



Graphic Design Major/Minor Assessment Report

May 2013

1. Profile:

Number of Majors: 31
Number of Minors: 4

Number of Faculty: 3 Full-Time
2 Adjunct

The Graphic Design Program at William Woods University was established to train artistically minded, creative students for successful careers as graphic designers. The course of study is interdisciplinary, emphasizing the development of visual sensibility, along with skill and knowledge in such diverse areas as art, communications, technology and business. As in the real world of design, the Graphic Design Program is oriented toward problem solving. Students learn to use their acquired knowledge of design principles and process, and the theories of visual perception, to structure and produce visual solutions to the communication and promotional needs of clients.

Graphic design continues to be a viable long-term career path for aspiring students. With media audiences growing more sophisticated, the marketing, advertising, and communications industries are more reliant than ever on creative graphics and strong visual concepts to convey their messages. This reliance shows no signs of abating. Figures from the U.S. Department of Labor show the number of Graphic Design jobs in the United States is expected to grow relative to the overall economy. The biggest increases continue to be in the areas of web-based design and interactive media.

Many artistically inclined students see Graphic Design as a viable and promising way to put their creative talents to use. Our program enrollment has maintained a consistent number of majors over the past twelve years. This year we experienced an increase of four majors, from 27 in May, 2012 to 31 currently.

Also, with the addition of the new Equestrian General Studies Major we are beginning to see an increase in the number of students enrolling in our lower level graphic design courses.

This past semester an additional section of ART 202 was added to accommodate the growing demand. As the new major grows in popularity we will be faced with the ongoing need for additional seat capacity in the courses affected.

Furthermore, there is an exploratory discussion underway with Westminster College to allow Westminster students to enroll in the WWU Graphic Design Major. Although nothing final has been decided, if this becomes a reality additional teaching capacity would be needed.

2. Program Objectives:

Upon completion of the program, the student will:

Objective	Measure of Objective How will the Program Measure?	Who is Responsible? At what point will it be done?
1. Produce works of visual art demonstrating the process and techniques relevant to a variety of forms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production of Visual Images in various media Oral and Written Reports Student Exhibits 	Studio art faculty; portfolio review team Content delivered throughout program
2. Demonstrate the use of a conceptual process in the design and implementation of graphics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production of Graphic Images Portfolio Review by Faculty 	Studio art faculty Content delivered throughout program
3. Demonstrate competency in the use of computer technology as it applies to the graphic arts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Exams Production of computer generated graphic images Portfolio Review by Faculty 	Graphic design faculty Content delivered throughout program.
4. Demonstrate a working knowledge of typography, layout, printing processes and the vocabulary of graphic art.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral and Written Reports Written Exams Production of Graphic Images Portfolio Review by Faculty 	Graphic Design faculty Content delivered throughout program.
5. Analyze and critique images as they apply to the creation, evaluation, and use of graphic images and photographs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral and Written Reports Written Exams Portfolio Review by Faculty 	Graphic design faculty; photography faculty Content delivered throughout graphic design sequence
6. Demonstrate an understanding of the professional, creative, and technical aspects of being a graphic artist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral and Written Reports Written Exams Portfolio Review by Faculty 	Graphic design faculty; photography faculty Content delivered throughout graphic design sequence
7. Demonstrate the development of an aesthetic philosophy and original creative vision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Production of Visual Images Portfolio Review by Faculty Capstone Course Assessment Senior Exhibition 	Upper level media course faculty; portfolio review team Experienced toward end of program.

Course/Objective Alignment:

Required Courses	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5	Objective 6	Objective 7
ART105		X					
ART110	X	X					
ART115	X	X					
ART202		X	X	X			
ART206	X	X			X		
ART210					X		

ART230					X		
ART231					X		
ART232			X	X		X	
ART 250		X	X	X	X		
ART256	X				X		
ART257	X				X		
ART332		X	X	X		X	X
ART432		X	X	X		X	X
ART470		X	X	X		X	X
MIS 325		X	X	X			

Electives	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5	Objective 6	Objective 7
ART 276	X	X	X				
ART 316	X		X		X		
ART 326	X	X	X		X	X	
COM 150		X	X			X	
COM 132	X	X	X				
COM 337		X	X	X		X	

