

Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

General Information

Academic Year of Implementation: 2010 – 2011

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area

(Items Highlighted in red require primary attention in the planning process – not all highlighted areas need to be completed):

Graphics Technology, Graphic Design Technology, CIP: 1650040200

Planning Team:

Planning Team Leader(s) ¹	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Kristy Pennino	East	kpennino@valenciacollege.edu	2864	3-2
Meg Curtiss	West & Osceola	mcurtiss@valenciacollege.edu	1452 & 4972	4-24 & 6-3
Wendy Givoglu, Dean	East	wgivoglu@valenciacollege.edu	2218	3-2
Dan Dutkofski, Dean	West	ddutkofski@valenciacollege.edu	1492	4-24
Dale Husbands, Dean	Osceola	dhusbands@valenciacollege.edu	4841	6-3
Planning Team Members ²	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Kristy Pennino	East	kpennino@valenciacollege.edu	2864	3-2
Meg Curtiss	West & Osceola	mcurtiss@valenciacollege.edu	1452 & 4972	4-24 & 6-3
Amanda Kern	East	akern@valenciacollege.edu	2720	3-2
Jason Ellison	East	jellison3@valenciacollege.edu	2868	3-2
Luis Salas	Osceola	Lsalas1@gmail.com	4972	6-3

¹ Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans. See the attached documents entitled *Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process* and *Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process – Student Affairs*

² Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the *Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams*. For faculty teams the principles include: Collegewide representation where possible; Full-time faculty from the respective program / discipline (tenured, tenure track, and Non-Tenure Earning 4 / 8 / 10 month faculty); Adjunct faculty when an adequate number of full-time faculty do not teach in the program / discipline; Faculty from both disciplines or programs when an outcome is assessed in two programs or a program other than the primary discipline. For plans developed in Student Affairs planning teams should include the following: Collegewide representation where possible; Staff from the targeted program area; Part-time Student Affairs professionals when an adequate number of full-time staff do not work in the targeted program area; Faculty / staff from other program / discipline areas working on the same or similar outcomes; Students representation when possible.

Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

<p>Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area: Graphics Technology, Graphic Design Technology, CIP: 1650040200</p>	
<p>Targeted Program Learning Outcome:</p> <p>Produce a finished digital or printed portfolio that visually demonstrates design, typography and technical abilities.</p>	<p>Targeted Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity associated with the Academic Program:</p> <p>GRA 1951C Portfolio Review</p>
	<p>Targeted Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity identified above:</p> <p>Student will demonstrate cumulative understanding of design, typography, creativity, concept development, visual communication and techniques while focusing on how what was learned meets industry expectations.</p>
<p>Performance Indicators for the Program Learning Outcome(s) selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry experts agree that student work visually demonstrates cumulative understanding of typographic fundamentals to communicate a visual message, • Industry experts agree that student work demonstrates cumulative understanding of appropriate design principles to communicate a visual message, • Industry experts agree that student work is developed with an understanding of it's function to market themselves, • Industry experts agree that student work is visually impactful and does not exhibit any visually apparent technical flaws, • Industry experts agree the student is able to visually and verbally present their finished portfolio in a way that demonstrates cumulative understanding of industry expectations. 	<p>Performance Indicators for Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student will produce a visual portfolio that applies cumulative program learning outcomes in design, typography, concept development and creativity, • Student will produce a visual portfolio that demonstrates cumulative technical proficiency needed to execute visual solutions, • Student will apply cumulative understanding of industry expectations while visually and verbally presenting their finished portfolio.
<p>Common Assessment (What assessment method (written assignment, speech, test, etc.) will you use to assess student ability related to the program / course outcome(s) selected): Portfolio review.</p>	

Description of the Proposed Common Assessment (Common assessments should be designed to ensure a balance between (1) the need for a consistency within the program in order to ensure comparable student artifacts and (2) the need for reasonable flexibility in order to encourage faculty judgment in the design and delivery of learning activities): **Portfolio review scheduled at the commencement of every semester where industry experts are asked to use a rubric to assess the final presentation of students' and their visual portfolios.**

Proposed Assessment Instrument (In some cases the assessment method may not need an associated assessment instrument – e.g., multiple choice tests): **Industry experts will complete a rubric evaluating students' finished visual portfolios.**

Implementation Process

Collection of Student Artifacts

What information needs to be communicated to students concerning the assessment process (informed consent, etc.)?

There is no random sampling or anonymity issues complicating the chosen assessment process.

How will student artifacts or data associated with student performance be collected?

