**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**SUBMITTED BY:** BRIDGET MURPHY  
**DATE:** FEBRUARY 2, 2015

**BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:** The majority of student work is collected and evaluated by the class professor. In Senior Portfolio (capstone course) work was evaluated by two faculty members who do not teach the course. Industry/external professionals evaluated senior portfolios as well. All external portfolio evaluations are returned to the professor in a sealed envelope. Internship reviews are mailed, emailed or delivered to faculty mentor. Data gathered for Graphic Design assessment forms are in an electronic format, sent (pdf) or delivered (hard copy) to faculty, professional reviewers, internship site supervisors, and students. Department Chair collects data documents each semester. Paper copies of data are kept in files and Chair compiles, evaluates, and inserts the compiled worksheets/data files electronically and includes information in the Appendix.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit competent design abilities with emphasis on typography</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to technically prepare design work for print, and interactive media including web.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to conduct design research, audience analysis, and the application to design problem solving process. (Inquiry Outcome)</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate competent design research and the application to service-learning projects for print, and/or interactive media including web.</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and relevant school plan:**

“The Graphic Design major is designed for students seeking a strong emphasis on the processes and skills necessary to distill and order visual information into aesthetically pleasing, comprehensible formats. Students are taught to create the best ways and forms to deliver information, messages, impressions and ideas to people. Competency skills include research, conceptualizing, layout, and
production. Graduates are prepared for entry positions in graphic design, advertising, corporate and institutional communications, and mass communications (print, broadcast, new media and the Internet)."

The Graphic Design Program is committed to academic excellence by preparing our students for a variety of careers in visual communications based on his/her own interests and strengths. Our program is committed to the liberal arts tradition with core subjects in the Fine Arts and Art History. We continue to build on the liberal arts and career preparation by including a variety of elective courses in Fine Art, Design, Communications, and Business. Graphic Design majors are encouraged choose a minor in Web Design, Business, Studio Art, Art History, Communications, or Media and Performance.

In all Graphic Design classes, we encourage all students to respect personal beliefs, moral values, and respect for the individual and Catholic teachings. We incorporate ethics into the curriculum through assignments and enhanced service-learning opportunities for our majors. Our small classes provide a personal, hands-on learning environment. Our students gain life-long research, design, and technical skills to be successful in visual communications.

Relevant to our Department Plan, our technology and instructional spaces are state-of-the-art. In the summer 2012, the most recent versions of industry software was installed in the Rowley Mac lab along with additional software for workstations in the Multimedia lab and the video editing suit—assuring academic excellence. This software was incrementally updated in fall 2013. The programs antiquated color laser printer was replaced with a state of the art printer in the summer of 2014.

Our internships have led to personal and professional development in the job market. The success of our internship directly affects our Learning Outcomes since we base our assessment on the professional, outside evaluations.

Graphic Design students are active in various student organizations, activities, athletics, and hold leadership positions on campus. Students supervise and participate in the Graphic Design Club, and student publications such as The Banner and BlueInk. Both faculty and students attend student activities such as the Student Art Show, sports events, University Poetry readings, Campus Ministry activities, etc. Having students active on campus affects our Learning Outcomes by developing their personal design skills, social skills and development, and thought as productive individuals.

As in the past, our students participated in the 2014 Student Research. This initiative supports student research and interests as well as encouraged student-faculty collaboration.
Our students are encouraged to study abroad during his/her Marymount experience knowing this greatly broadens their intellect, design abilities and character. In summer 2014, Graphic Design majors participated in a Greece Study Abroad Program.

Our department promotes service-learning projects throughout the year. This past year we supported the Women’s Institute for the Freedom of the Press and Alexandria African American Hall of Fame with a website designs, and promotional infographics for The Global Freedom Center. In spring 2014, Graphic Design majors assisted with the ARC of Northern Virginia and Marymount Education’s program for special needs children with photography and production of a video. In summer 2014 Graphic Design majors participated in the Foster Care to Success Aim Higher 2014 Fellows Program creating a series of video productions for the non-profit video.