3. Graphic Design Major Assessment

Program Objective	Method of Measurement	Criteria for and Threshold Level of Success	Data/Results Outcomes	Program Changes	Assessment Days Data	Budget Support
1. Produce works of visual art demonstrating the process and techniques relevant to a variety of forms.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	Not all students showed the variety of various types of work expected by the panelists	Better inform students as to the variety of work expected to be shown during the review process	Slightly lower overall scores were noted in this area.	None needed
2. Demonstrate use of a conceptual process in the design and implementation of graphics.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	All students meet the assessment benchmark requirements	None Required	N/A	N/A
3. Demonstrate competency in the use of computer technology as it applies to the graphic arts.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	All students meet the assessment benchmark requirements	None Required	N/A	N/A
4. Demonstrate a working knowledge of typography, layout, printing processes and graphic art vocabulary.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	All students meet the assessment benchmark requirements	None Required	N/A	N/A

5. Analyze and critique images as they apply to the creation, evaluation and use of graphic images and photographs.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	Evaluators noted the need for students to use more objective design language in their presentations.	Put greater emphasis on this aspect of instruction in all classes	Slightly lower overall scores were noted in this area.	N/A
6. Demonstrate an understanding of the professional, creative and technical aspects of a graphic artist.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	All students meet the assessment benchmark requirements	None Required	N/A	N/A
7. Demonstrate the development of an aesthetic philosophy and original creative vision.	Joint Faculty, Outside Professional Reviewer Portfolio Review Session	Students scored at or above the expected range for their class rank. Sr. – Advanced Jr, So – Proficient	All students meet the assessment benchmark requirements	None Required	N/A	N/A

4. Graphic Design Program Changes Based on Assessment

The Graphic Design Assessment Review went very smoothly this year. As in past years the review panel consisted of all fulltime faculty, some part-time faculty, and three outside professional graphic artists. All graphic design majors were required to participate in the event. Students failing to participate without a reasonable explanation were informed by the Division Chair that they should seek another program of study. Each senior, junior, and sophomore was given 20 minutes to present his or her portfolio to the panel. Freshmen were exempted from presenting, but were required to observe their upper class peers making presentations. Prior to the event students were required to submit written answers to three focused questions related to their artwork. These questions and their answers formed the basis for the student/panel discussions. Following the event data from the assessment was evaluated by the fulltime faculty (Elliott, Martin & Mudd) and conclusions were drawn as to curricular changes that needed to be made as a result of the findings.

The data revealed slightly lower evaluation scores in two areas. The first was Program Objective 1 related to the variety of artwork proficiencies demonstrated by the students. In response to this finding the faculty will make a systematic effort to better educate students as to the variety of artwork that needs to be demonstrated during Assessment Review Sessions. This will be addressed in three different ways. First, in ART 210, Portfolio Development this will be more vigorously addressed during the portfolio construction instructional phase of the class. Second, prior to the assessment event, during the student orientation meeting, this will be specifically addressed. Third, faculty will in their general portfolio assistance to students properly address the need for including a variety if visual art forms in their portfolio presentations.

The second area showing need for improvement was Program Objective 5 wherein students “analyze and critique images as they apply to the creation, evaluation and use of graphic images and photographs.” Evaluators noted the need for students to use more objective design language in their presentations. In response to this observation the faculty plans to further their efforts to instruct students in the use of appropriate design language. This is currently being addressed in the entry-level art classes with required student presentations of their work. Students have the opportunity to present and discuss their work before an audience of their peers using appropriate and acceptable art language.

It was noted in last year’s post event review that students needed more personalized information about the assessment process prior to the event. As a result of this feedback a few days prior to the assessment the faculty held a required meeting of all majors to carefully go over the procedures and expectations for the event. Students also had the opportunity to ask specific questions. As a result of the meeting students came to their review sessions better prepared and seemed more at ease throughout the event. This change in procedure seems to have been very beneficial to the overall success and smoothness of the process.

In addition to the faculty, this year’s assessment panel included Hal Moran, St. Louis Graphic Design Professional; Tisha Spencer, Owner/Principal Designer, Firehouse Design, Jefferson City; and Maura Mudd, Designer, D-Sports, Columbia.

No budget or additional support is needed to help meet the program outcomes and objectives at this time.

