of 21 students were assessed because three withdrew from the class.

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.

> All students assessed in this report were in the only section of the class offered this semester. The class was daytime, face-to-face.

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

> There were two tools used to assess this outcome:
>
> 1. 20 point exam about typographic anatomy;
> 2. 20 point project (scored on rubric) to show understanding of typographic classification

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: <u>Yes</u>
>
> The master syllabus states that these will both be based on exams and that 75% of students will score 2.5 out of 4 or higher (63%). I didn't use this standard. Rather, students had a possible 20 points on either of these, which I converted to percentages.
>
> In total, 17/18 students scored 75% or higher on both tools I used to assess. Only one student scored below the 63% standard of success.

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

> Overall, students were very successful achieving this outcome. Leading up to the test and project related to type classification, students researched on their own and did a number of exercises that helped reach the outcome.

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.

> The assessment tool I was supposed to use for this was a departmental exam. I did this for typographic anatomy, but not for type classification. Going forward, I would recommend keeping the exam for both areas to make sure students really achieved the outcome.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. 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?

   > Overall, I strongly believe this course is meeting the needs of students. It is an introductory course and based on the assessment, the majority of students are achieving what they need to go on to more advanced courses.
   >
   > That said, the standard of success in the learning outcomes must be raised to a "C" level, which is the required grade to continue to the next design class. Still, a majority of students are reaching that level currently.

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

   > I am the only full time faculty in this area, but will share this information with whatever part time instructors teach the class in the future while we work together to write the lectures, projects, and schedule.

3.
   Intended Change(s)

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

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

   > I think I need to refine the rubric to something that is less than 50 points. Perhaps just 1-5 would be a stronger tool.

III. Attached Files

GDT100 Assessment

Faculty/Preparer:	Ingrid Ankerson **Date:** 05/23/2017
Department Chair:	Ingrid Ankerson **Date:** 05/23/2017
Dean:	Kristin Good **Date:** 05/30/2017
Assessment Committee Chair:	Michelle Garey **Date:** 09/18/2017

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Background Information

1. Course assessed:
    Course Discipline Code and Number: GDT 100
    Course Title: Typography I
    Division/Department Codes: BCT/VISD

2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):
    ☒ Fall 2005
    ☐ Winter 20__
    ☐ Spring/Summer 20__
    The assessment report for F'05 was completed and submitted in April 2006. It appears to have been lost, so it is being resubmitted at this time (December 2006.)

3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.
    ☒ Portfolio
    ☐ Standardized test
    ☐ Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):
    ☐ Survey
    ☐ Prompt
    ☒ Departmental exam
    ☐ Capstone experience (specify):
    ☐ Other (specify):

4. Have these tools been used before?
    ☐ Yes
    ☒ No

    If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.   N/A

5. Indicate the number of students assessed/total number of students enrolled in the course. 12/12

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment. All.

II. Results

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment. N/A

2. State each outcome (verbatim) from the master syllabus that was assessed.

Outcomes	Assessment Method
1. Create typographic designs using graphic design software focusing on typographic form, creative and dynamic use of display type, typeface selection, formatting and organization, development and use of grid structures.	Portfolio evaluated by full-time graphic design faculty against a departmental typography rubric
2. Apply basic principles of design in completing typographic assignments	
3. Recognize and identify mechanics of type and typographic classification.	Departmental exam questions
4. Utilize visual vocabulary to critique typographic compositions considering communication effectiveness and basic design principles.	Written or recorded oral critique evaluated by graphic design faculty against a departmental rubric

3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. *Please attach a summary of the data collected.*

    Assessment results indicate that this group of students met the standard for success for outcomes 1 and 2 (Portfolio), but fell short of that goal for outcomes 3 and 4 (Critique Essay and Dept. Exam.

    See attached data summary.

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success. *Please attach the rubric/scoring guide used for the assessment.*

The stated Standard of Success was 80% of students must score 19.5 out of 26 possible points (75%) or better on learning outcome evaluations.

Outcome 1: 83% of students scored 1 (fair) or better.