Portfolio work samples and rubrics for GRA 1951C Portfolio Review completers are already collected at the commencement of this process.

If student artifacts are to be collected based on a random sample of students registered for the course or participating in the program / activity, what characteristics should the sample include? **n/a**

How will information about faculty / staff participation in the assessment project be communicated?

Electronically & in person.

Who will be responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts?

All instructors for GRA 1951C Portfolio Review whose responsibility it is to ensure students are prepared for their final Portfolio Review from industry professionals. Collection of artifacts is already common protocol for this course and has been an ongoing process.

At what point in the academic year / semester will the student artifacts be collected?

This is an ongoing process, however, each semester additional artifacts from GRA 1951C Portfolio Review are archived and published at semester-end to share with faculty, industry, the community and to help students market themselves.

Program Level Assessment / Evaluation of Student Artifacts and Analysis of Results

When will student artifacts be assessed / evaluated?

They are already assessed and evaluated every semester at the end of the semester.

Which faculty or staff from the program/discipline will evaluate student artifacts?

Meg Curtiss, Amanda Kern, Jason Ellison, Kristy Pennino. The final evaluation of finished portfolios, however, is completed by industry professionals to ultimately assess “industry readiness”.

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order adequately assess / evaluate the student artifacts collected?

The rubric is currently used by industry professionals to evaluate student artifacts is self-explanatory and requires no training for use.

When will the results / data associated with the assessment plan be analyzed?

May 2011

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order to analyze the results data associated with this assessment plan?

None. This will be discussed when meeting in person.

What additional sources of data might allow faculty / staff to better understand and act on the results of this assessment plan?

Feedback solicited from industry professionals who utilize the assessment rubric provided.

In order to ensure curricular and programmatic alignment, who else should be included in this conversation (e.g., faculty from related discipline areas in General Education)?

College-wide Deans (East, West, Osceola).

How will the assessment results be disseminated to stakeholders (Faculty, Staff, Advisory Boards, etc.)?

Electronically and/or in person.

Approval Process

Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans	Completion Date	Person Responsible	Results
Draft assessment plan is circulated for input to reviewers appropriate to the program / discipline (including Deans / Directors responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan)	July 20, 2010	Kristy Pennino	Draft assessment plan was completed and approved by the set completion date.
College-wide live or e-mail / Blackboard discussion will be coordinated to consider input received (if needed)	July 20, 2010	Kristy Pennino	Ongoing live and electronic meetings were arranged and input was received by the set completion date.
Draft assessment plan is revised to reflect input	May 5, 2011	Kristy Pennino	Assessment plan was revised and work was begun to implement the plan.

Faculty vote on the Assessment Plan using the Current voter eligibility list for curriculum (http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/)	May 5, 2011 July 26, 2011	Kristy Pennino Meg Curtiss Amanda Kern Jason Ellison	Voting on the assessment plan took place electronically. All supporting documentation for the work accomplished, in addition to approving the plan was accomplished by the date listed. Once this plan was approved all work referred to in the plan tasks were ASSIGNED and COMPLETED ON JULY 26 2011 AND ALL VOTES NEEDED TO CONFIRM COMPLETION OF ASSIGNED IMPROVEMENTS WERE SECURED.
---	------------------------------	---	--

Dean / Director Support

The Dean(s) / Directors (for Librarians) responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan need to indicate their support for the plan.

Dean / Director East / Winter Park Campus	Signature
Dean / Director Osceola / Lake Nona Campus	Signature
Dan Dutkofski Dean / Director West Campus	Dan Dutkofski Signature

Improvement Plan and the Use of Assessment Results (To be completed after the implementation of the initial Assessment Plan and the review of student artifacts)

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements needed within the curriculum (Specific recommendations for improvement, targeted course(s), co-curricular program or student activity)?

Rewording of the assessment device referenced (rubric) was needing to be aligned better with PLOs. This rewording and assessment of the changes made occurred during the Spring and Summer semesters of 2011 and was completed by July 26, 2011.

Refreshing of many of the course outlines to include more accurately articulated course outcomes to ensure they are outcomes and to ensure alignment with the newly defined Program Learning Outcomes. These plans, improvements and assessment of the results occurred during the Summer semester of 2011 and was completed by July 26, 2011.

What changes to the common course outlines, if any, need to be considered?

See above.

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements to the program assessment process?

See above.

Individual(s) Responsible leading the implementation of recommendations

Kristy Pennino, Meg Curtiss, Amanda Kern, Jason Ellison

Stakeholders Impacted by the recommendations for improvement

Faculty, students, industry.