Using the Metropolitan area as a backdrop, we require our students to visit museums, special events, and local businesses to increase their awareness of the both the region and the industry.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements:

In 2013-14, the assessment process was successful and faculty responses were complete. For the first time, all assessments were online. As in the past, faculty were reminded each semester to complete the appropriate assessments, but they were online—making data collection easier and accurate. Faculty were asked to fill out specific evaluation forms for each data set. The information that was needed for each assessment was compiled by PIE and sent to the Chair. Forms across each level of learning are consistent even though introductory level courses assessments are less detailed as compared to upper level evaluations. Methods in acquiring comparison data between introductory and upper level courses are consistent.

Technology being taught in all graphic design courses is being regularly updated to assure instruction includes the latest technology methods and processes for graphic designing.

Based on the findings from the report, the planned 2014-15 improvements are:

The Graphic Design Program will continue to:

• Assign real-world problem-solving projects at appropriate levels.
• Include more revisions in class projects to better student learning opportunities.
• Continue to work on the technical presentation of personal portfolios across all media including print, multimedia, and online
• Prepare written rationale for design solutions and present the creative briefs to improve verbal, visual and written presentation skills of design problem solutions
• Emphasize typography throughout the curriculum
• Strengthen individual typography skills, methods and processes at all levels through revisions
• Develop class projects/library instruction/class lectures at all levels to support research and inquiry.
• Assign research based inquiry assignments.

Note: Once the new Communication and Media Design (CMD) program starts in the Fall 2015, faculty will review and revise outcomes from both the Communication and Graphic Design Program so new Outcomes can be assessed which share similar skills and learning capabilities.

**Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:**
The following were planned improvements from 2012-13:
• Ongoing discussion and development for integration of graphic design, communications, and digital communications; develop a combined new program.
  Developed and passed UCIC in January 2015
• Review current Outcomes and assess whether to add to or revise Outcomes
  The Department added a new outcome in 2013-2014 and will be assessing it. PIE has suggested rewording it, which is to be worked on;
• Assign real-world problem-solving projects at appropriate levels.
  Ongoing faculty discussions assigning real-world projects for various classes
• Include more revisions in class projects to better student learning opportunities.
  Ongoing; some studios have added more class time and revision time
• Continue to work on the technical presentation of personal portfolios across all media including print, multimedia, and online
  Ongoing
• Develop verbal, visual and written presentation of design problem solutions
  Ongoing; faculty to review drafts and require revisions
• Strengthen individual typography skills, methods and processes at all levels
  Ongoing
• Develop class projects/library instruction/class lectures at all levels to support research and inquiry.
  • ongoing
  • COM/GD 200, there is now a research instruction day at the beginning of the semester to help students understand what research means in the fields and what resources are available for them at MU.
Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report: (List each recommendation and provide a specific response to each).

In 2012-13, the Assessment Committee Report states, “This is a comprehensive assessment that meets the requirements of the University Assessment process.” All measures were met except one measure: “Using assessment to make improvements” was ‘Partially Met.’ The report indicated that “Lots of valuable ideas for improving the curriculum of the GD program are presented, but it’s not clear that they tie in with assessment results.” On an annual basis, all faculty receive a summary of the assessments that states where we need to improve based on the previous year’s outcomes. Faculty need to adjust his/her course to include these suggestions to strengthen his/her individual courses.

Additional faculty meetings will take place to review methods of improving student outcomes

Once the new CMD Program has started, assessment can be reviewed with PIE to see if more focus will help with evaluation so changes can be implemented that tie directly to assessments.
Academic Year: 2013-14  Program: Graphic Design (revised)

**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 1:** Exhibit competent design abilities with emphasis on typography

**Is this outcome being reexamined? X Yes □ No**

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

In 2013-14, student work was acceptable. We continue to focus our Learning Outcome on specific skills not a general competency. Based on various assessment measures, in the beginning studio course (GD 305 Studio I), students’ typography skills need to improve. Data shows student success by the end of senior portfolio in 100% of the students’ work. Overall, The student Learning Outcomes for exhibiting competent design abilities with emphasis on typography has been steady. As our students progress through the degree, they are improving their competent design abilities. Typography became an emphasis throughout the curriculum to strengthen individual typography skills.

