

GRAPHIC DESIGN

2009 - 2010

OUTCOMES ASSESSED:

- LO 2.1: Demonstrate appropriate knowledge and application of industry standard software
- LO 3.1: Effectively organize and present their work in a portfolio
- LO 3.3: Effectively communicate the skills and knowledge demonstrated in the work displayed in the portfolio
- LO 4.2: Produce clear and well-organized oral responses that respond appropriately to an assignment
- LO 4.3: Effectively participate orally in critical analysis of visual work

SUMMARY REPORT

October 2010

Graphic Design Program: 2010 Outcomes Assessment Summary
Respectively submitted by Marc Mannheimer, Professor of Art & Design.

A. Outcomes Assessed:

Objective 2

Outcome 1: Demonstrate appropriate knowledge and application of industry standard software.

Objective 3

Outcome 1: Effectively organize and present their work in a portfolio.

Outcome 3: Effectively communicate the skills and knowledge demonstrated in the work displayed in the portfolio.

Objective 4

Outcome 2: Produce clear and well-organized oral responses that respond appropriately to an assignment.

Outcome 3: Effectively participate orally in critical analysis of visual work.

B. The Assessed Product:

The GRA250-Portfolio for Graphic Design course functions as a Capstone course for Graphic Design majors. The main goal of the course is to have the students produce a portfolio to be used for job seeking or transfer to a four-year institution. Over the course of the semester the students create, design and prepare a digital and print portfolio of their design work. Included in this portfolio are examples of their work from the various Art & Design courses they took as well as some free-lance work. The final assessment was performed on the presentation of their portfolio to the class and instructor. This presentation, for which they practiced, models how they might present to a prospective employer or admissions interviewer.

C. The Assessment and Rating Process.

A set of rubrics was designed in consultation with the Chair of Art & Design, Professor Patricia Kidney, and the Assistant Dean of Outcomes Assessment, Ellen Wentland (See Appendix A.). The specific criteria chosen are the most important aspects of both Graphic Design and one's abilities to present and explain the work produced. These were determined by synthesizing the main focus of our Graphic Design courses at all levels of instruction. These include among others: The principles of design; effective use of design terminology; effective verbal and non-verbal communication, etc. The rubrics were designed for the students to use in two ways; assessing how well a fellow member of the class presented their work during our regular critiques and self-assessing how well they performed these critiques.

Over the course of the semester we had 7 projects in class. During each critique for these projects the students would use the rubrics to assess each other's presentations and their own critiques. After each presentation we would all discuss the result based on the rubric check-sheet each student and the instructor had. The instructor alone did the assessment of the final grade. The rubrics were each rated on a scale of 1-3, Poor, Satisfactory, and Exemplary. This delineation was determined to be the most adequate scale as there cannot be wide variations for these kind of presentations, either they are effective or not! Our students are consistently taught that the focus of all Graphic Design is to sell something, in this case themselves.

Selected presentations and critiques were videotaped by the instructor who would then sit with the student, watch the video, and offer his feedback [assessment] on the student's performance. Students were also videotaped when they presented their finished portfolio at the end of class and in consultation with the instructor were offered a final assessment. Each member of the class assessed these individual presentations as well.

D. What was learned?

Based on the results of the students' assessments of presenters at the final, the vast majority of our students are well prepared for their chosen future. We need to use this tool again to get a more accurate gauge with a larger group but the results were encouraging. (See Appendix B.)

Using these rubric check-sheets was a very effective way of communicating to the students a better process for the presentation of their work and for critiquing works by other students. The critique process in Art & Design classes is always an area that needs constant focus. The method we used in Portfolio modeled well the industry standard for the kind of presentations a designer will be doing for a client or their creative director. The students obviously enjoyed the tool and its use and voiced their satisfaction with the critique process when approached in this manner. We also learned that requiring all of our students to create both a digital and print portfolio is extremely important, as we hadn't stressed that previously.

E. Action Plan

I have begun to adapt this tool in my other, entry level, design classes as it prepares the students very well for their progress through our curriculum and their subsequent studies or employment. Eventually I would like to see a variation of this tool used in every Graphic Design course we teach. Our whole Design Faculty will look at this in the near future. I feel strongly that this approach and the use of videotaping and individual feedback from their peers and myself prepared our students well to move on.

