

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Graphic Design Technology	215	GDT 215 05/23/2023- Typography II
College	Division	Department
Business and Computer Technologies	Business and Computer Technologies	Digital Media Arts (new)
Faculty Preparer		Ingrid Ankerson
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Apply advanced typographic principles such as typographic form, text type, and page structure.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio of student projects
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 70% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students meet a level of competency or higher on all components contained in the rubric (3 of 4).
- Who will score and analyze the data: GDT faculty will score and analyze the data.

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)
	2023, 2022	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
26	24

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.

Two students withdrew from the course.

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.

This is a face-to-face, daytime class. Both sections assessed reflect this criteria.

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

I used a large project from the class to evaluate all criteria in this outcome and used a rubric for scoring. This project had several components including print design, web design, animated type, and several other three-dimensional pieces. It was scored with a 1-4 rubric.

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
 22 out of 24 students (92%) scored 75% or higher on this outcome. The standard of success was met. However, this outcome as written is a little dated. I will update the master syllabus language to better reflect current design trends and language.

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

Students were able to select and use appropriate typefaces for the screen including websites, animations, and social media posts. The majority of them produced high quality professional typographic assets.

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 standard of success was met and assignments in this class should continue to challenge students to keep up with trends in both design and technology.

Outcome 2: Use both digital and hand-crafted methods to execute designs in visual communication.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio of student projects
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 70% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students meet a level of competency or higher on all components contained in the rubric (3 of 4).
 - Who will score and analyze the data: GDT faculty will score and analyze the data.

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)
	2023, 2022	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
26	24

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.

Two students withdrew from the course.

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.

This is a face-to-face, daytime class. Both sections assessed reflect these criteria.

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

Students completed five projects for this class and I looked at their entire portfolio of work to assess this outcome. It was scored on a 1-4 rubric.

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

All of the students (100%) sampled achieved this learning outcome. Students generally default to using digital type for their work, but there is one project in this class that specifically directs students to use hand-crafted type. By introducing this project, students are more likely to consider this as an option and they then incorporate it as appropriate.

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

Students excel in this outcome and produce some very interesting and compelling work. They learn that sometimes the best solution can be made by hands, not on a computer, and it really opens them to using different methods in other classes as well.

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.

I think instructors of this class just need to continue to make sure students know that "handmade" is almost always an option for assignments.

Outcome 3: Apply knowledge of advanced grid structures and page structure through visual communication designs.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio of student projects
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 70% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students meet a level of competency or higher on all components contained in the rubric (3 of 4).
 - Who will score and analyze the data: GDT faculty will score and analyze the data.

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)
	2023, 2022	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
26	24

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.

Two students withdrew from the course.

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.

This is a face-to-face, daytime class. Both sections assessed reflect these criteria.

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

I used a large project from the class to evaluate all criteria in this outcome and used a rubric for scoring. This project had several components including print design, web design, animated type, and several other three-dimensional pieces. It was scored with a 1-4 rubric.

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

22 out of 24 students (92%) scored 75% or higher on this outcome. The standard of success was met.

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

The standard of success was met. Students receive lectures and exercises on using grids in every class in the program, so by the time they get to an advanced class like this, they should know how to use them. "Advanced" grid structure lets them push things a little, which they are ready to do by the time they reach this class.

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.

Even though they repeatedly learn about grid structures, for some reason sticking to a grid is one of the hardest challenges for students. They often create documents with a grid and then "find it too constricting" and will put text and images anywhere. I think there is an opportunity in this class to give students a series of grids (both conventional and unconventional) for a poster design and have them work through design variations with this grid to show they can be dynamic, interesting, and can help with hierarchy and readability. I think students know that a grid is important, but instructors have to keep coming up with ways to show why it is important and how it can help the design.

Outcome 4: Identify and implement appropriate type choices for the web.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio of student projects
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All

- Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 70% of all students with a minimum of one full section
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students meet a level of competency or higher on all components contained in the rubric (3 of 4).
- Who will score and analyze the data: GDT faculty will score and analyze the data.

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)
	2022, 2023	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
26	24

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.

Two students withdrew from the course.

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.

This is a face-to-face, daytime class. Both sections assessed reflect these criteria.

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

I looked at the projects that had a web design component in this class. It was scored with a 1-4 rubric.

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

23 out of 24 students (96%) scored 75% or higher on this outcome. The standard of success was met. However, this outcome needs to be updated to reflect the current standards of type for the web.

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

There have been many advancements in font technology since this class was first designed. Using the knowledge they have from Type 1 and their other introductory design classes, they have a very good understanding of typography already and are able to apply it for web-based projects.

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.

It is important that our instructors keep up with font technology and trends and to share this with our students. This is also a class where we need to make sure students really understand screen resolution.

Outcome 5: Apply knowledge of typographic limitations and requirements for communication on screen-based media.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Portfolio of student projects
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2014
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 70% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of the students meet a level of competency or higher on all components contained in the rubric (3 of 4).
 - Who will score and analyze the data: GDT faculty will score and analyze the data.
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)
	2023, 2022	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
26	24

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.

Two students 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.

This is a face-to-face, daytime class. Both sections assessed reflect these criteria.

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

I looked at the projects that had a web/screen design component in this class. It was scored with a 1-4 rubric.

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
Outcome 4 and 5 can essentially be re-written and combined into one. I am using the same data as outcome 4 for these results. 23 out of 24 students (96%) scored 75% or higher on this outcome. The standard of success was met.

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

This outcome is essentially the same as outcome #4 and should be combined into one.

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.

Again this outcome is essentially the same as outcome #4 and should be combined into one.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

There was no previous report.

2. 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, this course is meeting the needs of students. Good typography is probably the most important thing for a designer to have and it is what potential employers look at first. This class both refreshes students on the basics of type, but really starts to push them forward in terms of experimentation and designing bigger systems using consistent typography. The assessment didn't necessarily bring anything to light, but it was a good reminder of how much students achieve and advance in this class.

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

This information will be shared with faculty at a meeting and will be relayed to the next instructor(s) to teach the class.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	I will update and clarify some of the language used for assessing outcomes. Also, outcomes 4 and 5 will be combined into a single outcome.	Some of the language is a little unclear and outdated. Outomes 4 and 5 are essentially assessing the same thing, and should be combined.	2023

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[GDT215 Assessment](#)

Faculty/Preparer:	Ingrid Ankerson	Date: 07/13/2023
Department Chair:	Jason Withrow	Date: 07/14/2023
Dean:	Eva Samulski	Date: 07/17/2023
Assessment Committee Chair:	Jessica Hale	Date: 11/08/2023