**Assessment Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect. | Define and explain acceptable level of student performance. | Discuss the data collected and student population | 1) Describe the analysis process.  
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |
| In GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I: Final project evaluation by faculty (magazine) (Direct measure) | A score of average (3) for “Final Project Evaluation Sheet” in Typography section; 75% of students should meet this rating | 6 student projects reviewed by professor; all GD majors | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
| In GD 405 Senior Portfolio: Portfolio evaluation by faculty (Direct measures) | A score of average (3) for “Portfolio Evaluation Sheet”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 8 senior portfolios randomly reviewed by three department faculty; total 15 reviews; all seniors; | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
Academic Year : 2013-14  
Program: Graphic Design (revised)

In GD 405 Senior Portfolio:  
Portfolio evaluation by external professional designers  
(Indirect measures)  
A score of average (3) for “Portfolio Evaluation Sheet”; 75% of students should meet this rating  
8 senior portfolios reviewed by various professionals; all seniors;  
See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results

In GD 400 Internship (Direct measure)  
Performance evaluation by site supervisor  
A score of average on “GD Internship Evaluation Sheet”; 75% of students should meet this rating  
3 students evaluated by various industry professionals; all seniors;  
See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results

**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**

The base assessment is from GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I, an introductory publication design course for majors. Course content focuses on the implementation of the design principles, typographic rules, computer technologies and creative typographical concepts throughout the course lectures and projects. The final assessments are obtained from external reviews from GD 400 and GD 405 from both external professionals and internal faculty reviews in GD 405. The majority of reviews selected ‘Above Average’ to ‘Average’ scores on design abilities with emphasis on typography. This past year, our Internship reviews were 100% ‘Above Average,’ which is ideal. Overall, the outcome was achieved. Below are details of findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice of typography (family, style, font)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of typography (readability, legibility)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Elements (layout/design)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Typography control</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative typography/design solution</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In GD 405 Portfolio **Internal** Review
Academic Year: 2013-14

Program: Graphic Design (revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>In GD 405 Portfolio External Review</th>
<th>In GD 400 Internship site supervisor Review</th>
<th>In GD 400 Internship Review form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice of typography (family, style, font)</td>
<td>1(17%) 3 (50%) 2 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of typography (readability, legibility)</td>
<td>1 (17%) 4 (67%) 1 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Elements (layout/design)</td>
<td>2 (33%) 4 (67%) 0</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Typography control</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative typography/design solution</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Process 12 (100%)

Comments:
“The above evaluation criteria were not included in the online supervisor evaluation forms that I was given access to.” The Site supervisor evaluation is a bit different in criteria. Evaluating ‘Design Process’ in Site Supervisor evaluation includes typography. Supervisor comments were very favorable for all of the internships. Mostly "excellent" with only a couple of "good."
The Internship placement of these students was a match for their expected level of designing skills.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:
Idealistically, the Graphic Design Program would like to have 100% of our students achieve a minimum rating of ‘Average’ in each Learning Outcome. But, realistically the Graphic Design Program aims to have 75% of our students achieve a minimum rating of
‘Average’ in each Learning Outcome. This year’s data shows a strong performance from the students. There was one weaker student whose work was below average. Internship Evaluations do not specifically measure typography, but the “Skills Appropriate to internship position” including design, production and technology skills have been assessed. Looking at the data, our students performed ‘Above Average’ in all internships this past year. Senior typography skills are acceptable. See Appendix for written comments by faculty and professional evaluators.

Having outside professional reviewers who work day-to-day with our students is one of our strongest assessments tools. It helps determine how they will succeed in gaining employment, compare our students to other entry-level designers, and success in the industry. Our department values these comments by addressing the comments through curricular changes.