5. Assessment Days Data Collection

The following table reflects the instrument used by both the faculty and outside professionals this past year to assess student achievement:

Fine Art Objectives	Criteria	Advanced (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Novice (1)
1) Knowledge of processes and techniques specific to disciplines in the arts. 2) Knowledge and/or use of medium's standard structural components.	Knowledge of Drawing (Objective #1)	Portfolio reflects a superior knowledge and command of drawing	Portfolio reflects a good drawing ability appropriate for student’s level	Portfolio reflects a basic knowledge of drawing skills	Portfolio reflects a beginning level of drawing ability.
	Principles of Design (Objective #2)	Portfolio reflects a well- developed understanding of design and composition	Portfolio reflects effective use and understanding of the elements and principles of design	Portfolio reflects a basic understanding of the elements and principles of design	Portfolio demonstrates a limited understanding of design knowledge
	Art processes and medium technique (Objective #1)	Work consistently reflects a superior understanding of numerous art processes and medium handling	Work shows proficiency in the handling of the media and reflects a variety art processes	Work reflects a few art processes and an emerging skill in handling the media	Work reflects very basic knowledge of art materials, and processes

3) Ability to critique art through the use of appropriate vocabulary. 4) Demonstrates an understanding of visual and performing arts in historical context.	Art History and Culture (Objective #4) <hr/>	Portfolio shows strong connection to art history and cultural awareness	Portfolio reflects some creative exploration supported by art history and culture	Portfolio shows a little knowledge and awareness of art history and culture	Portfolio shows no connection to art history and culture
	Originality/Personal Aesthetic (Objective #2)	Work reflects curiosity, originality and is consistent. Unusual combinations and risk taking is evident	Work shows an appropriate degree of problem solving and originality for student's level.	Work reflects some unique characteristics but originality and problem solving is still developing	Work attempts to fulfill assignment, but little originality is evident
Overall Portfolio Presentation	Able to communicate above criteria in level-appropriate language (Objective #3) <hr/>	Student can demonstrate in mature artistic language an understanding of process, design, and art history.	Student can demonstrate in proficient artistic language an understanding of process, design, and art history.	Student can demonstrate in basic artistic language an understanding of processes, design, and art history.	Student is just beginning to utilize artistic terms and language when assessing work.
	Presentation Skills <hr/>	Presentation is clearly organized (introduction, discussion and analysis, closing); speech is easily understandable, appropriately paced; regular eye contact is maintained	Presentation is generally organized; speech is understandable, pace sometimes rapid or slow; some eye contact with audience	Presentation shows limited organization; some words difficult to understand due to speech and/or pace; eye contact is intermittent	Presentation shows minimal effort
	Organization <hr/>	Portfolio is well organized and prepared	Portfolio is generally organized	Portfolio has some organization	Portfolio is not organized

6. Budget Support Needs

With the potential for increased student enrollment in graphic design courses do to the new Equestrian General Studies Major and possible Westminster students (see profile section above) the need for additional teaching capacity needs to be considered. It is very likely a second section of ART 202 will again be needed in the Spring '14 semester. Other courses are likely to see increased pressure as well. This may require the hiring of additional adjunct faculty. Planning for such a contingency seems appropriate.

Also of concern is the Graphic Design Program's laptop computer. It is an absolutely critical tool for daily classroom presentation and instruction. The current laptop is six

or more years old and in need of upgrading in order to run the updated software programs being taught in the Graphic Design Lab. This is an urgent issue that needs attention as soon as money becomes available.

An ongoing issue that has been a recommendation for improving the program for several years deals with the quality of student printed reproductions of their portfolio work. It was once again observed by our assessment panelists that most students' computer generated work did not accurately reflect the color and overall quality of their original images due to the reproduction deficiencies of the Mac Lab's laser printer. This issue continues to be particularly concerning because of the role a professional portfolio plays in job placement. Inaccurate, poor color reproductions can be a negative factor when it comes to contending for jobs in the Graphic Design industry. Better student printing capability is an issue that needs attention.

The present computer capability of the Graphic Design Lab meets the current student and program needs. However, for planning purposes, the built in obsolescence of the technology should be considered and a plan developed for eventual lab upgrading in the next few years.