Outcome 2: 91.6% of students scored a 1 (fair or 75%) or better

Outcome 3: 75% of students scored 75% or better.

Outcome 4: 58% of students scored 75% or better

(We found that the assessment rubric submitted with the Master Syllabus didn't sufficiently align to portfolio outcomes (1 and 2) and some competencies needed restating and reorganizing. (See attached revised rubric).

After revising the rubric, the 26 point scale approved in the Master Syllabus was no longer applicable, so we converted the standard for success to be that 80% of students would score equivalent to "C" (75%) or better on the assessment.

On the scale we ended up using, "Fair" (or 1 out of a maximum of 3 points) is the closest to that "75%" score we consider a success.)

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.

Strengths:
This group of students in general produced, strong, well designed portfolio pieces, with only a few exceptions. It was a very good group.

Portfolio evaluation/Outcomes 1 & 2: Students did extremely well with Typographic Form, and very well in Overall Competencies in the "Create typographic designs"

Dept. Exam/Outcome 3: Students did very well on Type Anatomy (label parts of letterforms)

Weaknesses:
The students didn't "test" as well as they designed. Scores on the critique essay, in particular, were weaker than expected, and did not meet the standard for success.

Portfolio evaluation/Outcome 1: 100 % of students scored "fair" (75%) or better on Text Type, but only 17% scored "good" or better. While this met the standard for success, we would like to see this improve.

Dept. Exam/Outcome 3: Students had some trouble with typeface classification and type measurement. Typeface classification was covered at the beginning of the course, and students did better on the unit quiz than they did on the end of semester exam questions dealing with classification.

Critique Essay/Outcome 4: Students did marginally well on the portion of the critique exam concerning *typography,* but did poorly on discussion of *communication effectiveness.* While these students were very strong at creating design that incorporates principles of design into typographic compositions that communicate effectively, they have not yet mastered the ability to analyze and clearly articulate about the quality and effectiveness of a visual design.

This is a beginning course, and it seems the standard for this outcome was set too high. Also, although college-level writing is a prerequisite for the course, some students' writing skills were lacking.

III. Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses.

GDT faculty strongly agreed nearly all of the materials collected from these students was well above average—it was a very good class—so the low scores indicate that our tools and rubrics need modification. Also, the standard for success may be too high for a beginning course, and maybe it should be changed to **75%** of students must score 75% or better on all learning outcomes.

2. Identify any other intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

a. ☒ Outcomes/Assessments on the Master syllabus
Change/rationale: Based on what we learned from this first assessment, modify standards for success and scoring rubrics (both forthcoming).

b. ☐ Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale:

c. ☐ Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale:

d. ☐ 1st Day Handouts
Change/rationale:

e. ☐ Course assignments
Change/rationale:

f. ☐ Course materials (check all that apply)
   ☐ Textbook
   ☐ Handouts
   ☐ Other:
Change/rationale:

g. ☐ Instructional methods
Change/rationale:

h. ☒ Individual lessons and activities:
Change/rationale:
Terminology and Classification (Outcome 3): Focus on using the terminology and classification identification terms more throughout the semester so students can better retain the material.

Essay Critique (Outcome 4): Require students write analyses for most of the project critiques throughout the semester, with instructor feedback on what they write. During W'06 and F'06, Critique guide sheets were used by students to respond to a series of questions relating to application of design and typography principles in other students' and their own design projects.

Future plans

1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.
As noted above, rubric modification and standards for success are needed (completed).

2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.
Changes to standard for success to **75%** of students will score "fair" (75%) or better. Revise scoring rubrics to range from 0 (missing/unacceptable) to 4 (very good) with descriptions for each level of evaluation (forthcoming).

3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?
All **X** Selected _____
If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: __Fall, 2008__ .

If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: _____.

Submitted by:

Name: _____ Date: _12/06/06_
Lind Babcock

Department Chair: _____ Date: _12/6/06_
Jennifer Baker

Dean: _____ Date: _12/15/0 C_
Rosemary Wilson

Please return completed form to the Office of Curriculum & Assessment, SC 247.