**General comments:**
“Type in nearly every piece seems ignored or secondary;” “Work on type readability/legibility;” “I found the typography choices to be pedestrian;” “Typographic poster for Blue Water was strong;” Typography had improved for the past couple years. This year it regressed. On Average portfolios were weaker then in the past.

vs.

Without question the strongest typography design I have seen in the portfolios reviews. Absolutely beautiful; overall not overly creative work, but acceptable design work;

**Strength:**
Readability; Importance of readable typography seems to be learned; Typography with concept; Understanding of type as a design element; strong layouts and good readability on various portfolio pieces; keeping a magazine design as the final project makes sense;

**Improvement:**
Typography including the choice of, verity, legibility, readability and appropriateness to the message and communication problem design solution; all aspects of typography; Many more weekly in-class and assignments should perhaps be considered; Prior to the final assignment many more assignments and exercises focusing on the diversity of approaches and rules of successful typographic design. More work added to portfolios; poorly mounted or assembled pieces; incomplete portfolios; fix low-res images on web sites; More web designing experience was recommended for one intern and learning a 2nd language was recommended for another.

The GD curriculum needs to continually work with students on their individual design abilities, typography, technical skills, and portfolio presentations. In the industry designers continually develop and mature.
Discuss planned curricular or program improvements **for this year based on assessment of outcome:**

**2014-15 Actions:**

Based on the findings from the report, the GD program can strengthen design abilities by continuing to:

- Strengthening individual typography skills, methods and processes at all levels in all media (print, web, and new media)
- Students’ work can be more creative and experimental by requiring more design concept and a stronger, in-depth rationale.
- Work on strengthening typographic rules and understanding their applications in intermediate studio classes (GD 305, 308, and 360)
- Work on presentation skills and portfolio work especially final portfolio execution
- Assign real-world problem-solving projects at appropriate levels, which allow students to apply the theory and design skills to real projects.
- Use of milestone critiques in GD Studio I helps with students being able to revise layouts and create more successful projects. The use of milestone critiques in GD 360 has helped with final deliverables and students welcome the review.
- Students need to pay attention to more details in their work; quality and professionalism
- As a program graphic design faculty should discuss ways to consistently teach effective typography throughout the curriculum;
- The course Typography should perhaps be revisited.
**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 2:** Demonstrate the ability to conduct design research, audience analysis, and the application to design problem solving process. (Inquiry Outcome)

Is this outcome being reexamined?  X Yes  □ No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

In 2013-14, the majority of students achieved “average” to ‘above average’ scores on technical ability in all areas. Overall, this year there was a slight drop in ratings with some students scoring “Below Average,” but the majority of the students did achieve an acceptable level.

**Assessment Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GD 202 Illustration I: Faculty evaluation of illustration project (direct + inquiry) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 30 GD students evaluated by faculty; majority are majors some minors | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
| GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I: Faculty evaluation of historical project (direct) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 6 GD students evaluated by professor; all majors; (2 papers not turned in) | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
| GD 404 Performance Media: Faculty evaluation of research project and supporting paper (direct) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 20 in class – not all evaluated; avg 16 students evaluated by professor; various majors = interdisciplinary course | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
Interpretation of Results

Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):
Overall the Technical Learning Outcome was achieved on all levels. There were fewer ‘Below Average’ students in areas this past year especially in the GD 202 Illustration class.