Assessment Rubric

Annual Assessment Report

Assessment Component	Assessment Reflects Best Practices	Assessment meets the expectations of the University	Assessment needs Development	Assessment is Inadequate
Learning outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Posted measurable program learning outcomes (objectives) are routinely shared with students and faculty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measurable program learning outcomes (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are posted on the program website.	<input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes (objectives) have been identified and are generally measurable	<input type="checkbox"/> Program learning outcomes (objectives) are not clear or measurable
Assessment Measures	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures are used to assess a student-learning outcome (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Emphasis on specific direct measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Rubrics or guides are used for the measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are created to assess the impact on student performance. <input type="checkbox"/> All measurements are clearly described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specific measures are clearly identified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures relate to the program learning outcomes (objectives). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures can provide useful information about student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> General measures are identified (e.g. student written assignment) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measurements are described, but need further description.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures do not connect to learning outcomes (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment measures are not clear. <input type="checkbox"/> No assessment measures are established.
Assessment Results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If not all learning outcomes (objectives) are assessed annually; a rotation schedule is established to assess all learning outcomes within a reasonable timeframe. <input type="checkbox"/> Data are aggregated and analyzed in a systematic manner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are collected and analyzed to evaluate prior actions to improve student learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for performance and gaps in student learning are clearly identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> A majority of learning outcomes (objectives) assessed annually. <input type="checkbox"/> Data collected and aggregated are linked to specific learning outcome(s). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are aggregated in a meaningful way that the average reader can understand.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data collected and aggregated for at least one learning outcome (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Data collection is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Standards for student performance and gaps in student learning are not identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes (objectives) are not routinely assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Routine data is not collected. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program is too new to have collected assessment data.

Assessment Component	Assessment Reflects Best Practices	Assessment meets the expectations of the University	Assessment needs Development	Assessment is Inadequate
Faculty Analysis and Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All faculty within the program synthesize the results from various assessment measures to form specific conclusions about each performance indicator for a learning outcome (objectives). <input type="checkbox"/> Includes input from adjunct faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> Includes input from outside consultant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All program faculty receive annual assessment results and designate program or department faculty to meet to discuss assessment results in depth. <input type="checkbox"/> Specific conclusions about student learning are made based on the available assessment results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Some program faculty receive annual assessment results <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty input about results is sought 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Annual assessment results are viewed only by the faculty who authored the report. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty input is not sought. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions about student learning are not identified. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes.
Actions to Improve Learning and Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All assessment methods, timetable for assessing, and evaluating the effectiveness of action plans are included. <input type="checkbox"/> A comprehensive understanding of the program's assessment plan and suggestions, if needed, for altering assessment practices is articulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description of the action to improve learning or assessment is specific and relates directly to faculty conclusions about areas for improvement. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description of action includes a timetable for implementation and identifies who is responsible for action <input type="checkbox"/> Actions are realistic, with a good probability of improving learning or assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> At least one action to improve learning or improve assessment is identified. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed action(s) relates to faculty conclusions about areas for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Adjustments to the assessment plan are proposed but not clearly connected to data <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal discussion of the effectiveness of the assessment plan; minimal discussion of changes, if needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No actions are taken to improve student learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Actions discussed are not connected to data results or analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Program recently started or too few graduates to suggest any changes.

Additional Comments:

Program faculty discussion on the objectives is an ongoing process. Only one objective asks students for higher order thinking skills. If that is appropriate for the program faculty, that is fine, it is just important to review and determine if program objectives continue to lead the program successfully.

In the course/objective alignment some programs have modified this chart to represent the level of skill demonstrated by students. the various “X’s” are replaced with “I” Introduced, “R” Reinforced, and “M” Mastered. This differentiation has helped some programs come to terms with the skills and how they are laid out in the courses. This also helps some programs identify which course/courses are truly responsible for the mastery of that skill?

Excellent description of how the program will make changes to the assessment. Also, THANK YOU for including the rubric for the portfolio. It appears to met that all objectives are covered by the portfolio review and the entire program is reviewed during assessment day (sophomore-senior). Does the program have any freshmen students identified? Are there activities for them during assessment day?

Are the artifacts used in the portfolio collected from courses in the major? (I assume??) It would be helpful in order to tie in the classwork with the portfolio is to include that in the rubric with program objectives.

Objective	Measure of Objective How will the Program Measure?	Course
1. Produce works of visual art demonstrating the process and techniques relevant to a variety of forms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Production of Visual Images in various media• Oral and Written Reports• Student Exhibits	Course code ###: assignment name

It does not have to be done this way but it would be nice to connect the artifacts in the portfolio back to the coursework where the artifact originated, or they learned the skill to create the artifact. This might also help in determining if all course skills are represented in the portfolio.

Also in the chart if the measure of the objective is discussed as an exam, then some representation of the exam (or whatever questions pertain to that objective) could be used as evidence that students learned the material. The need to weave the measures identified in the chart with the data that is collected for the course through assignments and on assessment day to show evidence of student learning in the program.