RUBRIC

APPENDIX A

RUBRIC – INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATION AND CLASS CRITIQUE – PORTFOLIO COURSE

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			RATING
	POOR 1	SATISFACTORY 2	EXEMPLARY 3	
FOR THE PRESENTER				
1. Explains how work reflects principles of design	Little or no mention of Principles of design	Rudimentary mention of Principles of design	Clear inclusion of Principles of design in presentation.	
2. Uses design terminology in presentation of work	Little or no use of design terminology	Uses some design terminology	Makes extensive use of design terminology	
<i>Oral Presentation Skills</i>				
3. Organizes presentation effectively in terms of introduction, main points and conclusion; Sequenced, flows	Little or no evidence of organization; Delivery was choppy; Points unclear	Fairly well-organized, though with some disconnects or breaks; Introduction, main points and conclusion fairly well-stated	Very well-organized with smooth transitions; Introduction, main points and conclusion all very clearly stated.	
4. Delivers effectively paying attention to tone, articulation, clarity of expression, voice projection	Presentation lacks energy, enthusiasm; Sometimes inaudible, difficult to understand	Some energy or enthusiasm; Mostly audible, articulate; Understandable for the most part	Energy and enthusiasm evident throughout; Consistently audible and articulate; Easy to understand	
5. Uses effective non-verbal communication; Includes use of gestures, body language, eye contact, connection with audience	Little or no use of gestures or body language to reinforce content; Very limited audience eye contact; Little or no connection with audience	Fairly satisfactory use of gestures or body language; Makes eye contact, but not consistently or just with only certain audience members; Engages audience to some extent	Uses gestures and body language to reinforce content; Makes good audience eye-contact; Engages audience	
6. Listens and responds appropriately to audience	Fails to invite comments or questions; Provides little in the way of effective responses	Listens to responses, gives general reactions without specifics related to questions or responses.	Invite comments and questions; Provides thoughtful and effective responses	

CRITERIA	STANDARDS			RATING
	POOR 1	SATISFACTORY 2	EXEMPLARY 3	
FOR THE CLASS – EVALUATION OF STUDENTS' CRITIQUE				
1. Uses design terminology to critique the work	No mention of design terminology.	Includes design terminology in critical responses.	Uses design terminology specifically during the critique.	
2. Asks questions to elicit information related to the design process used by the presenter	Asks no questions.	Asks about individual aspects of the work presented.	Asks about the overall design concept, specific questions about process and software usage.	
3. Demonstrates recognition of the design process as well as the tools or software used by the presenter	Little or no response.	Acknowledges use of software rudimentary discussion of design process.	Points out specifics about software use and the incorporation of specific aspects of the design process.	
4. Offers the presenter constructive and supportive feedback/recommendations	Little or no response.	Makes general, complimentary remarks.	Compliments the design, with specific reactions. Offers advice on how to fix or adjust aspects.	

RESULTS

APPENDIX B

Spring 2010

GRA250 PORTFOLIO FOR GRAPHIC DESIGN

RUBRIC RATING RESULTS - INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS

RUBRIC CRITERIA	NUMBER OF STUDENTS RATED SATISFACTORY OR ABOVE (Total = 9)
1. Explains how work reflects principles of design	8
2. Uses design terminology in presentation of work	9
3. Organizes presentation effectively in terms of introduction, main points and conclusion; Sequenced, flows	8
4. Delivers effectively paying attention to tone, articulation, clarity of expression, voice projection	9
5. Uses effective non-verbal communication; Includes use of gestures, body language, eye contact, connection with audience	8
6. Listens and responds appropriately to audience	8

STUDENT	TOTAL POINTS EARNED ACROSS ALL CRITERIA (Total Possible = 18)	PERCENTAGE OF POSSIBLE POINTS EARNED
1	14.5	81
2	14.5	81
3	12.5	69
4	15.5	86
5	18	100
6	17.5	97
7	15	83
8	10	56
9	17	94