In GD 202 Illustration I

Application of Design Research
- Evidence of audience research
  - 5 (17%) Above Average
  - 21 (70%) Average
  - 4 (13%) Below Average
- Evidence of the ability to communicate a message through original design work using audience analysis
  - 7 (23%) Above Average
  - 19 (63%) Average
  - 4 (13%) Below Average
- Accuracy in application of design research to design project
  - 6 (20%) Above Average
  - 20 (67%) Average
  - 4 (13%) Below Average

Research Paper/Creative Design Brief
- Evidence of Audience Research
  - 5 (17%) Above Average
  - 11 (37%) Average
  - 14 (47%) Below Average
- Development
  - 5 (17%) Above Average
  - 18 (60%) Average
  - 7 (23%) Below Average
- Mechanics
  - 5 (17%) Above Average
  - 21 (70%) Average
  - 14 (47%) Below Average
- Organization
  - 5 (17%) Above Average
  - 18 (60%) Average
  - 7 (23%) Below Average

In GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I

Application of Design Research
- Evidence of audience research
  - 5 (83%) Above Average
  - 4 (67%) Average
  - 0 Below Average
- Evidence of the ability to communicate a message through original design work using audience analysis
  - 5 (83%) Above Average
  - 1 (17%) Average
  - 0 Below Average
- Accuracy in application of design research to design project
  - 5 (83%) Above Average
  - 5 (83%) Average
  - 0 Below Average

Research Paper/Creative Design Brief
- Evidence of Audience Research
  - 1 (25%) Above Average
  - 2 (50%) Average
  - 1 (25%) Below Average
  - Note: 2 papers not delivered
- Development
  - 1 (25%) Above Average
  - 2 (50%) Average
  - 1 (25%) Below Average
Academic Year: 2013-14  
Program: Graphic Design (revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In GD 404 Performance Media**

*Application of Design Research*

- Evidence of audience research: 13 (81%) 2 (13%) 1 (6%)
- Evidence of the ability to communicate a message through original design work using audience analysis: 13 (81%) 2 (13%) 1 (6%)
- Accuracy in application of design research to design project: 7 (35%) 12 (60%) 1 (5%)

*Research Paper/Creative Design Brief*

- Evidence of Audience Research: 13 (81%) 2 (13%) 1 (6%)
- Development: 13 (81%) 2 (13%) 1 (6%)
- Mechanics: 7 (35%) 10 (50%) 3 (15%)
- Organization: 7 (35%) 12 (60%) 1 (5%)

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**

This year our research area in our GD program continues to be “Average.” Based on the outcomes, we still need improvement in the area of Research: data collection, audience analysis and creative solutions. In GD 202, GD 305, GD 401, and GD 404 the majority of students met an acceptable level in the application of the design research, but scored very low on the written paper/creative brief. Our department would like to have 100% of our students achieve ‘average’ in the areas of design research and writing, but realistically, we aim for 75%.

As for writing, the writing intensive courses including a graphic design specific course will help students’ writing for the field.

A writing assignment in the entry-level class (COM/GD 200) has been revised to include a separate written project with a review and a stronger assessment tool.

In general, all our students need help in writing clearly (mechanics). Faculty will need to urge or require students to seek help at the CTL.

**Projects Evaluated:**
Retro paper and design project; Pen & Ink Recipe Illustration; Traditional & Electronic Applications; Illustration Projects; Million Bones promotional campaigns including individual projects: website, guerrilla marketing, and three social medias

Comments
Design briefs were critiqued multiple times and required re-writing. Some student chose not to rewrite their briefs. They were content with an average grade.

Strengths
Design skills and drawing skills were particularly strong in this group; Several students showed exception creative talent in this group; Students with the most thought out and research backed design briefs created the most successful communication problem solving designs. There campaigns also drew the largest number of social media participants.

Weaknesses The weakest research area is audience analysis. In addition to audience analysis, looking beyond one's own conclusions to the larger design community; Research of previous projects and where to find them is order to do a thorough design brief; More professional pretensions following business practiced style of research and design brief is required.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
2014-15 Actions:
Based on the findings from the report, the GD program can improve competency in design research, audience analysis, and the application to design problem by:
• More in depth research supporting design directions is needed.
• Drafts, draft, drafts!
• Encourage or require students to use the CTL
• Continuing to address weaknesses in research and concentrate on the creative brief, research processes, audience analysis and the application to the design problem.
• Developing more class projects/library instruction/class lectures at all levels that focus on research and inquiry.
• Students will continue to be active in research in the design field at all levels so when it is required in the capstone course, students are familiar with resources and the process.
**Outcome and Past Assessment**

**Learning Outcome 3:** Demonstrate competent application of research to service-learning projects for print, and interactive media including web.

Is this outcome being reexamined? □ Yes  x No

If yes, give a brief summary of previous results (including trends) and any changes made to the program.

### Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect. | Define and explain acceptable level of student performance. | Discuss the data collected and student population | 1) Describe the analysis process.  
2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable. |

| In GD 305 Graphic Design Studio I: Faculty evaluation of service-learning project (direct) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 6 GD students evaluated by professor; all majors | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
| GD 360 Graphic Design Studio II: Faculty and/or client evaluation of service-learning project (Direct measure) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 8 GD students evaluated by professor; all majors | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |
| GD 310 Electronic Media: Faculty and/or client evaluation of service-learning project (direct)) | A score of average (3); A score of average on “Project Evaluation”; 75% of students should meet this rating | 14 students evaluated by professor; various majors = interdisciplinary course | See detailed breakdown below in Interpretation of Results |

*Note: GD 310 Electronic Media was offered in place of GD 404 Performance Media*
**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this Learning Outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**

This is the first year for analyzing the learning outcome. It requires our standard research and design components, but is targeted to a service-learning project. This is evaluated through the research of the client’s needs, analysis, and design application. This outcome also includes student reflection and project effectiveness. The data reflects strong evidence in most areas. Our department would like to have 100% of our students achieve “average” in the areas of design research and writing, but realistically, we aim for 75%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of research competency in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical and/or contemporary design trends</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of audience research</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the ability to communicate a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message through original design work</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application of Design Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy in application of design principles</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively apply visual communication to state a message</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student reflection on service-learning project</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that service-learning project achieved real objective</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In GD 360 Graphic Design Studio II**

**Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of research competency in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical and/or contemporary design trends</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (62%)</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of audience research</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the ability to communicate a message through original design work</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application of Design Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>4 (50%)</th>
<th>3 (37%)</th>
<th>1 (13%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy in application of design principles</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively apply visual communication to state a message</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student reflection on service-learning project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that service-learning project achieved real objective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In GD 310 Electronic Media**

**Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of research competency in historical and/or contemporary design trends</th>
<th>12 (86%)</th>
<th>2 (14%)</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of audience research</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the ability to communicate a message through original design work</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application of Design Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>14 (100%)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy in application of design principles</td>
<td>11 (479%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively apply visual communication to state a message</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student reflection on service-learning project</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that service-learning project achieved real objective</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:**
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The GD Department continues and will continue to work on research, application and achieving client objectives and needs. Our students are introduced to service-learning in GD 301 and continue for the next year+ to work on service-learning projects using all different media. Their reflections are positive and client responses have been positive and outstanding.

**Projects evaluated:** Integrated web and social media campaign; Global Freedom Project

**Comments** Students worked well as a group; met with client twice;

**Strengths** Student communication design skills showed improvement of previous semesters. Creation and use of visuals and media including video was very effective. A couple students really worked well together, designed strong pieces and the client was very pleased.

**Improvement** Student communication design problem solving skills can be improved. The ability of students to define communication design problems specifically to a client’s needs rather then attempting to apply a previously completed assignment approach. Presentation of design proposals including creative concepts and researched rationales needs to be refines. A few team members did not pull their weight and missed group deadlines - very typical of group work.

**Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:**

**2014-15 Actions:**
Based on the findings from the report, the GD program will continue to improve competency in design research, audience analysis, and the application to design problem by:

1. All studio course assignments will continue to require a research and audience analysis supported project design brief and creative rational.
2. Developing more higher-level class projects/library instruction/class lectures at all levels that focus on research and inquiry.
3. Students will continue to be active in research in the design field at all levels so when it is required in the capstone course, students are familiar with resources and the process.

* A complete student learning assessment report includes appendix of rubrics, survey questions, or other relevant documents and information.*